

THE STUDENT'S LIFE OF PAUL

•The M Co.

THE
STUDENT'S LIFE OF PAUL

BY

GEORGE HOLLEY GILBERT, PH.D., D.D.

PROFESSOR OF NEW TESTAMENT LITERATURE AND
INTERPRETATION IN CHICAGO THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY
AUTHOR OF "THE STUDENT'S LIFE OF JESUS"

New York

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

LONDON: MACMILLAN & CO., LTD.

1907

All rights reserved

COPYRIGHT, 1899,
By THE MACMILLAN COMPANY.

Set up and electrotyped March, 1899. Reprinted February,
1902 ; May, 1907.

Norwood Press
J. S. Cushing & Co. — Berwick & Smith
Norwood Mass. U.S.A.

PREFACE

THE aim of this book is threefold: first, to present the biography of the great apostle to the Gentiles entirely apart from a study of his theological teaching, which has not hitherto been done. The importance of Paul's life and the importance of his teaching fully justify a separate treatment of each, and such treatment is also in the interest of a clear and forcible presentation both of his biography and of his teaching.

Second, to present the facts in as simple and scientific a manner as possible, without comment and without rhetorical elaboration, assuming that what the reader desires to know first of all, and what he surely ought to know first of all, is the facts, or the nearest possible approximation to the facts.

Third, to present the material in an accessible and usable form. To this end the chapters are subdivided into numbered paragraphs, full references are made to the Biblical sources, and abundant, though by no means exhaustive, references to the modern literature of the subject.

G. H. G.

CHICAGO,
January 14, 1899.



CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| PAUL'S CHILDHOOD IN TARSUS | I |
| 1. The City | I |
| 2. The Jews of the Diaspora | 3 |
| 3. Paul's Family and Boyhood | 9 |

CHAPTER II

| | |
|---|----|
| PAUL AT THE FEET OF GAMALIEL | 12 |
| 1. Sent to Jerusalem | 12 |
| 2. Gamaliel I. and Rabbinic Education | 13 |
| 3. Rabbinism in Paul | 17 |

CHAPTER III

| | |
|--|----|
| PAUL AS INQUISITOR AND PERSECUTOR | 19 |
| 1. Return to Tarsus | 19 |
| 2. Stephen and the Larger View of Christianity | 21 |
| 3. Persecution by Paul | 24 |

CHAPTER IV

| | |
|--|----|
| THE VISION OF JESUS AND THE CHANGED LIFE | 27 |
| 1. The Testimony of the Epistles | 27 |
| 2. The Testimony of Acts | 30 |
| 3. Preparation for the Vision | 34 |
| 4. The Commission | 38 |
| 5. The First Days in Damascus | 39 |

CHAPTER V

| | PAGE |
|---|------|
| THE PERIOD OF OBSCURITY | 42 |
| 1. In Arabia | 42 |
| 2. In Damascus | 44 |
| 3. From Damascus to Jerusalem | 46 |
| 4. In Syria and Cilicia | 52 |

CHAPTER VI

| | |
|---|----|
| THE WORK IN ANTIOCH | 57 |
| 1. The City | 57 |
| 2. The Origin of the Church in Antioch | 58 |
| 3. Paul's Mission to Jerusalem in the Judean Famine | 62 |
| 4. The Name <i>Christian</i> | 67 |

CHAPTER VII

| | |
|--|----|
| THE FIRST MISSIONARY TOUR FROM ANTIOCH | 69 |
| 1. Barnabas and Paul set apart | 69 |
| 2. The Tour of Cyprus | 72 |
| 3. The Work in Pisidian Antioch | 76 |
| 4. The Work in Iconium | 81 |
| 5. The Work in Lystra and Derbe | 83 |
| 6. The Journey Homeward | 85 |

CHAPTER VIII

| | |
|---|-----|
| THE STRUGGLE FOR GENTILE FREEDOM | 87 |
| 1. The Problem of the Sources | 87 |
| 2. The "False Brethren" | 94 |
| 3. The Compromise | 96 |
| 4. The Subsequent History of the Decree | 102 |

CHAPTER IX

| | PAGE |
|---|------------|
| THE INTRODUCTION OF THE GOSPEL INTO EUROPE . . . | 107 |
| 1. The Inception of the European Tour | 107 |
| 2. Seeking New Fields | 109 |
| 3. Paul's Vision in Troas | 112 |
| 4. The First Church in Europe | 114 |
| 5. The Work in Thessalonica | 118 |
| 6. The Work in Beroëa | 123 |
| 7. Paul in Athens | 125 |
| 8. The Work in Corinth | 130 |
| 9. Distinguished Colaborers of Paul | 135 |

CHAPTER X

| | |
|---|------------|
| PAUL IN EPHESUS | 142 |
| 1. The City | 142 |
| 2. The Disciples of John the Baptist | 143 |
| 3. Extent of the Work in Ephesus | 146 |
| 4. Special Features of Paul's Work in Ephesus | 149 |
| 5. The Close of Paul's Work in Ephesus | 153 |

CHAPTER XI

| | |
|--|------------|
| PAUL'S SECOND VISIT TO EUROPE AND LAST JOURNEY TO JERUSALEM | 157 |
| 1. The Collection for the Poor Christians in Jerusalem | 157 |
| 2. The Troubles in Corinth | 160 |
| 3. In Macedonia and Achaia | 166 |
| 4. The Fifth and Last Journey to Jerusalem | 168 |

CHAPTER XII

| | |
|---|------------|
| ARRESTED IN JERUSALEM, IMPRISONED IN CÆSAREA | 175 |
| 1. The Concession to Jewish Prejudice | 175 |
| 2. Paul assaulted by Jews and saved by Roman Soldiers | 179 |
| 3. Paul's Speech from the Castle Stairs | 181 |

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| 4. Paul in the Sanhedrin | 184 |
| 5. Paul's Final Departure from Jerusalem | 189 |
| 6. Two Years in Cæsarea | 191 |

CHAPTER XIII

| | |
|--|-----|
| THE JOURNEY TO ROME IN BONDS | 195 |
| 1. The Appeal to Cæsar | 195 |
| 2. From Cæsarea to Myra | 200 |
| 3. From Myra to Malta | 203 |
| 4. From Malta to Puteoli | 207 |
| 5. From Puteoli to Rome | 210 |

CHAPTER XIV

| | |
|---|-----|
| AT THE BAR OF NERO | 216 |
| 1. The Character of Paul's Roman Imprisonment | 216 |
| 2. Evangelistic Labors in Rome | 218 |
| 3. The Trial | 222 |

CHAPTER XV

| | |
|--|-----|
| THE CLOSE OF PAUL'S LIFE | 225 |
| 1. The Tour from Rome Eastward | 225 |
| 2. The Second Imprisonment and Death of Paul | 229 |

APPENDICES

| | |
|--|-----|
| I. The Sources of Paul's Biography | 233 |
| II. The Chronology of Paul's Life | 242 |
| III. The Churches of Galatia | 260 |

INDEX OF PASSAGES FROM ACTS AND THE PAULINE

| | |
|-------------------------------------|-----|
| EPISTLES | 273 |
| INDEX OF LITERATURE CITED | 279 |

THE STUDENT'S LIFE OF PAUL

CHAPTER I

PAUL'S CHILDHOOD IN TARSUS

1. *The City.*

ABOUT halfway between Jerusalem, the capital of Judaism, and Constantinople, the capital of the first Christian Emperor of Rome, stood Tarsus, the birthplace and early home of that man who, more than any other, carried Christianity from Judea throughout the Roman empire. The city was in Level Cilicia, sixty miles west of the field where Alexander defeated Darius (333 B.C.), 129 miles west of Antioch, the first metropolis of Gentile Christianity, and 515 miles north-west of Jerusalem. It was situated on the Cydnus River, twelve miles from the Mediterranean coast, for which distance the river was navigable in Paul's time. It was called the capital of Cilicia when Cicero was governor of the province (51-50 B.C.), and later bore the title of *metropolis*. It had been a free city for a century before Paul's birth, and as such possessed certain rights and privileges, the chief of which were control of its

own finances, which included the power to levy taxes within its own territory and to coin money, jurisdiction over its own citizens and also over foreigners who sojourned there, freedom from the land tax levied by the Roman government, and freedom from a garrison of Roman soldiers.¹

It is not quite certain whether Cilicia was a province at the time of Paul's birth, or only a part of the province of Syria. The natural inference from Acts xxiii. 34, 35, is that, at the time of Paul's arrest in Jerusalem and imprisonment in Cæsarea, Cilicia was a separate province. When Felix, the Roman procurator, received the prisoner, he at once asked to what province he belonged, and he was informed that he was from Cilicia. But Marquardt² is of the opinion that Cilicia was under the government of Syria during the greater part of the first century, and this view is adopted by many scholars.³

Tarsus was a centre of education and culture, and ranked with Athens and Alexandria. Strabo ranked it above these cities in philosophy and general education. He said that the men who dwelt there had such zeal for philosophy and all other instruction that they

¹ Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, I. 78-80; Mommsen, *Römisches Staatsrecht*, III. 655-659.

² *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, I. 386, 387.

³ *E.g.*, Schürer, Zahn, and Hort.

surpassed Athens and Alexandria, and any other place that can be named in which there have been schools and studies of philosophy.¹ It was the home of the poet Aratus (270 B.C.), from whose words Paul quoted in the Areopagus address.² Apollonius, a contemporary of Paul and a native of Tyana, a city about seventy-five miles north of Paul's home, studied in Tarsus. In later years, Paul must have known his name and works well, for Apollonius was one of the most striking characters of the first century, whether he was "a sage, an impostor, or a fanatic." A little before the time of Paul, Strabo, the geographer, studied in Tarsus (54 B.C.—24 A.D.), and with him the Stoic philosopher Athenodorus Cananites, a teacher of the Emperor Augustus; and two centuries after Paul's day we find such eminent men studying in Tarsus as Theodore of Mopsuestia (†429) and Chrysostom (†407). Strabo says that in his time Rome was full of learned men from Tarsus and Alexandria.³

2. *The Jews of the Diaspora.*

Paul was a Jew of the Diaspora, or Dispersion, and therefore, at this point, we may properly take a rapid survey of the location, numbers, and estate of these scattered Jews. Already in the second century be-

¹ Strabo, Müller's edition, p. 574.

² Acts xvii. 28.

³ Müller's edition, p. 575.

fore the time of Paul, the Sibylline writings said that every land and sea was full of Jews.¹ Strabo, in a passage quoted by Josephus, says, it is hard to find a place in the habitable earth that hath not admitted this tribe of men, and is not possessed by it.² Philo and Josephus testify that Jews were settled in all the world, and it was said that Jerusalem might be called the world's capital because of the widespread Jewish colonies. Philo says that there were a million Jews in Egypt in his day. They were numerous in Rome from the time of Pompey, and still more numerous in Syria and Asia Minor. Antiochus Epiphanes deported two thousand Jewish families from Babylon to the cities of Phrygia and Lydia. There must have been a large Jewish population in Damascus, for Josephus tells of the slaughter of ten thousand there in the time of Nero.³

These Jews who were thus scattered throughout the Roman empire sometimes had the rights of citizenship in the particular cities in which they lived, and sometimes had the rights of Roman citizenship.⁴ Paul had both. He was a citizen of Tarsus,⁵ and also a citizen of Rome.⁶ There were many and important cities, especially in Syria, Asia

¹ Schürer, *Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes*, II. 494, 495.

² *Antiquities*, xiv. 7. 2.

³ *Jewish War*, ii. 20. 2.

⁴ Schürer, II. 533-541.

⁵ Acts xxi. 39.

⁶ Acts xxii. 28.

Minor, and Egypt, in which the Jewish residents had the rights of citizenship. Thus Seleucus Nicator, in the third century before Christ, bestowed these rights upon the Jews in all the cities which he founded in Asia and Syria,¹ and they still possessed them in the time of Josephus. Likewise in the third century, Antiochus II. gave the rights of citizenship to the Jews of Ephesus and some other cities on the coast of Asia.² In Alexandria, which was founded in part by Jews, they enjoyed the rights of citizenship from the first. Josephus says that a large part of the city was allotted to them, and that they had an ethnarch who governed them as though he were the ruler of a free republic.³ In Cyrene, which had a large Jewish population, the Jews had equal rights with the other inhabitants.⁴

A considerable number of Jews, both in Rome and elsewhere, were Roman citizens. The *Libertines*, who are mentioned in Acts vi. 9, are generally regarded as Jews who had been manumitted in Rome and at the same time had been presented with citizenship, or as the descendants of such Jews.⁵ According to Philo, most of the Jews in Rome were Roman citizens.⁵ In like manner, there were

¹ *Antiquities*, xii. 3. 1.

³ *Antiquities*, xiv. 7. 2.

² Schürer, II. 535.

⁴ *Antiquities*, xvi. 6. 1.

⁵ Schürer, II. 537.

numerous Jews in Ephesus, Sardis, and Delos who were Roman citizens,¹ and they were probably to be found in other cities.

The chief privileges of Roman citizenship were three: trial by Roman courts, freedom from dishonorable punishments, as scourging and crucifixion, and the right of appeal to Cæsar, within certain limitations.²

The policy of the Roman government toward the Jews, as also the policy of Alexander and the Seleucidæ in their time, was, in the main, friendly. Julius Cæsar, Augustus, and Claudius dealt liberally with the Jews.³ Judaism had a legal status nearly half a century before the beginning of the Christian era,⁴ and this brought with it to the scattered Jewish communities the right to exercise jurisdiction over their own members, unless they were Roman citizens, and also the right to control their property. This latter point was of great importance because the Jews of the Diaspora might otherwise be hindered in sending money to Jerusalem for the payment of the temple dues.⁵ Of great importance also was the right of the Jewish communities to try their members according to their own laws. This they did

¹ *Antiquities*, xiv. 10. 13-19.

³ *Antiquities*, xvi. 6. 2; xix. 5. 2, 3.

² Schürer, II. 538, 539.

⁴ Schürer, II. 525.

⁵ *Antiquities*, xvi. 6. 2-7.

both in civil and criminal matters.¹ Instances of this right are furnished by the life of Paul.²

Further evidence of the friendliness of the Roman government toward the Jews is seen in the fact that their religious scruples against serving in the army and against any activity on the Sabbath, other than their own laws allowed, were respected,³ and when the worship of the emperors arose the Jews were exempted from the obligation, if we except the brief reign of Caligula.⁴

The language of the dispersed Jews was almost universally Greek, the language which since the conquests of Alexander had become more and more widely used in the East, and which as the language of art and culture was cultivated in Rome and the West. This was used in the synagogues of the Jews,⁵ and was the language in which their sacred writings were commonly read. The Old Testament had been translated into Greek in the third and second centuries before Christ.

The missionary activity of the scattered Jews in the time of Paul was considerable, as we see from the Acts where there is frequent mention of Gentiles who are attached to the synagogue and who fear God.⁶ The same activity is referred to by Jesus, who said that

¹ Schürer, II. 527, 528.

² Acts ix. 2; xviii. 14; xxii. 19; xxvi. 11.

³ *Antiquities*, xiv. 10. 12, 13; xvi. 6. 2, 4.

⁴ Schürer, II. 529, 530.

⁵ Schürer, II. 543.

⁶ *E.g.*, Acts xiii. 16, 43.

the Pharisees compassed sea and land to make one proselyte.¹ Graetz says that more proselytes were made in the decade before the fall of Jerusalem than ever before.² Josephus tells us that most of the women in Damascus were proselytes,³ also that Queen Helen of Adiabene, and Izates her son, who became king, were adherents of the Jews' religion.⁴

The popular attitude of the Gentiles toward the Jews was one of contempt and hatred. This was caused in part by the exclusiveness of the Jews, and by their outspoken scorn for idolatry and idolaters. Tacitus⁵ says that whatever is held sacred by the Romans is profane with the Jews, and what in other nations is unlawful and impure is with them fully established. He attributes to the Jews a "sullen and inveterate hatred" toward the rest of mankind. This entire passage in Tacitus is most unworthy of the historian, for it betrays great ignorance regarding the facts and a willingness to accept the worst slanders as authoritative; but it is just this latter fact which makes his testimony valuable at this point. It illustrates the widespread Gentile aversion to the Jews. We shall have more than one occasion to note how, in the life of Paul, this bitter feeling toward the Jews caused suffering to the Christian missionary, and apparently hindered his work.

¹ Matt. xxiii. 15.

³ *Jewish War*, ii. 20. 2.

² *History of the Jews*, II. 215.

⁴ *Antiquities*, xx. 2. 1.

⁵ *History*, v. 4.

3. *The Family and Boyhood of Paul.*

Our knowledge regarding the family of Paul is very meagre. He never mentions father or mother, brother or sister. That his father was a Roman citizen, we know from Paul's word to the chief captain;¹ but we cannot infer from the fact of citizenship that he had at least moderate wealth. Manumitted slaves were frequently presented with citizenship.² On the other hand, the fact that Paul learned a trade is not evidence that his family was poor, for the Jewish rabbis taught that it was a man's duty to teach his son a trade.³ Paul's education in Jerusalem is not proof of wealth, for we learn from Luke that a married sister was settled in Jerusalem with whom he may have lived,⁴ and the cost of instruction was probably small. Rabbis, like Gamaliel, who had schools and who were wholly occupied with them, may have received presents from scholars who were able to make presents,⁵ but these were not regarded as pay for teaching the law, which is itself priceless, and must be taught without price; but they were regarded as a recompense for the rabbi's time.⁶

Paul's word to Agrippa that he had lived after

¹ Acts xxii. 28.

² Schürer, II. 537.

³ Gfrörer, *Das Jahrhundert des Heils*, I. 160, 161.

⁴ Acts xxiii. 16.

⁵ Gfrörer, I. 161.

⁶ Weber, *Die Lehren des Talmuds*, p. 126.

the straitest sect of the Jews' religion, his saying before the sanhedrin, "I am a Pharisee, a son of Pharisees," and his entire life before his conversion, suggest that his father, though living among the Gentiles, was a zealous observer of the law. It seems not improbable that the sister in Jerusalem remained a strict Jew and hostile to Christianity, for had she shared Paul's faith, we might have expected some indication of the fact, expressed or implied, and possibly, as Ramsay¹ suggests, the fact that the conspiracy to kill Paul was known to his sister's son implies that she was in touch with the hostile Jews.

It is not quite certain what Paul means when he says that he is *a Hebrew of Hebrews*,² but the phrase probably signifies no more than this, that Paul was of pure Jewish descent. It is useless to seek an explanation by means of the tradition that Paul's parents had come from Palestine; for even if the tradition could be trusted, it is certain that Paul himself was born in Tarsus,³ and therefore was a Hellenist.

Since Paul's home was that of zealous Pharisees, we may infer that he was most carefully instructed in the Scriptures from earliest youth.⁴ What Josephus says of the training of all Jewish children, though manifestly somewhat exaggerated, may well have been

¹ *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, p. 35.

² Phil. iii. 5.

³ Acts xxii. 3.

⁴ Comp. 2 Tim. iii. 15.

applicable in a good degree to Paul. He says that the Jews learned the law as soon as they became sensible of anything, and had it engraven on their souls so that they could tell the whole of it more easily than they could tell their own names.¹ We can only conjecture what the school life of Paul may have been while he was a boy in Tarsus. It seems probable that schools in connection with the synagogue date back as far as the earlier part of the first Christian century,² and if so Paul may have attended such a school. There as at home his study would have been study of the law, probably in Greek.

If Paul went to Jerusalem at an early age, as we hold that he did, it is not likely that he attended a Gentile school in Tarsus; and as to the university, if he ever listened to lectures there at all, it must have been after his rabbinic course in Jerusalem had been completed.

¹ *Against Apion*, II. 19.

² Schürer, II. 353.

CHAPTER II

PAUL AT THE FEET OF GAMALIEL

I. *Sent to Jerusalem.*

AT what age Paul was taken to Jerusalem to receive instruction in the law we cannot definitely ascertain. He was evidently quite a young boy. This is implied when he says, "I am a Jew, *born* in Tarsus, but *brought up* in this city."¹ It is implied also when he says that his manner of life *from his youth* was known to the Jews of Jerusalem.² If he was sent to Jerusalem when he became a "son of the law," which, however, cannot be affirmed, then we know his age within narrow limits, but still not absolutely, for it was after Paul's day that the thirteenth year was fixed as the time when a Jewish boy became responsible to do the whole law.³ Prior to this, the age at which Israelites were counted responsible for keeping the law was the age of puberty, and therefore not the same year in every case.

Therefore we must be content with the general knowledge that Paul went to Jerusalem to enter on a

¹ Acts xxii. 3.

² Acts xxvi. 4.

³ Schürer, II. 354, 355.

course of rabbinic training when he was a young boy. It was not necessary that he should go to Jerusalem in order to secure this training, for there were competent teachers elsewhere, doubtless in the neighboring Antioch with its great synagogue and large Jewish population; but it was altogether natural that he should go to Jerusalem, for there were not only the most famous schools of Hillel and Schammai, men whose work belonged to the recent past, but there was the temple with its imperishable fascination for the Jewish heart. If Paul was ambitious to become a rabbi, no place of study could for a moment rival in attractiveness the holy city.

2. *Gamaliel I. and Rabbinic Education.*

Paul was fortunate in his teacher. Gamaliel I. may or may not have been a grandson of Hillel,¹ he was certainly of a kindred spirit, and the most illustrious representative of the school of Hillel. Tradition represents him as humble minded, one who served those who were inferior to him in rank, though the rabbis usually laid great stress upon their claim to honor.² In the Book of Acts, Gamaliel appears as a man of courage, and yet conciliatory; a man of somewhat liberal mind, and the most influential person in the san-

¹ Gfrörer and Strack hold that Gamaliel was a grandson of Hillel, Schürer that he was not.

² Weber, *Die Lehren des Talmud*, p. 129.

hedrin.¹ His words in favor of a mild policy toward the apostles are not evidence of an inward leaning toward Christianity: they are evidence rather of a fatalistic philosophy. If this movement be of men, he argued, it will be overthrown by divine providence, and we need not stain our hands with the blood of Peter and the others. It is manifest that he expected such an overthrow of the Christian movement; and that just as Theudas and his followers were dispersed, and as Judas of Galilee and his adherents were destroyed, so this sect would come to naught.

We can form only a general idea of the substance and the method of the education which Paul received in the school of Gamaliel. The rabbis met their pupils in the courts of the temple.² The teacher occupied a high seat, while his pupils sat on the floor in front of him. As Gamaliel was a famous teacher, it is probable that the number of pupils gathered before him was great. Josephus mentions two teachers, Judas and Matthias by name, who in the time of Herod the Great were surrounded by a *multitude* of young men.³ And so Paul may have been one of several hundred students who waited upon the instruction of Gamaliel.

The work of a Jewish school was chiefly memorizing. The teacher repeated again and again an ex-

¹ Acts v. 34-40.

² Luke ii. 46; xx. 1, etc.

³ *Jewish War*, i. 33. 2.

planation of a passage of Scripture, and the scholars were required to commit it to memory. Hence it came to pass that the very word *repeat* meant to *teach*, and one of the two great divisions of the Talmud is called *Mishna*, that is, *repetition*. By this method of teaching the imagination was suffocated and the memory strengthened.¹ The ideal of the student was to be like a well-plastered cistern, which loses no drop of the water which is put into it.² How long this course of study usually continued in the case of those who aspired to be teachers cannot be definitely stated. Sometimes, at least, it required twelve years to complete the course.³ A student was not qualified to teach as the head of a school until he was forty years old and knew the entire traditional law.

The power of the rabbi over his pupils was great, and the honor which he demanded was higher than that which was shown to parents. The pupil might not stand in the presence of the teacher except at the time of morning and evening prayer.⁴ The rabbi regarded himself as a mediator between God and men, who made known the divine will and helped men to keep it. The combined honor and power of king, priest, and prophet were supposed to belong to the

¹ Gröner, I. 160.

² Schürer, II. 264, 265.

³ Weber, p. 30.

⁴ Weber, p. 128.

scribe. To receive him was equivalent to receiving the Shekinah itself.

The content of rabbinic teaching was, theoretically, the law of Moses, but in reality it was the traditional interpretation of that law. It began with the memorizing of the text, and ended with the memorizing of the vast traditional interpretation of the text. This was regarded as of far the greater value.¹ The instruction was chiefly religious. The principal subject in civil law which was discussed was divorce. There was no place for the history and literature of any Gentile people, no place for art or philosophy, or for such knowledge of science as was then extant among the Egyptians or Greeks.

That there was some knowledge of Greek and Latin among educated Jews in Palestine is well known. The existence of a prohibition against teaching one's children Greek—a prohibition which dates from the seventh Christian decade—indicates plainly that there was a tendency to do just this thing. A Hellenist, like Paul, who spoke Greek, may of course have read Greek literature even while studying in Jerusalem, but there is no evidence that Paul as a pupil of Gamaliel was instructed in any subject except the law and its traditional interpretation.

¹ Gfrörer, I. 151; Schürer, II. 264; Weber, p. 103.

3. *Rabbinism in Paul.*

We should expect to find rabbinic ideas and rabbinic modes of thought in the Christian Paul. In some fundamental things his views were totally changed by conversion to Christianity, and yet he remained a Jew. He retained his Pharisaic zeal for God, and the heritage of his Jewish home and school is manifest in his thought to the end of his life. There is a lack of the historical sense in his interpretation of Scripture, but this belonged rather to the age than simply to the rabbinic school. Again, Paul draws from Jewish tradition, and communicates things which are not found in the Old Testament. Thus he gives the names of the magicians who withstood Moses,¹ and he says that the law was mediated by angels.² He speaks of a rock which followed the Israelites in the wilderness.³ He refers to these points just as any rabbi might have done, making no distinction between tradition and the Old Testament. Again, Paul occasionally allegorizes as the rabbis did. Thus Sarah and Hagar are two *covenants*. Hagar is Mount Sinai in Arabia, and Sarah is the Jerusalem which is above.⁴ In like manner, the rock which followed the Israelites in the wilderness was Christ.⁵ Once more, there are sections of Paul's teaching which have a marked

¹ 2 Tim. iii. 8.

² Gal. iii. 19.

³ 1 Cor. x. 4.

⁴ Gal. iv. 22-25.

⁵ 1 Cor. x. 4.

rabbinic or Jewish color, for example, his angelology and eschatology. Thus in common with the rabbis he knows of several orders of angels, both good and bad, and he departs notably from Jesus in the prominence which the subject has in his writings, though even he gives far less space to it than most Jewish writers of his time. There are also elements in Paul's eschatology which we may call Jewish rather than Christian, since they are based neither upon the Old Testament nor upon the teaching of Jesus. Thus, for example, by the side of the Christian teaching that the believer at death departs to be at home with Christ,¹ in a body conformed to the glorious body of Christ,² we find passages which speak of the resurrection of the body, which are in form at least materialistic.³ Likewise there are features in his representation of the *parousia* which have parallels in the Jewish writings rather than in the Christian.⁴ Yet these Jewish and rabbinic elements in Paul's writings are exceptional and incidental, and we should be surprised, not at their presence, but rather that they are not far more numerous.

¹ Phil. i. 23; 2 Cor. v. 8.

² Phil. iii. 21.

³ 1 Thess. iv. 16, 17.

⁴ 1 Thess. iv. 15-17; 2 Thess. i. 5-10.

CHAPTER III

PAUL AS INQUISITOR AND PERSECUTOR

I. *Return to Tarsus.*

IT is probable that Paul returned to Tarsus and remained there some time prior to his appearance in the Book of Acts at the martyrdom of Stephen. He would naturally return to his native city to learn his trade. It is doubtful whether he could have found opportunity in Jerusalem to learn it, for his trade was that of weaving goat's hair, and this was a Cilician industry.¹ Then it is altogether improbable that he was in Jerusalem during the public ministry of Jesus; for had he been, he would certainly have seen the prophet over whom the religious authorities were so highly excited, and who was reported to have wrought such extraordinary miracles; and if he had seen Jesus, we should expect some sort of allusion to that fact in his writings. But he nowhere intimates that he saw Jesus until he saw Him on the way to Damascus.² Yet, while it is probable that

¹ Schürer, II. 39.

² 2 Cor. v. 16 refers to a false judgment of Jesus, which Paul had formerly held.

Paul returned to Tarsus, and spent considerable time there before he began his career as a persecutor of the Church, it is not possible to fix the limits of that sojourn. If Paul followed the custom of marrying early, he may have returned to Tarsus and have married when he was eighteen or twenty years old. It is not, however, quite certain that he married at all. The view that he did is favored, first, by the fact that the Jews laid great stress on marriage. They did not sympathize with celibacy. This feature of the teaching of the Essenes was foreign to genuine Judaism.¹ The rabbis, moreover, were no exception to the rule that the Jews married and married young, and hence the presumption is that Paul married. It is sometimes supposed that the words of Paul in 1 Cor. vii. 7, 8 imply that he had not married. "I would that all men were even as I myself." "I say to the unmarried and to widows, It is good for them if they abide even as I." It seems plain that when Paul wrote these words he had no wife,² but they do not require us to suppose that he had never been married.

Again, Paul's exalted conception of the married state is rather favorable than otherwise to the view that he had been married. He glorifies the relation of husband and wife by comparing it with the rela-

¹ Schürer, II. 487.

² Comp. 1 Cor. ix. 4-6.

tion between Christ and the Church.¹ He could not have used this language if, as Pfleiderer holds,² he had allowed marriage only as an evil which was necessary for the prevention of unchastity, and had believed that the unmarried state was holier than the married. The seventh chapter of 1 Corinthians does not support this view of Pfleiderer, for it considers marriage simply from the standpoint of the speedy coming of the Lord.

But since the marriage of Paul is uncertain, no evidence can be derived from this source that bears upon the time of his return from Jerusalem to Tarsus. This must be left undetermined, as also the length of the sojourn in Tarsus. This, however, appears certain, that at the time of the first Christian persecution Paul was permanently located in Jerusalem, for his language implies that he was then a member of the sanhedrin,³ and to hold this office he must of necessity reside in or near Jerusalem. As election to the sanhedrin seems to have been for life,⁴ Paul must have counted himself a resident of Jerusalem when he accepted the office.

2. *Stephen and the Larger View of Christianity.*

Before Stephen arose, the opposition to Christianity had come largely from the Sadducees,⁵ and had

¹ Eph. v. 22, 23.

² *Das Urchristenthum*, pp. 280, 281.

³ Acts xxvi. 10.

⁴ Schürer, II. 152.

⁵ Acts iv. 1; v. 17.

not gone further than imprisonment. The reason of this lay in the fact that Christian believers were loyal to the temple, and so gave no offence to the Pharisees. But Stephen was not content to have the new faith made as narrow as the old. He seems to have held that Jesus taught a spiritual worship, and that legal rites were not necessary to salvation. In so doing he aroused the same hatred on the part of the Pharisees which had caused the death of Jesus. Stephen himself was probably a Hellenist,¹ and this explains why the opposition to him came from Jews of the Diaspora, from the Libertines, the Cyrenians, the Alexandrians, and from Jews of Cilicia and Asia.² Doubtless it was among these that he had been active.

It was charged that Stephen spoke blasphemous words against Moses and God, and said that Jesus would destroy the temple and change the customs of Moses.³ It is not possible to determine just what the position of Stephen had been with reference to the law and the temple,⁴ but we may suppose that, in line with the thought of Jesus,⁵ he had spoken of a destruction of the temple, and had said that the customs of Moses were not essential to salvation. In his defence before the council one prominent

¹ Acts vi. 1-3.

² Acts vi. 9.

³ Acts vi. 11, 14.

⁴ Acts vi. 13.

⁵ Mark xiii. 2; Matt. v. 17.

thought is that the revelation of God in the past had not been conditioned on the observance of legal rites.¹ From this we can infer that his position was one of spiritual freedom, and that he virtually claimed for the teaching of Jesus, that it had made the law obsolete. Thus the point at issue between Stephen and his opponents was indeed vital to the existence of the Jewish system. Either Stephen and his position must be overcome, or Pharisaism would be undermined and the temple would ultimately perish.

Such was the man and such the position which called out the strength of Paul. It is more than likely that Paul was one of those who had disputed with Stephen, for he doubtless belonged to the synagogue of the Cilicians, and this synagogue, we are told, was involved in the controversy.² Paul himself tells us that he consented to Stephen's murder,³ which is apparent also from Luke's narrative, for this says that Paul held the garments of the witnesses while they hurled the first stones at the martyr.⁴

The death of Stephen, in which Paul participated, was a death by mob-violence. The Jews had not the power of death at that time.⁵ They must have the authority of the Roman government in order to inflict the death penalty, and yet in the case of Ste-

¹ Acts vii. 2, 30.

² Acts vi. 9.

³ Acts xxii. 20.

⁴ Acts vii. 58; viii. 1.

⁵ John xviii. 31.

phen the narrative appears to exclude any reference to the procurator. Then, according to the humane law of the Jews, a sentence of condemnation could not be passed until the next day after the trial; but they condemned and executed Stephen on the same day on which he was brought before them.

3. *Persecution by Paul.*

From the day of Stephen's death Paul entered into the work of persecution with his whole soul. It was a matter of conscience with him,¹ and therefore he threw himself wholly into it. From all the indications of Acts and of the epistles, he was easily the leader of the opposition, and made a terrible record in his bloody work. His aim was radical and comprehensive. He purposed to wipe the entire sect of Christians out of existence. He had the sanhedrin back of him, though it does not seem likely that Gamaliel favored his bloody plan. If he did, his thought must have undergone a change since the day when he secured the release of Peter and the other apostles.² The sanhedrin, as a whole, plainly supported Paul,³ and the procurator seems not to have cared to exercise his veto power to save the lives of believers in Jesus.

In proceeding against the disciples, Paul sought

¹ Acts xxvi. 9.

² Acts v. 34-40.

³ Acts ix. 2; xxii. 5; xxvi. 10.

first to make them blaspheme, that is, blaspheme *Jesus*, and renounce their loyalty to Him; and if he failed in this, he caused them to be put to death. Many persons were imprisoned, and many put to death, both men and women.¹ Paul went throughout Judea,² and even outside of Palestine. He told Agrippa that he persecuted Christians unto foreign cities, which implies that he made journeys to other foreign cities besides Damascus.³ Of these journeys we have no knowledge. An illustration of how widely Paul was known and feared is found in the fact that before he went to Damascus, Ananias, who lived in that city, had heard from *many* what evil Paul had done in Jerusalem.⁴

How long Paul was occupied in this work of persecution can only be conjectured. Some months at least would be required for a thorough search after believers in Jerusalem and Judea, and the persecutions to *foreign cities* would, at the lowest estimate of the extent of this vague expression, require some months.

The success of Paul in this work of persecution was manifestly very great. Luke speaks of it as a "great persecution," a "ravaging of the Church," which left no disciple in Jerusalem save the apostles,⁵

¹ Acts xxvi. 10.² Gal. i. 22, 23.³ Acts xxvi. 11.⁴ Acts ix. 13, 21.⁵ Acts viii. 1, 3.

who may have been in hiding, and with this testimony agree the statements of Paul's letters. He says that he persecuted the Church *beyond measure*, and that he made *havoc of the faith*.¹ If the infant Church could have been annihilated by man, it would have been accomplished by the consuming zeal and rigor and perseverance of Paul.

¹ Gal. i. 23; 1 Cor. xv. 9; Phil. iii. 6.

CHAPTER IV

THE VISION OF JESUS AND THE CHANGED LIFE

1. *The Testimony of the Epistles.*

Two facts that are indelibly engraven upon the history of the first century are, first, that Saul of Tarsus persecuted the early Church, and, second, that he afterward became a most zealous and successful herald of the Gospel. *How* he was transformed is more or less disputed, but it is incidental; *that* he was transformed is indisputable, and this is the essential fact. We have more distinct and detailed accounts of the event than are to be found regarding the conversion of any other character in Scripture. There are three of these accounts in Acts, one by the author¹ and two which purport to be by Paul himself.² There is one account in the epistle to the Galatians,³ and there are two distinct references to the event in the first epistle to the Corinthians.⁴ We will first consider the testimony of the epistles, the unquestioned references of Paul himself. According to Galatians, Paul's con-

¹ Acts ix. 1-19.

² Acts xxii. 6-16; xxvi. 12-18.

³ Gal. i. 11-17.

⁴ 1 Cor. ix. 1; xv. 8. Comp. 2 Cor. iv. 6.

version occurred in or near Damascus,¹ and had been immediately preceded by zealous persecution of the Church.² The occasion of the change was the revelation of the Son of God in him.³ The change was a sudden one. Paul departed immediately into Arabia;⁴ his career as a persecutor was instantly abandoned. The heart of the event, according to this narrative, was a spiritual apprehension of the Son of God. Christ was revealed *in* him. Here is no suggestion of an external phenomenon in connection with his conversion, and no suggestion of a miracle, save as the operation of the Spirit of God upon any sinful heart, bringing it into the light and love of God, is miraculous. But it must not be at once inferred that because this narrative mentions nothing external in connection with Paul's conversion, therefore there *was* nothing of the sort. We have no right to assume that this is a complete account of his conversion, which is manifestly improbable. But we have a right to hold that what Paul specializes here is central and fundamental; and we have a right to test by this any statements which we find in other sources. However, we cannot reject what we find elsewhere, simply because it is not in this account of Paul. The reference in 1 Cor. ix. 1 is plainly to the same event of which Gal. i. 16 speaks. For Paul derives his apostle-

¹ Gal. i. 17.² Gal. i. 13-15.³ Gal. i. 15, 16.⁴ Gal. i. 16, 17.

ship from the fact that he has seen Jesus the Lord. To have seen Him, however, with the eyes of flesh, would manifestly not establish a claim to apostleship. Hence the vision of which he speaks must of necessity have been inward, and this passage therefore adds nothing to the thought of Gal. i. 16, a revelation of the Son of God in him. In 1 Cor. xv. 4-8 Paul is speaking of the appearances of the risen Jesus which confirmed the Scripture teaching that He should rise. After appearing to Cephas, to the twelve, to more than five hundred brethren, to James, and to all the apostles, He appeared to Paul. The following verse suggests that when Jesus appeared to Paul he was a persecutor of the Church. This fact is evidence that the vision here mentioned is to be identified with that of 1 Cor. ix. 1 and Gal. i. 16. Moreover, this identification is necessary because the appearance of Jesus of which Paul here speaks was to him the signal evidence of the resurrection of Jesus, as His appearance to the other apostles convinced them that He had risen, and certainly *after* the event of Gal. i. 16 Paul never again needed proof that Jesus had risen from the grave. Hence the appearance of Jesus in 1 Cor. xv. 8 is none other than the revelation of Him which is mentioned in Galatians. It may be added that the Greek word which is translated *appeared* (ᾤφθη), though not employed in any other

undisputed letter of Paul, is commonly used of spiritual appearances.¹

2. *The Testimony of Acts.*

Between the three accounts of Paul's conversion which we have in Acts, the differences both small and great are very numerous; but it is to be especially noticed that the differences between the two accounts which are attributed to Paul are as great as the differences between these two and that of Luke. Thus, for example, the account of the twenty-sixth chapter says nothing about Ananias, and represents the commission of Jesus as being given to Paul in the hour of his conversion, while in the twenty-second chapter the commission is given by Ananias in Damascus, and not outside the city where the light shone upon Paul.

There are some details in the accounts attributed to Paul which accord well with the representation that in these passages we hear one speaking who was present and who participated in the events that are described. Thus in these accounts we are informed that it was about *noon* when Paul was arrested by the heavenly light;² that this light was *great* above the brightness of the sun;³ that it shone round about

¹ Comp. Matt. xvii. 3; Luke i. 11; Acts vii. 2; xvi. 9.

² Acts xxii. 6; xxvi. 13.

³ Acts xxii. 6; xxvi. 13.

them *all*;¹ that the one who spoke to Paul said, "I am Jesus of *Nazareth*;"² that *all* fell to the earth;³ and that Jesus said to Paul, "It is hard for thee to kick against the goad."⁴ These words can hardly be regarded as originating with the author of the Acts. To these may be added the summons of Ananias, "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on His name."⁵

Again, it may be said that the great differences in the accounts which are attributed to Paul are as easily explicable on the theory that Luke followed good sources and that these differences are traceable to Paul himself as they are when we hold that the accounts were freely invented by the author. For plainly we have no right to demand that Paul, speaking twenty-five years after his conversion, and having regard to the central facts of that great hour, would describe the event in the same terms and mention the same incidents in every case; while, on the other hand, if the two accounts were free inventions of the author of Acts,⁶ then it is altogether unlikely that he would represent the commission as coming to Paul in one case from Jesus Himself *outside* the city, and in the other case as coming from Ananias *in* the city.

¹ Acts xxvi. 13.

² Acts xxii. 8.

³ Acts xxvi. 14.

⁴ Acts xxvi. 14.

⁵ Acts xxii. 16.

⁶ See, for example, Jülicher, *Einleitung in das N. T.*, p. 267.

When we compare these two accounts with Luke's, the principal differences noted are that Luke alone speaks of a three days' blindness and a three days' fast of Paul;¹ that he alone speaks of a vision to Ananias and another to Paul;² that he alone makes it part of the purpose of Ananias's visit that Paul might be filled with the Holy Spirit;³ and that he alone speaks of scales that fell from Paul's eyes as he recovered sight.⁴ Of less real significance are the two apparent discrepancies between Luke's account of the external phenomena and the account which is attributed to Paul. Luke says that the men *stood* while the voice spake,⁵ but in Paul's account it is said that all fell to the ground.⁶ Luke also says that the men with Paul heard the voice,⁷ while in the later narrative it is said that they heard not the voice of Him who spake to Paul.⁸ These two details, as also the fact that in chapter twenty-two the commission comes to Paul from the lips of Ananias in Damascus, while in chapter twenty-six it comes from the lips of Jesus outside of Damascus, are plainly inconsistent with *absolute* historicity, but they do not militate against the general trustworthiness of the narrative.

Let us come now to the agreements of the narratives

¹ Acts ix. 9.

² Acts ix. 10-12.

³ Acts ix. 17.

⁴ Acts ix. 18.

⁵ Acts ix. 7.

⁶ Acts xxvi. 14.

⁷ Acts ix. 7.

⁸ Acts xxii. 9.

in Acts. First, they agree that there was some sort of external phenomenon connected with Paul's conversion. His eyes were blinded and his companions saw a light. It is perhaps uncertain whether for the companions of Paul the external phenomenon was anything more than light.¹ The narratives represent that for Paul the external phenomenon was twofold: he saw a light, and he also heard certain words.

Second, the narratives in Acts agree in the representation that Paul saw, with his physical eyes, nothing but the light.² They all say that he fell to the ground when the great light shone upon him, and that it was while he lay there prostrate that he heard the voice.³ But his physical eyes were blinded by the glory of the light,⁴ and therefore they beheld nothing while he was lying upon the earth.

Third, the narratives in Acts agree that Paul met Jesus near Damascus, and since they preclude a *physical* seeing of Him, we must hold that they desire to represent Paul as having a spiritual vision of Jesus. Here then, in that which is manifestly deepest in these narratives in Acts, there is perfect agreement with the representation of Paul in his epistles.

¹ Acts xxii. 9.

² Comp. Weizsäcker, *Das Apostolische Zeitalter*, p. 77. For the old view, see Conybeare and Howson, *The Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, new edition, 1892, p. 75.

³ Acts ix. 3, 4; xxii. 7, 8; xxvi. 14.

⁴ Acts xxii. 11.

The Son of God was revealed *in* Him.¹ What he saw was a heavenly vision.² It is this agreement in that which is essential which is of real importance. On this we must lay the stress. The prime conception which the epistles and Acts alike have of the event by Damascus is one and the same. Jesus was revealed to the spirit of Paul. According to the accounts in Acts this revelation was introduced by some sort of physical phenomenon, natural or supernatural. The fact that Paul does not mention this in his epistles only shows that he regarded it as of incidental importance. His silence is not a proof of the unhistorical character of the narrative in Acts. The assertion of this narrative that the spiritual revelation to Paul was introduced by some sort of striking physical phenomenon contains nothing improbable. History has many parallels. It frequently comes to pass that men, arrested by some striking material event, become open-minded to spiritual communications. The nature of the physical phenomenon, whether in Paul's case or in any other, is a matter of relatively slight importance. If it brings a vision of Jesus, that is enough.

3. *Preparation for the Vision.*

Processes of the mind are often difficult to follow, even when we have ample details of the outer and

¹ Gal. i. 16.

² Acts xxvi. 19.

inner life: much more when, as in Paul's case, we know so little of the influences which affected him before his conversion, and so little of his own thoughts in those days. That there was something in his inner life which led up to the event by Damascus, it is rational to believe, and to some minds, at least, a necessity. Nor is there anything in Paul's epistles which is unfavorable to this hypothesis. He says indeed that he received his apostleship directly through Jesus Christ,¹ and he says that the hour of his conversion came when it was the good pleasure of God to reveal His Son in him;² but these statements by no means imply that the great change in his life came without preparation. They teach that he was not the convert of any man, but they do not suggest that his conversion had no roots in his previous life.

That which can be said with any positiveness regarding a preparation for Paul's vision is negative in character. His own language in Galatians precludes the possibility that he had received Christian instruction, and the representation of Acts and of the epistles that Paul was zealously persecuting the Church when he went to Damascus is evidence that there was no conscious leaning toward Christianity. That some words of Jesus had reached his heart, and that the martyr courage of Christians

¹ Gal. i. 1.

² Gal. i. 16.

had touched his conscience¹ is perhaps possible, but of course cannot be proven. As far as we can judge from the words of Paul, he was no less conscientious when he set out for Damascus than he had been before, and his zeal in that project appeared to him no less praiseworthy than his zeal of earlier days.²

Pfleiderer³ starts from the word of Acts xxvi. 14, interpreting the "goad" to mean a doubt in the soul of Paul, whether it was right to persecute the Christians, and he thinks this doubt had been caused by the bearing of the Christians and by the words which Paul had heard from their lips. But it is not certain that this interpretation of the proverb is correct. The word may simply mean that Paul's course is suicidal. In persecuting Jesus he is wounding himself. Therefore we cannot build upon this saying with much confidence.

There is more of suggestion furnished by Paul in that passage in Romans through which we get a glimpse into his inmost heart as it was in the days before he went to Damascus.⁴ Paul is here interpreting past experiences in the light of his present Christian knowledge, and we cannot hold that the struggle of spirit which he describes had

¹ Jülicher, *Einleitung*, p. 21.

³ *Das Urchristenthum*, pp. 36, 37.

² Acts xxvi. 9; Phil. iii. 6.

⁴ Rom. vii. 14-25.

been felt by him *at the time* so keenly as he now intimates, when he sees the meaning of it all as he had not done before. Yet it remains true that the man who thus portrays his old Pharisaic experience must have felt, at times at least, if not constantly, that his life of blameless righteousness, as men judged it, and as he himself judged it by the standards of Judaism,¹ was, after all, a failure. He must have felt, at least in moments of clearer moral seeing, that, although he kept all the requirements of the law as it was interpreted by the scribes, he was in bondage to sin and powerless to deliver himself.

In this deep fact which Paul thus uncovers we may see a real preparation for the experience by Damascus. His inner life was felt to be incomplete, and he was not wholly satisfied with a righteousness of works. That he had come to doubt whether Jesus was really a false Messiah, as he had believed, one cannot say; but in view of the seventh chapter of Romans, we must say that there were moments in which he doubted whether he was pleasing God. This doubt may have been nourished in one way and another by what he had seen of the Christians, and by what he had heard from them when he entered their houses as a per-

¹ Phil. iii. 6.

secutor, and when he had sought to make them blaspheme the name that was most dear to their hearts. In such an hour, then, when he was conscious of the contrast between his blameless, outward life and his inner bondage, some striking physical phenomenon was used of God to open fully the way for a revelation of Jesus to his soul.

4. *The Commission.*

The hour of Paul's conversion to faith in the risen Messiah witnessed also the creation of a conviction in his soul that he was to preach the Gospel to the Gentiles. In his letter to the Galatians Paul represents this preaching as the end had in view by God when He revealed His Son in him.¹ In all the accounts of his conversion in Acts this thought is found, though variously expressed and coming from different persons. In after years Paul associated the gift of apostleship to the Gentiles with the gift of grace which he experienced in the pardon of his sins,² and repeatedly connected this Gentile mission with his first vision of Jesus.³ In that vision, therefore, and in the experiences of that hour we must see the source of Paul's conviction that he had a mission from Jesus to the Gentiles. In explaining this call we have to bear in mind two facts in particular. First, Paul himself

¹ Gal. i. 16.

² Rom. i. 5.

³ 1 Cor. ix. 1; xv. 8, 9, etc.

was from the Gentile world, from one of the Greek cities of Asia, and his father had lived there before him. His own experience had given him a much broader horizon than the original apostles had. He knew the Gentile world. He had seen its elements of good, and could sympathize with it as the twelve apostles could not. Second, and more important, the vision of Jesus had come to him when he was bent upon destroying the Church, and thus the pure *graciousness* of God in his salvation was made to stand out in singular prominence. But if salvation was offered to him on the single condition that he would accept it, then it must be for Gentiles¹ no less than for Jews, for both alike can accept what is offered them. Faith is equally within the power of both. And thus the manner in which he had been "apprehended" by Christ, together with the fact that his youth had been spent in the midst of the Gentile world, makes it natural that in the very hour of his conversion to Jesus he felt that he was called to the Gentiles.

5. *The First Days in Damascus.*

Of what happened to Paul in Damascus in the next days after his conversion he tells us nothing in his epistles. This fact, however, should not be regarded as strange, inasmuch as the occurrences of those days

¹ Rom. i. 16; iii. 30.

were in any case quite subordinate in importance to the event which took place outside the city, and Paul makes but brief reference even to that.

It is probable that Paul was taken to the house whither he had expected to go when he left Jerusalem, and that may have been the house of a certain Judas in Straight Street.¹ In a short time the Jews throughout the city must have heard more or less of the strange events connected with Paul's approach to Damascus. According to Acts a certain Jewish Christian, by the name of Ananias, heard of Paul's arrival and of his state, and came to him in the spirit of Jesus, to sympathize with him and to comfort him.² It is said that he restored Paul's sight, and it seems impossible to take this statement in a figurative sense,³ as meaning that through Ananias Paul came out into the light of the Gospel, for Paul certainly teaches that he came into the light regarding Jesus before he entered the city, and without any human mediation. Therefore, unless this detail is legendary in character, we must understand the passage to refer to the physical sight of Paul. If the language of Gal. iv. 15 implies that Paul was suffering from some trouble with his eyes when he was in Galatia, which is the view of some, and if weak eyes are implied in the

¹ Acts ix. 11.

² Acts ix. 10-17; xxii. 12-16.

³ So Weizsäcker, *Das Apostolische Zeitalter*, p. 77.

fact that Paul did not write his letters with his own hand,¹ and also in the fact that his salutation was written with large letters,² then this fact *might* be regarded as a consequence of the blinding which he experienced by Damascus, and so as an incidental confirmation of the narrative in Acts. But this ground is all conjectural, and yields nothing positive in regard to Paul's eyes.

Again, it is intrinsically probable that Paul, since he had come to believe in Jesus, was baptized, as is affirmed in Acts,³ and we may suppose that Ananias administered this rite. We may well believe also that Ananias, when he baptized Paul, uttered some prophetic words regarding his future; for his remarkable experiences, now publicly known, suggested that he might have a remarkable work to do. The only reference which Paul himself is said to have made to the testimony of Ananias represents it as of a general character.⁴ It does not specify the Gentile mission.

¹ 2 Thess. iii. 17.

² Gal. vi. 11.

³ Acts ix. 18; xxii. 16.

⁴ Acts xxii. 15.

CHAPTER V

THE PERIOD OF OBSCURITY

I. *In Arabia.*

IMMEDIATELY after his conversion Paul retired into Arabia.¹ The region which bore this name stretched from the Red Sea to the Persian Gulf, and as far north as Gadirtha and Palmyra.² It included Arabia Petræa with Petra as its capital, Arabia Felix with Saba as its capital, and Arabia Nomadum, the great eastern desert which extended to the borders of Babylon.³ Since Paul seems to have retired into Arabia in order that he might have quiet for meditation, and since when he came forth out of his retirement he came to Damascus,⁴ it is to be held that he went into the neighboring region of Arabia Petræa, either south or east from Damascus. In Paul's time this was part of the Nabatæan Kingdom, and was ruled by Aretas IV., who gave a daughter in marriage to Herod Antipas.⁵

Luke says nothing of this Arabian sojourn, and one

¹ Gal. i. 16, 17.

² Strabo, Müller's edition, p. 653; Ptolemy, Porta's edition, p. 100.

³ Winer, *Real-Wörterbuch*.

⁴ Gal. i. 17.

⁵ Schürer, I. 617, 618.

may read his narrative and doubt whether he knew of it. He says that Paul was certain days with the disciples in Damascus, and straightway proclaimed Jesus. Then when many days were fulfilled, the Jews plotted to kill him, but he escaped, and came to Jerusalem.¹ The natural impression of the whole passage is that Paul left Damascus for Jerusalem a few weeks, or at the most a few months, after his conversion.² That this is the correct impression to gain from the passage (ix. 19-26) seems to be confirmed when the author in the next verse represents the Christians in Jerusalem as afraid of Paul, not believing that he was a disciple. If he had been absent three years,³ and no one had heard of his persecuting the Church during these years, that would have been a strong argument why the disciples should believe Paul and receive him. In other words, the attitude of the disciples in Jerusalem seems to imply that Luke thought of Paul's return to Jerusalem as occurring in far less than three years. It is difficult, therefore, to escape the conclusion that the author of this narrative did not know of Paul's sojourn in Arabia, a fact not strange since Paul himself did not regard it as of importance to others. He refers to it but once, and then simply to show that he was absent

¹ Acts ix. 19, 20, 23, 26.

² Comp. Wendt in *Meyer's Commentary on Acts*, 7th ed., pp. 229-232.

³ Gal. i. 18.

from Jerusalem. If the author of Acts knew of the sojourn in Arabia, he at least left no trace of his knowledge on the narrative.

The length of the Arabian sojourn may be learned approximately. Paul tells us that it was three years from his conversion to his first visit to Jerusalem.¹ This time was all spent in Arabia and Damascus, and the period spent in Damascus does not seem to have been long. We know from Paul's subsequent life that a few weeks or a few months were as long as he could labor in any place where the Jewish influence was as strong as it was in Damascus. The narrative in Acts also represents the stay of Paul in Damascus as comparatively short.² Weizsäcker thinks the stay in Arabia was brief in comparison with that in Damascus,³ but this opinion is based upon the untenable⁴ view that the three years of Gal. i. 18 are counted, not from Paul's conversion, but from his return to Damascus. Therefore we are to think of the sojourn in Arabia as covering the greater part of the three years between Paul's conversion and his visit to Jerusalem.

2. *In Damascus.*

Paul returned from Arabia to Damascus, and began his career as a preacher where his career as a perse-

¹ Gal. i. 18. ² Acts ix. 19, 23. ³ *Das Apostolische Zeitalter*, p. 81.

⁴ See Gal. ii. 1; also Lipsius, *Hand-Commentar* on Galatians, p. 18.

cutor had ended. We have this on the authority of Paul himself. He says¹ that the governor under Aretas sought to take him prisoner in Damascus, and this statement presupposes that Paul had made himself obnoxious to the Jews by his preaching. He was persecuted many times in subsequent years, but never for any other reason than this, if we except the experiences in Philippi and Ephesus. The narrative in Acts is therefore in harmony with the epistles. It says that Paul preached in the synagogue, proved the Messiahship of Jesus with great power, and that because of a plot of the Jews he fled for his life.² It says that they watched the gates, which of course implies what is explicitly stated by Paul, that the governor of the city was a party to the plot. It agrees with Paul also in regard to the method of escape,³ though the account of the apostle is more vivid, as we should expect it would be. He tells us that it was *through a window* as well as *through the wall* that he was let down, which suggests that there was a *house* on the wall, and he adds, as though fully realizing the great peril in which he had been, that he *escaped their hands*. There is nothing improbable in the detail of Luke, that they who lowered the basket which contained Paul were *his disciples*. If he had preached long enough to arouse the Jews and

¹ 2 Cor. xi. 32.

² Acts ix. 23-25.

³ Acts ix. 25; 2 Cor. xi. 33.

the governor against him, it is natural to suppose that he had won some disciples.

3. *From Damascus to Jerusalem.*

The sources agree that when Paul fled from Damascus he went to Jerusalem, but regarding the events which fell in this stay in Jerusalem they seem to be at variance. In the epistle to the Galatians,¹ in a passage which deals with the independence of Paul's apostleship, he tells us that he went to Jerusalem to visit Cephas, that he tarried with him fifteen days, and that he saw no other apostle, except James, the brother of Jesus. Then he came to the regions of Syria and Cilicia, and at that time he was still unknown by face to the Christian communities of Judea. Luke's account diverges from this in a striking manner. Thus he says that Barnabas took Paul to the *apostles*,² as though at least the greater part of the twelve were meant. Then he represents Paul as preaching boldly in the name of the Lord, and disputing with the Hellenists with such success that they formed a plot to kill him.³ In like manner the address from the castle-stairs implies that Paul had preached openly in Jerusalem on his return from Damascus, for in a trance which Paul experienced in the temple the Lord told him to depart quickly from

¹ Gal. i. 18-24.

² Acts ix. 27.

³ Acts ix. 28, 29.

Jerusalem because the Jews would not receive his testimony.¹ This vision plainly implies that he had been active in the name of Jesus. In the address before Agrippa Paul is represented as saying explicitly that he preached in Jerusalem after preaching in Damascus.² Thus the two accounts seem to be mutually exclusive, and some scholars,³ holding this to be the case, reject Luke's account as un-historical. It becomes necessary, therefore, to look at the accounts more closely. It must be noticed, in the first place, that the account of Luke has a different *aim* than has the narrative in Galatians. Paul is showing his independence of those who were apostles before him.⁴ Luke has no such specific end in view. His aim is rather to give an outline of Paul's career. Paul says that he saw Peter and James, but none other of the *apostles*. His purpose called for no further statement. Yet, plainly, it is not inconsistent with this, that Paul met other members of the Church in Jerusalem. He is not seeking to show his isolation from all believers, but his independence as related to the original apostles. He might mingle with common believers without mentioning it in the letter to the Galatians, for it did

¹ Acts xxii. 18.

² Acts xxvi. 20.

³ So, among others, Weizsäcker and McGiffert.

⁴ Gal. i. 17.

not occur to any one to say that he had received his apostleship from them.

Again, Paul says in Galatians that when he went into Syria and Cilicia he was unknown by face to the churches in Judea, while Luke represents him as preaching openly in Jerusalem. Of course, the church in Jerusalem was the chief church in Judea, and if he was known to that by face, he could hardly say that he was unknown to the churches of Judea. But this apparent conflict is modified by the fact that, according to Luke, Paul's activity in Jerusalem was among the *Hellenists*.¹ Who can say that in a great city like Jerusalem Paul might not labor two weeks among the unbelieving Hellenists, and not be known by face to the Jerusalem church? That possibility is so obvious that we need not stay to discuss it.

Now it must be conceded, in view of Paul's spirit and practice, that he was likely to preach in Jerusalem, as he had recently done in Damascus. Nor would his preaching be at variance with his statement in Galatians, that he saw none of the apostles save Peter and James. His preaching simply had nothing to do with the point which he was there considering, and it would have been entirely irrelevant to have mentioned it. I am constrained therefore to hold that when we duly consider the *aim* of the respective accounts, and

¹ Acts ix. 29.

when we consider that Paul's activity was among the Hellenists, we cannot admit that Luke's account is in its main features unhistorical. His statement that Barnabas brought Paul to the *apostles*, looked at in the light of Gal. i. 19, is misleading, if not absolutely wrong, and, as we have already seen, he appears to put this visit to Jerusalem much too early; but his statements that Paul saw some of the disciples in Jerusalem, and that he preached to the Hellenists, should not be brought into conflict with the teaching of Galatians, that he saw none of the *apostles* but Peter and James, and that when he departed from Jerusalem he was unknown to the churches of Judea by face.

According to the address from the castle-stairs Paul had a notable vision in the temple during this visit of fifteen days.¹ He saw Jesus, who told him to depart quickly from Jerusalem because the Jews would not receive his testimony. Paul was unwilling to leave, and urged in favor of his staying the fact that he was known as a persecutor of the believers. This appeared to him a reason why he should labor here. His testimony, as he thought, would have special weight. But the Lord refused the request, and told Paul to depart to the Gentiles. Ramsay² puts this vision of Acts xxii. 17-21 at the time of Paul's visit

¹ Acts xxii. 17-21.

² *St. Paul the Traveller*, pp. 61-64.

to Jerusalem recorded in chapter xi. 30, which belongs in the year 44. His argument consists of the following items: *first*, Luke gives a plot of the Jews as the reason why Paul left Jerusalem at the first visit after his conversion,¹ while Paul gives a revelation of Jesus as the reason why he departs;² *second*, the mission of Paul to the Gentiles³ does not suit his first visit to Jerusalem, for after that he spent many years in work within the circle of the synagogue and its influence before he went to the Gentiles; and, *third*, the necessity of a revelation to Paul suits the second visit but not the first. He thinks that Paul was tempted to remain in Jerusalem by the favorable opportunity for his message, and that, in consequence, it required a vision to overcome his desire.

Replying to these points in order, we may say that there is no inconsistency in supposing *two* reasons for Paul's departure from Jerusalem: a plot *and* a revelation. And this is the more manifest since the narrative of the revelation in Acts xxii. plainly implies bitter opposition to Paul, such as in Acts ix. produced the plot to kill him. Again, as to the point that it was many years after Paul's first visit to Jerusalem before he went on a mission to the Gentiles, two things are to be said: *first*, there is no proof whatever that during the fourteen years spent in Syria

¹ Acts ix. 29.

² Acts xxii. 17.

³ Acts xxii. 21.

and Cilicia¹ Paul labored among Jews and proselytes only; and, *second*, if Paul even at his conversion was called by Jesus to labor among the Gentiles, which cannot be doubted,² then surely the long interval between the commission of Acts xxii. and the first recorded Gentile mission of Paul cannot be urged against the early dating of that commission.

The third argument of Ramsay seems to have even less appearance of weight. For the "favorable opportunity" to preach, of which he speaks, is a pure assumption. Paul came from Antioch with an offering at the time of the famine in Judea, but there is no evidence that this opened a door for his testimony among the Jews of Jerusalem. At a later day Paul came to Jerusalem again with an offering, a much larger one than was brought from Antioch, but it did not create a favorable opportunity for his message. It did not prevent his imprisonment, or the attempts to put him to death.

We must hold, therefore, that the trance of Acts xxii. 17 occurred at the first visit of Paul in Jerusalem after his conversion.

One point remains to be considered. In the address before Agrippa Paul is represented as saying, that after preaching in Damascus he preached in Jeru-

¹ Gal. ii. 1. This period also covers the first missionary tour from Antioch.

² Gal. i. 16.

salem and *throughout all the country of Judea*.¹ But this preaching could not have taken place in connection with the first visit in Jerusalem, for Paul says that when he came into the regions of Syria and Cilicia he was unknown by face to the churches of Judea.² During the next fourteen years Paul did not visit Judea,³ and after that, by agreement with Cephas, James, and John, he went to the Gentiles, and so cannot possibly have preached throughout Judea. Therefore this detail of the narrative in Acts seems to be at variance with Paul's unquestionable testimony in Galatians.

4. *In Syria and Cilicia.*

If Paul, on the occasion of his first visit to Jerusalem, departed because of the hostility of the Hellenists, then there is nothing improbable in the representation of Acts that the brethren brought him down to Cæsarea.⁴ The passage implies that from Cæsarea Paul went by ship to Tarsus, which was the quickest and least expensive route. The statement of the apostle in Galatians is simply that he came into the regions of Syria and Cilicia; and from the fact that Syria is here mentioned first, it has been inferred⁵ that Paul went by land instead of by sea,

¹ Acts xxvi. 20.

³ Gal. ii. 1.

² Gal. i. 21, 22.

⁴ Acts ix. 30.

⁵ Clemen, *Chronologie der Paulinischen Briefe*, p. 164.

and that he began his preaching in Syria. But it is surely unsafe to argue that because Paul mentions Syria before Cilicia in his summary statement of where he spent the subsequent years, therefore he *began* work in Syria, and hence went from Jerusalem by land rather than by sea, as Luke says. This is to put an unwarrantable stress on the order of words. It is manifest that he may have mentioned Syria first for other reasons than because he *began* there. This order of words would have been natural if the greater part of his work was in Syria. Hence there is no ground afforded by the order of words in Galatians for the view that Luke's narrative is to be rejected.

Of the length of the period which Paul spent in the regions of Syria and Cilicia, one can speak only in approximate terms. The statement of Jülicher,¹ that Paul was there fourteen years rests on the assumption that the visit of Gal. ii. 1 was made at the close of the stay in Syria and Cilicia. Now the utmost that can be said is that if we had only the epistle to the Galatians, it would be natural to think that the stay in Syria and Cilicia continued until the journey to Jerusalem in Gal. ii. 1. That interpretation would not be absolutely necessary, for since the purpose of Paul was to show his independence of those who were apostles before him,² and since they were

¹ *Einleitung in das N. T.*, p. 23.

² Gal. i. 17.

in Jerusalem, it was needful only to say that he was *not* there. It was relatively unimportant to say *where* he was, so long as he could say that he was *not* in Jerusalem. We cannot therefore affirm at once that there was no interval between the work in Syria and Cilicia¹ and the visit to Jerusalem which is mentioned in Gal. ii. 1. All that we can affirm is that Paul did not visit Jerusalem between his departure to Syria and Cilicia and that visit which came after fourteen years.

It is to be held, therefore, in harmony with Paul's narrative in the epistle to the Galatians, that the fourteen years of Gal. ii. 1 not only cover the period spent in Syria and Cilicia, but also the year passed in Antioch,² and the first tour from Antioch, commonly called the first missionary journey.³ But since this tour was of uncertain duration, we are unable to determine closely how long Paul spent in Syria and Cilicia. An approximate estimate for the time of this first tour from Antioch is three years, and deducting this, with the year spent in Antioch, from the fourteen years, we have left ten years for the sojourn in Syria and Cilicia.⁴

How these years were spent we do not know in detail. The only direct reference which Paul makes

¹ Gal. i. 21.

² Acts xi. 26.

³ Acts xiii.-xiv.

⁴ This is also the estimate of Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 47.

to the work in Syria and Cilicia is in the epistle to the Galatians. He says that the churches in Judea heard that he was preaching the faith which he had once sought to destroy, and that they glorified God in him.¹ We infer from this that he did successful evangelistic work in Syria and Cilicia. The Book of Acts has no direct reference to this period of labor in the regions of Syria and Cilicia, but nevertheless it bears witness to it, for it says that Paul at the beginning of his second tour from Antioch went through Syria and Cilicia *confirming the churches*.² Now the fact that Paul visited and confirmed certain churches in these regions leads us to believe that he founded them, for it was his principle not to build upon another man's foundation.³ But if Paul founded these churches, it must have been done during this period of ten years of which we are now speaking.

The indications are that these churches in Syria and Cilicia were predominantly Gentile. Paul never established a church, so far as we know, which was chiefly Jewish in its constituency, and since, from the hour of his conversion, he had a conviction that he was called to work among the Gentiles, we naturally hold, in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, that his Syrian and Cilician labor had its chief fruitage among the Gentiles. This is con-

¹ Gal. i. 22-24.

² Acts xv. 41.

³ Rom. xv. 20.

firmed by the statement in Acts that the decree of the council of Jerusalem was addressed to the brethren of the *Gentiles* in Antioch and *Syria* and *Cilicia*.¹

These, then, are the only points which can be made out with certainty regarding the Syrian and Cilician period of Paul's life. It was a period of some ten years, and Paul spent it in successful evangelistic work, chiefly among the Gentiles. But we are wholly ignorant of the details of Paul's work and experiences in these years. There is no evidence that Antioch was the centre of his activity,² and we do not know the name of a single city in which he labored. It is not improbable that in this obscure period belong some of the many hardships which Paul enumerates in 2 Cor. xi. 23-33.

The period was doubtless significant for Paul. We may assume that his thought of Christianity was matured, and that this long experience in evangelistic work prepared him for the larger and better known missions of later years. It may also be held with Weizsäcker³ that in this period Paul became perfectly assured of the truth of his principles and was established in the belief that the work among the Gentiles was indeed a work of God.

¹ Acts xv. 23.

² So Weizsäcker and Jülicher.

³ *Das Apostolische Zeitalter*, p. 86.

CHAPTER VI

THE WORK IN ANTIOCH

I. *The City.*

ANTIOCH, the royal city of the Syrian kings from the time of Antiochus IV.,¹ and later the residence of the Roman proconsuls, was situated on the Orontes River, at the northeast corner of the Mediterranean Sea, about sixteen miles from the coast. Cicero in his oration *For Archias*² says of Antioch that it was formerly an illustrious and wealthy city, the seat of learned men and liberal sciences. In Paul's time also it was one of the most important cities of the East. Josephus³ rates it as the third city in the empire, Rome and Alexandria alone taking precedence of it. Strabo reckons it as the fourth, placing above it not only Rome and Alexandria but also Seleucia on the Tigris.⁴ It was a free city, having bought its freedom from Pompey,⁵ and at the same time was the residence of the governor of the province. If we may form an estimate

¹ *Jewish War*, vii. 3. 3.

² *Pro A. Lic. Archia*, cap. III.

³ *Jewish War*, iii. 2. 4.

⁴ Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, I. 416, note 13; Strabo, Müller's edition, p. 638.

⁵ Marquardt, I. 77, note 12.

of its population on the basis of 1 Maccabees¹ and Josephus,² it may easily have been a million in the time of Nicator, for the Gentile population of the city is there represented as furnishing an army of one hundred and twenty thousand, and the Jewish population is represented as slaying ten myriads in a great conflict.

The chief street of Antioch was broad and ran in a straight line through the city, a distance of some two and a half miles. It was paved with polished marble by Herod the Great, who also built colonnades on both sides of it.³

Antioch had a large Jewish population, who from the time of Seleucus (312-280 B.C.) had enjoyed the right of citizenship and special immunities.⁴ Their synagogue next to that in Alexandria was the most magnificent in the world. Among its ornaments were votive gifts of brass which Antiochus Epiphanes had taken from the temple in Jerusalem.⁵ Josephus tells us that a very large number of proselytes were attached to this synagogue, a fact of great significance for the church which was to be established there in coming time.

2. The Origin of the Church in Antioch.

The martyrdom of Stephen and the bitter persecutions which ensued scattered all the Christians of Jeru-

¹ Chapter xi. 41-51.

⁴ Schürer, II. 498, 529.

² *Antiquities*, xiii. 5. 3.

⁶ Schürer, II. 542.

⁸ *Antiquities*, xvi. 5. 3; *Jewish War*, i. 21. 11.

salem,¹ and those from the Dispersion returned to their homes, some to Phœnicia and Cyprus and Antioch.² The statement of Luke is intrinsically probable that these Hellenistic believers, as a rule, preached the word to Jews only, and that it was an extraordinary event when some who were natives of Cyprus and Cyrene preached the Lord Jesus in Antioch to Greeks also. This preaching resulted in the conversion of a large number of Gentiles, and the report of the work came to the church in Jerusalem. Barnabas was accordingly sent to Antioch, and continued there in acceptable labor for more than a year. During most of this time he was aided by Paul, whom he had sought out and brought from his mission field somewhere in Syria or Cilicia.³

This narrative regarding the early history of the church in Antioch is said to be impossible.⁴ The account which Paul gives us of his relation to the church in Jerusalem is said to exclude the possibility that the church of Antioch was watched and guided from Jerusalem, and that Paul came to Antioch as the helper of Barnabas, and thus, as it were, under the direction of the church in Jerusalem. But do the facts really support this judgment? Are we justified in assuming that the church in Jerusalem sent out Barna-

¹ Acts viii. 1.

² Acts xi. 19, 20.

³ Acts xi. 22-26.

⁴ So Weizsäcker, *Das Apostolische Zeitalter*, p. 91.

bas with the design of *controlling* the work in Antioch? It is certain that Barnabas was not one of the more conservative Jewish believers, for we know from Paul himself that Barnabas had labored with him among the Gentiles.¹ But if he was a man of like mind with Paul in regard to the right of preaching the Gospel directly to the Gentiles, is it likely that the Jewish church of Jerusalem sent him to Antioch to guide the movement there in the interest of Jewish Christianity? Plainly this hypothesis is untenable.

If the church in Jerusalem was Christian, it must have felt a deep interest in such a work as that which was reported from Antioch, and must have desired to render any service in its power. And what more natural than to send to this young church an experienced and able teacher and helper? But this is not all. The church in Jerusalem undoubtedly looked with considerable distrust and hesitation upon the free offer of Jesus to the Gentiles. This is the clear testimony of Paul and also of Acts. There had been thus far but one instance of preaching to Gentiles,² and that seems to have been regarded as isolated and exceptional. Peter's scruples were only overcome by a vision.³ The Christian brethren who went with Peter to the house of Cornelius were *amazed* that the Spirit was given to Gentiles,⁴ and when

¹ Gal. ii. 1, 9.

² Acts x.

³ Acts x. 9-16.

⁴ Acts x. 45.

Peter returned to Jerusalem he was called to account for his conduct. The church finally endorsed his act because it seemed to be so manifestly owned of God.¹ Hence this doubt of the Jerusalem church regarding the propriety of preaching the Gospel to the Gentiles made it more solicitous for the work in Antioch. It shrank from admitting the Gentiles, and some of its members may have been immovably opposed to it, but the church as a whole could not refuse in case the conversion of the Gentiles was evidently a work of God.

It seems unwarrantable also to say with Weizsäcker that Paul's relation to the church in Jerusalem was such that we cannot conceive of his being a helper of Barnabas, and so in a sense under the direction of the mother church. In the first place, the Book of Acts does not represent Barnabas as having or claiming to have any official relation to the church in Antioch. His presence there was not recognized as bringing the church of Antioch under the authority of the church in Jerusalem. The text suggests no such idea. And surely there is no inherent improbability in the statement that Paul came to Antioch at the request of Barnabas. We know from Paul himself that they were men of kindred spirit, and we have no right whatever to say that Paul would have refused

¹ Acts xi. 18.

this request for help on the ground that he was not the originator of the work in Antioch.

3. *Paul's Mission to Jerusalem in the Judean Famine.*

According to the Book of Acts Paul made a visit to Jerusalem, in company with Barnabas, either during the year spent in Antioch,¹ or soon after it. The church in Antioch requested him to make this trip, to convey relief to the Christians of Judea. The prophet Agabus had foretold a famine, and thus had stirred up the Christians of Antioch to prepare to aid their fellow-believers in Judea.² There seems to be nothing intrinsically improbable in this narrative. There were prophets in the early Church who sometimes claimed to announce future events.³ It is quite natural that, if they foresaw a famine in Judea, they should seek to prepare for it by enlisting the sympathy of Christians abroad, and the wealthy city of Antioch would offer them an attractive field. There is no reason to suppose that Paul would refuse to represent the church of Antioch in the distribution of its offering. In subsequent years he was zealous in behalf of the poor in Jerusalem, and more than once raised funds for them

¹ Acts xi. 26.

² Acts xi. 27, 28; xxi. 10.

³ Acts xxi. 10, 11.

among his Gentile converts.¹ The prophecy of Agabus is essentially confirmed by Josephus. He tells us that there was a severe famine in Judea under the procurators Fadus and Tiberius Alexander, that is, in the period 44-48 A.D.² According to Acts, Agabus foretold a *universal* famine, that is, universal in the Roman empire. There is no evidence that such a famine took place in the reign of Claudius, though there were local famines in different sections of the empire in different years of his reign.³ It is probable that Agabus prophesied a famine in Judea, and that this prophecy was modified in tradition under the influence of the fact that the reign of Claudius was marked by an unusual number of famines. This hypothesis is favored by the consideration that if Agabus had foreseen a universal famine, and had announced it in Antioch, the Christians of that city would naturally have laid up means for their own need. But of this there is no trace. Moreover, this hypothesis is supported also by the fact that Agabus as a Christian prophet, one who was concerned with the kingdom of God and with the world only as it was related to that kingdom, had nothing to do with a universal famine. It is improbable that he prophesied a famine in Spain, for example, or in

¹ Gal. ii. 10; Rom. xv. 25-28.

² *Antiquities*, xx. 2. 5; 5. 2; iii. 15. 3.

³ Schürer, I. 474.

Gaul, or in Asia Minor, for there is no apparent Christian use for such a prophecy and no motive for it. It is to be held therefore that Agabus prophesied a local famine, and that the language of Acts shows the influence of well-known facts of subsequent years.

But while the narrative of this journey of Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem is in itself acceptable, a good many scholars reject it because Paul's account of his visits to Jerusalem in Gal. i., ii. does not mention it.¹ Now Paul is unquestionably our highest authority on the events of his own life, and if it is quite plain that he was under obligation to mention all the visits that he made to Jerusalem before the time of the council, then plainly we cannot accept the narrative of Acts. But was he under such an obligation to the Galatians? That is the point upon which everything here depends. Now if there is any doubt whatever as to the answer to be given to this question, then we must admit that the narrative in Acts *may* be historical.

The work of Paul in Galatia had been seriously endangered by Jewish believers who insisted upon the circumcision of the Gentiles and their observance of the law. They sought to undermine Paul's work by denying his authority. Therefore Paul in

¹ So, e.g. Pfeiderer, Wendt, Jülicher, Volkmar, and Weizsäcker.

his letter to the Galatians insists upon his divine authorization to preach the Gospel, and his independence of the original apostles. He declares that he received his Gospel through a revelation of Jesus Christ, and not from men.¹ In establishing this statement he narrates how God revealed His Son in him, and how for the first three years of his Christian life he did not even see the original apostles.² At the end of that time he met Peter, and James the brother of Jesus, and was in communication with them for fifteen days.³ Then after fourteen years his Gospel to the Gentiles was officially recognized by the leaders of the church in Jerusalem,⁴ and still later, while in Antioch, he had openly resisted Peter because, having once associated with the Gentile believers, he then withdrew from them.

The sole contention of Paul is that he received his Gospel from Jesus, and was independent of the original apostles. Now as the primitive apostles remained a long time in the mother church at Jerusalem, Paul speaks of his visits to that city and his relation to that church. He is under obligation, according to his own statement, to mention all facts which might fairly be said to involve dependence or independence regarding his relation to the elder apostles. If he had made a second visit when

¹ Gal. i. 1, 12.

² Gal. i. 17.

³ Gal. i. 18, 19.

⁴ Gal. ii. 9.

he spent even fifteen days with Peter, he must have mentioned the fact, especially if it had fallen in the earlier years of his Christian ministry; but under what obligation was he to refer to a journey to Jerusalem if it brought him into no contact with the apostles? Such a visit would have no more bearing upon the point in hand than would a visit to Damascus. We have no right then to assume that in Gal. i., ii. Paul is enumerating *all* his visits to Jerusalem. What the argument requires is that he enumerates his interviews with the apostles in Jerusalem.

Therefore, if it is conceivable that Paul could visit Jerusalem with a contribution from the church in Antioch and *not come into contact with the apostles*, it must be admitted that the narrative in Acts may be historical.

The supposition of Lightfoot, that the apostles may have been absent from the city, or in hiding, just at this time, since Herod had put one of their number to death and imprisoned another, ought not to be treated with contempt.¹ It is assumed that if they fled or hid themselves they were cowards. But Paul repeatedly fled before persecution, and no sane man will call him a coward. Even Jesus hid from His enemies,² and told His disciples to flee when per-

¹ Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 53.

² John xii. 36; Luke ix. 9, 10.

secuted.¹ The hypothesis therefore is plausible, and involves no discredit for the apostles. But the historical character of the narrative in Acts does not stand or fall with this hypothesis, as we have shown above.

Finally, the suggestion of Weiss² is worthy of consideration that after Paul had come forward as a preacher, as he did when he left Jerusalem for Syria and Cilicia, there was no further interest in recording his visits to Jerusalem, for the possibility of his being instructed in the Gospel was now excluded.

4. *The Name Christian.*

The first general preaching to the Gentiles was that in Antioch, and hence the statement of Luke is inherently probable that with the success of this preaching arose the name *Christian*.³ He indicates that the name originated outside the Church when he says that the disciples *were called* Christians. It is altogether likely that the name originated among the Gentiles, not among the Jews; for the Jews did not admit that the disciples of Jesus were followers of the true Messiah or Christ, and if they had called them *Christians* they would have appeared to admit what they did not believe.

It has frequently been said that the name was given in derision or sport. Thus Farrar⁴ regards it as a nick-

¹ Matt. x. 23.

² *Einleitung*, 2d ed., p. 122.

³ Acts xi. 26.

⁴ *The Life and Work of St. Paul*, p. 168.

name given by the vulgar, as though he had the word of Tacitus¹ in mind. Ramsay² affirms that it belonged to the popular slang. But the only evidence for this singular view is the statement that the people of Antioch were notorious for inventing names of derision. This support, however, is much too feeble. For even if it were granted that Antioch was notorious for the invention of names of derision, which is by no means proven by the citation of two or three such names, still it would be unwarrantable to infer that *every* name which originated there was one of derision. Moreover, there is nothing in the name itself to support this notion. It is a natural mode of designation to call the disciples by the name of their master. Just as the supporters of Herod are called *Herodians*,³ so the disciples of *Christos* are called *Christians*. In the preaching of the apostolic age, Christ was the great theme, and His name must have been familiar to a large number of people outside the Church. He was preached as Messiah and King, and nothing could have been more natural than to call His disciples by His name. The rise of the name *Christians* implies that the Gentile believers in Antioch were recognized as independent of the synagogue and separate from the Jews, and so it may be regarded as contemporaneous with the first distinctly Gentile Christian church.

¹ *Annals*, xv. 44.

² *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 48.

³ Mark iii. 6.

CHAPTER VII

THE FIRST MISSIONARY TOUR FROM ANTIOCH¹

1. Barnabas and Paul set apart.

It is certain that Paul was not recognized in Antioch as an apostle at the time of his separation unto the missionary work. Had he claimed apostleship at this time and had the claim been recognized, the act of dedication to the Gentile work would have seemed incongruous. For if his fellow prophets and teachers had known of this appointment, if they had known that he considered himself divinely ordained to work among the Gentiles,² it is hardly probable that they would have formally set him apart, especially as they were not an ecclesiastical body. It is therefore to be

¹ It is quite generally recognized that the author of Acts had a written source covering the first tour from Antioch, which was distinct from the sources at his disposal for the preceding chapters. It is also recognized that this source bears the marks of trustworthiness. Evidence that we have a *new* source in chapter xiii. is found in the fact that the presence of Barnabas and Paul in Antioch is mentioned just as though there had been no previous reference to their work there. But according to the eleventh chapter they had had a large part in founding the church in Antioch, and the last verse of chapter xii. tells of their return to Antioch from Jerusalem.

² Gal. i. 16.

held that Paul's call to be the apostle of the Gentiles was unknown in Antioch at this time. Nor should it be considered strange that Paul had not published this fact. We might never have heard from his lips anything about his commission as apostle of the Gentiles if his authority had not been attacked. But again it is certain that Paul did not date his apostleship from the hour of the dedication service in Antioch. He says that his apostleship was not *from men* neither *through man*,¹ and he plainly could not have said this if he had been constituted an apostle by the brethren in Antioch. Farrar² thinks that Paul received the title of apostle in its more special signification after his dedication in Antioch, and refers to the two occasions³ on the first tour from Antioch when Paul was called an apostle. But Barnabas is there called an apostle no less than Paul, and he surely was not an apostle in the "more special signification" of that term. There is no reason then to connect Paul's title with the event in Antioch. In the eyes of the church there Paul was a prophet or teacher, or both,⁴ and apparently less prominent than some others. He is mentioned last of five men who are introduced as *prophets* and *teachers*.

There is no good reason to hold that Luke had

¹ Gal. i. 1.

² *The Life and Work of St. Paul*, p. 188.

³ Acts xiv. 4, 14.

⁴ Acts xiii. 1.

two distinct classes in mind when he said *prophets* and *teachers*, and if he did, it is not possible to determine who belonged to each class.¹ Paul at least was conscious of being both prophet and teacher.²

The dedication of Paul and Barnabas was not performed by the *church* in Antioch, but by Symeon, Lucius, and Manaen. While these five men were fasting, on a certain occasion, and engaged in some undescribed service belonging to them as prophets and teachers, it was borne in upon them by the Spirit that Barnabas and Paul should be separated unto the work among the Gentiles. In what way this communication of the Spirit came we are not told. A certain preparation for it lay in the fact that Barnabas and Paul had been signally blessed of the Lord in the work in Antioch, which was largely a work among Gentiles. Here they had shown a manifest fitness for this kind of Christian work, and hence their brethren may well have felt that it was the will of God that they should be dedicated to it. Accordingly they fasted, and laid their hands upon Barnabas and Paul, with prayer, and sent them forth. What part the church had in this dedication, whether indeed it had any part, we are not told. It is plain that if it had any part, it was quite subordinate, since it is not

¹ Comp. Wendt in *Meyer's Commentary on Acts*, p. 279.

² 1 Cor. xiv. 6.

mentioned. Barnabas and Paul were dedicated by the other prophets and teachers, and the church is not alluded to in the narrative. Hence the separation of Barnabas and Paul was in no sense an ecclesiastical ordination.¹ No authority was imparted to them. There was simply a recognition of the fact that the Spirit had called them, and a prayerful dedication of them to the appointed service by their associates in the work in Antioch.

2. *The Tour of Cyprus.*

When Paul set out from Antioch with Barnabas, it was not on his first missionary tour. He had been laboring for years in Syria and Cilicia. Nor are we to say that this was the "first missionary journey formally and officially undertaken," while the previous preaching of Paul had been that of an individual.² There is no trace of an official relation between Paul and the church in Antioch. He is not a missionary of that church, supported and directed by it. He is as independent in his work after the year spent in Antioch as he had been before. But Antioch was in a sense his church-home, a church with which he was in full sympathy, a church which from its location and numbers was of great importance, and therefore it

¹ Comp. Bethge, *Die Paulinischen Reden der Apostelgeschichte*, p. 13. Hort, *Judaistic Christianity*, p. 63, holds the ecclesiastical view of the event.

² Hort, *Judaistic Christianity*, p. 63.

was natural that he should return thither again and again during the years of his missionary labors.

The fact that Barnabas was a native of Cyprus,¹ very likely decided the missionaries to go first to that island. The Gospel had already been preached there to some extent, but we do not know with what success.² Moreover, some of the men who had begun the work of the Gospel in Antioch were Cypriote Jews,³ and therefore there may have been among the Antiochian Christians a special acquaintance with the needs of Cyprus which had something to do in determining the route of Barnabas and Paul.

The distance from Antioch to Cyprus is about one hundred and forty miles. The missionaries probably walked from Antioch to Seleucia, which was the harbor of Antioch and about sixteen miles distant, and there took a boat to Salamis, the eastern port of Cyprus. They were accompanied by John Mark, a young man whom they had brought with them from Jerusalem to Antioch,⁴ and who perhaps attended them now as a body servant. Mark was a cousin of Barnabas,⁵ and it is not improbable that Barnabas was the one who suggested taking him on the tour.

The missionaries began their work in Salamis, and went through the whole island to Paphos, a distance

¹ Acts iv. 37.

² Acts xi. 19.

³ Acts xi. 20.

⁴ Acts xiii. 5; xii. 12.

⁵ Col. iv. 10.

of about one hundred miles. Paphos was the chief city of the island, and the residence of the proconsul.¹ Luke says that they preached in the synagogues, and makes no reference to any work among the Gentiles.²

The one incident of the tour which he preserves is Paul's meeting with the Roman proconsul.³ Sergius Paulus *summoned* Barnabas and Paul into his presence, whether chiefly out of curiosity or with some religious interest cannot be determined. He sought to hear what the missionaries had to say, but they were interrupted by a Jewish sorcerer, Bar-Jesus, who gave himself the Arabic title *Elymas*, which means *wise*. Sergius Paulus was a reasoning, intelligent man, and yet he had this magian near him. He may have hoped to learn something of the invisible world through his art, or may have retained him as a physician. The study of magic was widespread at this time, and was cultivated even by the Jews. Many magic formulæ were in use, especially for healing,⁴ and Josephus⁵ says that many of these were composed by Solomon. The magi were supported and consulted by some of the most intelligent people of the times, and we cannot regard their profession as pure fraud. Ramsay⁶

¹ Marquardt, I. 390-392.

² Acts xiii. 5.

³ Acts xiii. 6-12.

⁴ Schürer, II. 691, 692.

⁵ *Antiquities*, viii. 2. 5.

⁶ *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 78.

is of the opinion that they represented not only the modern fortune-teller, but also the man of science.

Elymas opposed Paul and Barnabas, very likely because he regarded them as magi like himself, and feared that they might supplant him in the favor of the proconsul. This opposition aroused all the energy of Paul's soul, and according to Luke's account he spoke words of judgment against the sorcerer which were straightway fulfilled in a temporary blindness.

The spiritual result of this act upon the proconsul is not plain. Luke says he *believed, being astonished*. But what did he believe? Did he believe that Jesus was the Messiah? He of course believed that Paul had a subtle power not possessed by Bar-Jesus, but did that belief lead him to a spiritual acceptance of the Gospel of Paul? Luke's language seems to imply an affirmative answer to this question. If, however, we think of Sergius Paulus as won to the faith by this incident, we may hold that his faith was mingled with much superstition and ignorance.

Luke changes the name of his hero at this point in the narrative. Prior to this hour he calls him *Saul* exclusively, and after this *Paul* exclusively. We can only conjecture the reason for the change, and the origin of the name *Paul*. The view that Paul adopted the proconsul as his patron,¹ and so took his name, is

¹ Renan, *Saint Paul*, p. 18.

quite at variance with Paul's independence, and also with his consciousness of being an apostle of Jesus Christ. It is possible that he had had both names from childhood, in accordance with the practice of the Hellenists,¹ and that Luke introduced the second name as a memorial of the deed in Paphos, the first miracle attributed to Paul. It is also possible that Paul took the name after his conversion,² in analogy with the fact that Jesus frequently gave new names to His disciples; and if this was the case, we may suppose that he chose it because he was *little* in his own estimation, which is the meaning of the Latin word *paulus*.

The tour through Cyprus does not appear to have resulted in many conversions. Luke is in the habit of recording results, but here he is silent. It may perhaps be inferred from Acts xv. 36, that *some* disciples were won, for there Paul and Barnabas propose to visit the *brethren* in every city where they had preached, and after the separation of the two missionaries Barnabas went to *Cyprus*.

3. *The Work in Pisidian Antioch.*

Luke does not suggest why the missionaries went north from Cyprus to Perga, and then from Perga to Antioch of Pisidia;³ nor do we know that they had any

¹ Lewin, *The Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, 3d ed., 1875, I. 6.

² So Jülicher and Weizsäcker.

³ Antioch was not *in* Pisidia, but near its boundary.

special route planned when they set out. The sea-voyage from Paphos to Perga is one of about one hundred and seventy-five miles. No halt seems to have been made in Perga, though there were doubtless Jews in that city.¹ The only incident connected with the place was the departure of Mark, who returned to Jerusalem.² It is simple conjecture to say that he gave up the tour because he feared hardships.³ We know only that at a later time Paul looked back on Mark's action as showing unfitness for further missionary service,⁴ while Barnabas seems not to have regarded it as especially blameworthy.

The hypothesis that Paul contracted a malarial fever in Perga and went up to Antioch in the highlands for his health⁵ is characterized by Zöckler⁶ as an "empty fancy," and this estimate seems just. Luke gives a detailed account of the work in Antioch, but makes no reference to any sickness of Paul. And moreover a malarial fever does not meet the requirements of Paul's language in Gal. iv. 13, 14. Such a fever would not make him an object of contempt or abhorrence either while he was suffering from the attack or after it had passed.

¹ See Acts ii. 10, where Jews from *Pamphylia* are mentioned, in which province Perga was a prominent city.

² Acts xiii. 13.

³ So Conybeare and Howson.

⁴ Acts xv. 37-40.

⁵ Ramsay in *Expositor*, 1892, Vol. VI. p. 373 f.

⁶ *Studien und Kritiken*, 1895, p. 63.

Antioch, described by Strabo as *near Pisidia*,¹ is identified with the modern Jalowadj, ninety miles in a straight line northeast from Perga, but much more than that by any travelled road. It was a Roman colony, planted by Augustus, and consisted of veterans of the Fifth Gallic legion.² The privileges of the provincial colonies were not always the same, and they changed from time to time. From the period of Augustus the main privileges were the following: liberty from the control of the governor of the province, immunity from poll and land taxes, and full possession of the land.³ The inner organization of the colony was modelled after that of Rome. In the time of the empire, foreign cities in which colonies were planted, as was the case in Antioch, became colonies in their entire extent, that is, the former population became Roman citizens. The administration of the government in Antioch appears to have been in the hands of two magistrates, who were over the senate and the popular assembly.⁴

Of the details of the work in Antioch, as of that in Iconium, Lystra, and Derbe, the Book of Acts is our only source. We have no references to this

¹ Müller's edition, p. 494.

² Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, I. 365.

³ Marquardt, I. 88-92.

⁴ Marquardt, I. 365, note 2; 152, 153.

period by Paul in his letters, for the modern theory that the churches which Paul founded at this time were the "churches of Galatia"¹ cannot, I think, maintain itself.²

Again, of the narrative in Acts the material can hardly all be regarded as of quite equal value. Thus the address which is attributed to Paul, like those of subsequent chapters, is plainly not a verbatim report. The occasion called for an address of an hour or two in length,³ but the words in Acts can be read in less than five minutes. Moreover, as a literary production, it bears the stamp of Luke, not of Paul, and therefore can neither be regarded as a verbatim report nor as an outline prepared by the speaker or by some hearer. Yet it is not therefore necessary to conclude that the address is a free composition by the author of Acts, with no historical basis.⁴ Unless its thought is un-Pauline, we may hold that the author had some trustworthy source.⁵ But it is said that verses 38, 39 are "sufficiently un-Pauline to excite surprise," and that the conception of justification in verse 39 "falls far below Paul's character and controlling idea of justification as the state of the saved man who is completely reconciled to God and enjoys peace with

¹ Gal. i. 2.

³ Comp. Acts xx. 7-11; xxviii. 23.

² Appendix III.

⁴ So Pfeleiderer, Weiss, Wendt, and McGiffert.

⁵ So Meyer, 4th ed., and Bethge.

Him."¹ But Wendt, though he attributes the address wholly to Luke, holds that the thought of these verses is "characteristically Pauline," and I think we must agree with this. These thoughts of the inadequacy of the law to justify, of the sufficiency of faith in Jesus, and of a justification which consists in the forgiveness of all sins, are surely Pauline. It does not then appear plain that this Antiochian address may not preserve the essential thought of the apostle. And the subsequent narrative of events in Antioch contains nothing which from the standpoint of Paul's letters appears objectionable.

We are told that the word of the missionaries was fruitful. Many Jews and proselytes followed Paul and Barnabas from the synagogue, and there was a general request that they should speak again on the next Sabbath.² This they did with the result that the Jews, as a whole, rejected them, whereupon they turned to the Gentiles. In spite of the common hatred of the Jews there were everywhere proselytes to Judaism, and these furnished the most receptive soil for the Gospel. The reason of this lay in the fact that the proselytes had not accepted Judaism as a mass of rites and ceremonies, but rather as an exalted religious and moral conception of God, of the soul, and of human life.

¹ McGiffert, *The Apostolic Age*, p. 186.

² Acts xiii. 42, 43.

So in Antioch, as in all the fields where Paul labored, the chief success of the Gospel was among the proselytes and other Gentiles. The impression which was made by Paul and Barnabas upon the community may be inferred from the hostility of the Jews. They did not rest until they had driven the missionaries out of their borders; but the grounds are not indicated on which they secured the coöperation of the Roman authorities of the colony.

How long Paul and Barnabas had been in the city can be only approximately determined. Since the word of the Lord was spread abroad through all the *region*¹ before they left Antioch, we must think of a visit of at least several months. And the fact that they left a vigorous church also implies a sojourn of some considerable length.

4. *The Work in Iconium.*

Iconium was about eighty miles southeast of Antioch, and either in the province of Phrygia or of Lycaonia. According to the earlier and popular division, it was Phrygian; according to the Roman governmental organization, it was Lycaonian.² Luke seems not to have regarded Iconium as a city of Lycaonia. He says the missionaries came to Iconium, and from

¹ Acts xiii. 49.

² Marquardt, I. 368, 383; Ramsay, *Church in the Roman Empire*, pp. 36-40.

there they fled to the cities of Lycaonia, Lystra and Derbe. Thus, by implication, Iconium does not belong to the same province with Lystra and Derbe.

Iconium was an important city, and was perhaps already a Roman colony like Antioch, for it was colonized in the reign of Claudius (41-54 A.D.).¹

The labors of Paul and Barnabas met with greater success in Iconium than in Antioch. A great multitude of Jews and of Greeks believed. It is not said that the apostles were excluded from the synagogue at all during their stay in Iconium, and the statement that a great multitude of Jews believed makes it possible to think that they continued their preaching in the synagogue until the onset was made which put an end to their work. This onset was planned by the unbelieving Jews, and carried out by them with the aid of such Gentiles as they had been able to incite against the missionaries, the same method of persecution that we find later in Thessalonica and Ephesus. But Paul and Barnabas were informed of the plot and fled. Paul counted not his life dear to himself when a plain duty called him to face great perils, but when no duty commanded him to stand, he simply fled for his life, as any sensible man should do.

It is in the narrative of Paul's labor in Iconium, and nowhere else, that the Book of Acts calls him an apostle.²

¹ Marquardt, I. 364.

² Acts xiv. 4, 14.

The title is given to Barnabas as well as to Paul. Since the author elsewhere restricts this title to the original apostles, it is conjectured that the use of it in these two passages is an indication that he followed a written account of this tour, and derived the title from this source.

5. *The Work in Lystra and Derbe.*

The Wolfe expedition¹ to Asia Minor and the subsequent investigations of Professor Ramsay² agree that Lystra was located near the modern village of Khatyn Serai, which is about eighteen miles southwest from Iconium. Professor Sterrett of the Wolfe expedition and Professor Ramsay also agree very nearly on the site of Derbe. Sterrett³ inclines to identify the ruins at Bosola and Losta (Zosta) with the ancient Derbe, and Ramsay⁴ locates it about four miles northwest from Zosta, at Güdelissin. The ruins of Losta and Bosola are about sixteen miles southeast from Lystra, as measured on the Sterrett-Kiepert map.

There is no reference to a synagogue in either Lystra or Derbe, and therefore we infer that the Jewish element was very small or entirely wanting. Luke records

¹ J. R. S. Sterrett, *Papers of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens*, Vol. III. p. 142.

² *The Church in the Roman Empire*, pp. 47-54.

³ *Papers of the American School*, etc., Vol. III. pp. 22, 23.

⁴ *The Church in the Roman Empire*, pp. 54-56.

two incidents of the sojourn in Lystra. First, the miracle on the cripple,¹ which interests him chiefly because of its consequences. When the people saw the miracle, they thought that Paul and Barnabas were gods, as the people of Melita argued when Paul took no harm from the bite of the viper.² This was the pagan inference from a miracle, while the Jewish inference was that the one who wrought the miracle was a prophet.³

The sincerity of the Lycaonian belief was shown in the fact that the people proceeded at once to offer sacrifice to the apostles. Their identification of Barnabas with Zeus may have been due to the fact that the worship of Zeus was especially cultivated among them.⁴ It was natural to identify Paul with Hermes, because Paul seemed to be the spokesman of Barnabas as Hermes was the interpreter and spokesman of Zeus.

It is to be noticed that the miracle on the cripple did not convince the people of the truth of Paul's doctrine, but only that Paul himself was supernatural. Thus it was productive of evil rather than good as far as the multitude was concerned. The work in Lystra was finally interrupted by Jewish emissaries from Antioch and Iconium. They aroused popular antagonism to Paul, in what way we are not told, and he was stoned

¹ Acts xiv. 8-18.

² Acts xxviii. 6.

³ John ix. 17.

⁴ Acts xiv. 13.

in the streets of the city and dragged out as dead. But he had only been stunned, and as the disciples stood about him he regained consciousness. The fact that he was able to go forth to Derbe on the following day is an indication that no bones had been broken.

Of the work in Derbe Luke says only that many disciples were made.¹ There is no reference made to Jews or to any opposition. Neither is there any clue to the length of time spent in Derbe or in Lystra. It may have been weeks; more likely it was months. From Derbe, as also from Lystra, came one convert whom we find associated with Paul in later years, Gaius from Derbe and Timothy from Lystra.²

6. *The Journey Homeward.*

From Derbe the missionaries might easily have reached home by continuing eastward through the great pass of the Taurus Mountains, but they chose to go back by the way which they had come, though that required them to face the enemies from whom they had recently fled. They did this in order to strengthen the disciples whom they had won, and provide for their future growth in the Gospel.³ It is probable that the brethren were already suffering for their faith, since it is expressly said that the apostles spoke of the value of tribulations.⁴ In addition to

¹ Acts xiv. 21.

³ Acts xiv. 21, 22.

² Acts xvi. 1; xx. 4.

⁴ Acts xiv. 22.

teaching, the apostles took the initiative in the appointment of elders. According to Luke this was done for each church that they had established, and more than one elder was appointed for each.¹ The mode of appointment is not indicated.² It is plain that the initiative was taken by the missionaries, but there is no ground to think that the several groups of believers had no part in the appointment. For Paul and Barnabas did not come to the churches with any official authority for organization and government. Their authority was wholly moral, and their converts were their brothers and sisters in the Lord.

In only one new field did the missionaries preach on the return journey, and that was Perga, the second city in Pamphylia. They passed through it as they entered Asia, coming from Cyprus, but at that time they did not stop to preach. The visit on the return journey is passed over by Luke as though it had no important results, and there is no evidence that Paul came again to the city. From Perga they went down to the port of Attalia, and thence sailed directly to Antioch, not revisiting Cyprus.³

¹ Acts xiv. 23.

² The verb is *χειροτονεῖν*. Comp. 2 Cor. viii. 19.

³ The total distance travelled by the missionaries was about fourteen hundred miles, half by land and half by water. A conservative estimate of the time occupied by the tour is perhaps three years. Churches were established in four cities at least, perhaps in more. There were probably Jews and Gentiles in all these churches, the Gentiles predominating.

CHAPTER VIII

THE STRUGGLE FOR GENTILE FREEDOM

1. *The Problem of the Sources.*

THE critical meeting between Paul and the church in Jerusalem in regard to the relation of Gentile believers to the law is sketched by the apostle in his letter to the Galatians.¹ It is universally agreed that the Book of Acts also deals with this great event in Jerusalem, but it is uncertain where it deals with it and how trustworthily it deals with it. Some identify the journey of Acts xi. 27-30 with that of Gal. ii.,² some see in Acts xv. the parallel to the apostle's narrative in Galatians,³ and others⁴ regard Acts xi. and xv. as variations of one and the same story. Again, they who regard Acts xv. as parallel with Gal. ii. are divided in their view, some holding that this chapter is made up of separate documents, one of which has nothing to do with the events of Gal. ii.,⁵ others holding that the entire account of Acts xv. with

¹ Gal. ii. 1-10.

² So Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller*, pp. 152-177.

³ Among others, H. J. Holtzmann and Weiss.

⁴ E.g. McGiffert, *The Apostolic Age*, p. 171. ⁵ So Clemen.

some slight and unimportant exceptions is a historical account of that which Gal. ii. describes,¹ and others holding that the chapter concerns the events of Gal. ii., but that it modifies facts in the interest of church harmony.²

But the visit of Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem which is recorded in Acts xi. 27-30 manifestly belongs to an earlier time than the controversy of Gal. ii.; for this controversy presupposes a long and successful activity of Paul among the Gentiles. Such a work followed the year spent in Antioch, but did not precede it. Then the mission of Acts xi. was primarily, if not exclusively, philanthropic, while that of Gal. ii. was as exclusively religious. It is quite difficult to believe that the same visit had two so totally different aspects, and that two writers kept so completely each to one aspect of the visit, betraying no knowledge of the other aspect. Nor is it possible to regard Acts xi. and xv. as varying accounts of the same visit. They have nothing in common except that in both cases Paul and Barnabas started from Antioch and went to Jerusalem. The occasion, purpose, and results are wholly different. One cannot claim, it is true, that the author of Acts is above criticism, but his methods justify us in believing that he handled his sources with care and intelligence. More-

¹ So Pfeleiderer.

² So Weizsäcker.

over, it is conceded that from the thirteenth chapter forward the author drew from exceptionally good sources, and this makes it difficult to believe that in chapter xv. he unconsciously offers us a second account of a visit to Jerusalem which he had already described. It is said that Gal. ii. 10 seems to imply that a double purpose was fulfilled by the journey, and that Paul was the bearer of alms as well as the defender of Gentile Christianity. But this interpretation will not do. For the remembrance of the poor of which Paul speaks in Gal. ii. 10 was surely a *fulfilment* of the exhortation of the leaders, James, Peter, and John, and therefore was not *prior* to that exhortation.

A comparison of Acts xv. and Gal. ii. brings out two classes of facts. In the first place, certain fundamental points of agreement are obvious, which constrain us to the conclusion of most recent scholars that the narrative of Acts xv. concerns the event of which Paul speaks in Gal. ii. 1-10.¹ Thus in Acts as in Galatians the question which takes Paul to Jerusalem is the relation of the Gentile believers to the law.² In Acts as in Galatians the position of Paul is recognized by the leaders in Jerusalem.³ In Acts as in Galatians nothing is *imparted* to Paul as regards the terms on which salvation is offered to

¹ So Pfeleiderer, Weizsäcker, Wendt, and H. J. Holtzmann.

² Acts xv. 1; Gal. ii. 2.

³ Acts xv. 10, 24; Gal. ii. 9.

the Gentiles.¹ In Acts as in Galatians it is assumed that the position of Jewish believers remains unchanged. The decree from Jerusalem, according to Acts, is for *Gentile* believers;² and what Paul contended for in Jerusalem, according to his letter, was the freedom of Gentile believers, not of Jewish believers. These features of agreement are manifestly fundamental, and forbid the separation of Gal. ii. and Acts xv.

But still the narrative in Acts is not without difficulties when compared with Paul's own account in Galatians, though there are some differences which ought not to be regarded as difficulties. Thus, according to Galatians, Paul went up to Jerusalem by revelation, while according to Acts he went by the appointment of the church in Antioch.³ But it is obviously unnecessary to see any conflict here. The two reports supplement each other. In the epistle to the Galatians, where Paul is showing the independence of his Gospel, it is natural that he should refer to the inner impulse to go to Jerusalem, rather than to the action of the church. Again, the silence of Acts in regard to Titus, who was so important a figure in the conference according to Gal. ii., may be regarded simply as a part of its plan to give

¹ Acts xv. 31; Gal. ii. 6.

² Acts xv. 23.

³ Gal. ii. 2; Acts xv. 2.

a general sketch of events. It deals with the public gatherings and the issue, but not with details. The private conference of Paul with the leaders in Jerusalem, of which Gal. ii. speaks, is not mentioned in Acts, but neither does the narrative in Acts exclude it.

But while these differences are not serious, there are other points which cannot be easily explained. Thus, according to Paul in Galatians, there was at first a difference of opinion between Paul and the leaders. They did not give him the right hand of fellowship until they had perceived the grace that was given to him.¹ It is implied that they did not at first agree with him, but were constrained to endorse his work by the fact that God had manifestly endorsed it. But of this alienation of the leaders from Paul and their subsequent approach to him, there is no trace in Acts. Peter is on Paul's side from the first, and James agrees with Peter.² There is perfect harmony between the apostles of the circumcision and the apostle of the uncircumcision. But this is not the impression which is made by Paul's impassioned words in Gal. ii. He is on one side and the apostles are on the other. He contends for Gentile freedom, and it is evident that he does so with all his might. But there is no need for this contention if the elder apostles are already in perfect harmony with

¹ Gal. ii. 9.

² Acts xv. 7-11.

him. It cannot be supposed that the experience which Peter had in Joppa and in the house of Cornelius must necessarily have led the apostles to admit the freedom of Gentile believers. That was an isolated case. Peter did not draw from it the inference that the Messianic salvation was to be freely offered to all Gentiles. No one drew such an inference. The attitude of the Jewish church in Jerusalem seems not to have been seriously affected by it. And therefore, when Paul came up to Jerusalem to lay before the church the Gospel which he preached among the Gentiles, he met with opposition. Of this there is no trace in Acts, as we have already noticed, and this fact has been regarded as unfavorable to the character of Luke as a historian. He is said to be a harmonizer, who paints the early history of the Church in a rosier light than the facts warrant.¹ It must be admitted that the fifteenth chapter of Acts affords not a little ground for this charge. And yet there remains one word more to be said for Luke. The scene described in Galatians is stormy; that of Acts is peaceful. But that of Galatians is *private*, and there is no obstacle in the way of our supposing that, in the public meeting which followed, Peter and James, who, according to Paul himself, had given him the right hand of fellowship in the private interview, now came forward in defence of

¹ Weizsäcker, p. 175.

Paul's position. They were bound by their handshake to confess before the church that Paul's Gospel to the Gentiles was a true Gospel, and just that is what they do, according to Acts.

There is another point of serious divergence between Gal. ii. and Acts xv. Paul says that they who were of repute imparted nothing to him, while the author of Acts tells of four *necessary* things which were laid upon the Gentile converts.¹ Some scholars feel that these statements are in absolute conflict,² and they naturally reject the account of Acts. Some think that such a decree as that of which Luke speaks was never promulgated,³ and others that it was not promulgated at the time of the conference in Jerusalem and in the circumstances there set forth.⁴ This latter question is the only one which can be fairly raised, for there is no tangible argument in support of the view that the decree is purely fictitious.

Now, much depends upon the meaning of Paul when he said that the leaders "imparted nothing to him."⁵ Plainly this statement must be understood in harmony with the context. It is really defined by the positive affirmation that follows. They imparted nothing to me,

¹ Gal. ii. 6; Acts xv. 22-29.

² For example, Weizsäcker, Pfeiderer, and McGiffert.

³ So Volkmar, Weiss, and Pfeiderer.

⁴ So, *e.g.* Weizsäcker.

⁵ Gal. ii. 6.

Paul says, but gave us the right hand of fellowship, that is, they recognized the Gospel which we preach to the Gentiles. Accordingly, the words "they imparted nothing to me" signify that they did not interfere with his preaching of the Gospel. They did not in any wise alter the conditions on which he offered the Gospel to the Gentiles. In other words, they recognized his authority to preach and to found churches. But if this be the meaning of the words of Paul in Galatians, then plainly it cannot be said that the language of Acts is inconsistent with it. For the four prohibitions which are laid upon the Gentile converts in Acts xv. have nothing to do with the *salvation* of Gentiles, but only with their association with Jewish believers.¹ The conflict therefore between Galatians and Acts at this point seems to be, after all, an artificial one.

2. *The False Brethren.*²

When Paul returned from the first tour which he made from Antioch, he found the church in that city deeply agitated over the question of the relation of the law to Gentile believers. Jewish Christians from Jerusalem declared that the observance of the law was absolutely necessary to salvation.³ And there were facts which seemed to support the position of these men.

¹ Comp. Wendt in *Meyer's Commentary on Acts*, 7th ed., pp. 331-341.

² Gal. ii. 4.

³ Acts xv. 1.

Thus, in the first place, Jesus had not formally abrogated the law for His disciples. On the contrary, He had used words which might be thought to teach its perpetual existence. He said that He came not to destroy the law but to fulfil it, and that no jot of it should pass away till all things were accomplished. Then, in the second place, Jesus had observed the law, keeping the Passover, paying the temple tax, and bidding the healed leper offer the prescribed gifts. And third, the disciples in Jerusalem, including the apostles, had not separated themselves from the temple. All this seemed to favor the view that when Gentiles were admitted to the Christian Church, they must come in through the door of Moses. According to Acts this was the view of the apostles prior to Peter's experience in Joppa and Cæsarea. It required a vision to convince him that God is no respecter of persons, and to prepare him to go to the house of the Gentile Cornelius. They also who were most zealous for the proclamation of the Gospel at first confined their efforts to the Jews.¹

Thus there was not a little in the life of Jesus and in the history of the Church which seemed to favor the position of the men who said that the Gentiles must be circumcised if they were to be saved. When Paul and Barnabas came from their tour, they found these "false

¹ Acts xi. 19.

brethren" or Judaizers in Antioch, who had come in to spy out the liberty which the Gentile believers had in Jesus Christ and bring them under bondage to the law. How long they had been there is not plain, but they had acquired considerable influence and were making a deep impression. It does not appear whether any of the Gentile Christians had allowed themselves to be circumcised. The Judaizers withstood Paul and Barnabas so strongly that the church thought it necessary to send a committee to Jerusalem regarding the matter.

3. *The Compromise.*

The gathering in Jerusalem was not an ecclesiastical council, with power to legislate for the various bodies represented, but it was rather a friendly conference of a younger church with an elder one. The church in Jerusalem did not *summon* the church of Antioch, but the church of Antioch acted on its own motive. It took a practical question to the mother church, and asked for counsel. In so doing it did not assume that the Jerusalem church had any other authority than such as belonged to the wisdom and experience of its individual members.

This meeting was of great importance, though this is exaggerated, I think, when it is said that the future of Christianity depended upon it,¹ and that the ques-

¹ Pfeleiderer, pp. 46, 47.

tion to be decided was whether Christianity was to be a petty sect or a universal religion.¹ To assume that it was possible for Christianity to be a petty Jewish sect is to deny the fundamental claims of Jesus. The importance of the conference in Paul's view is apparent from his words in Gal. ii., when he says that he laid his Gospel before the leaders in Jerusalem, "lest by any means I should be running or had run in vain." We must hold with Weizsäcker that Paul does not express here a doubt about the stability of his work among the Gentiles, but only in regard to his success in Jerusalem. It would seem as though he had run in vain if he should fail to secure the recognition of the Gentile work on the part of the Jewish church.

The course of events at the conference cannot be made out in detail. In view of Gal. ii. we must hold that the hour of supreme importance was that in which Paul met the leaders privately and secured from them the recognition of his Gospel. It is this alone of which he speaks in the epistle to the Galatians. Whatever other conferences there may have been, they were of secondary importance in Paul's judgment. The right hand of fellowship from James, Peter, and John was the essential thing. As these leaders went, the entire church would go.

¹ Renan, *St. Paul*, p. 58.

The argument which won in this private conference was the fact that the blessing of God manifestly rested upon Paul's work. There was Titus, a converted Greek and a living witness that Paul's Gospel had been owned of God. As Peter could not resist what he saw in the home of Cornelius, so the apostles could not deny the force of the argument which was afforded by Titus. They saw that Paul had been intrusted with the Gospel of the uncircumcision; they perceived the grace that was given unto him.¹ They perceived it in what he had done,² in the work of which Titus was an illustration. And as Titus had manifestly been accepted of God, though uncircumcised, Paul successfully contended that he should not be circumcised now to gratify the conservative Judaizing element in the church.³

The epistle to the Galatians, though it mentions only a private conference, implies at least one other. For the great question of the relation of the Gentile believers to the law of Moses must of necessity come before the whole church: it could not be fully settled in a private conference with the leaders. Therefore the account of a public meeting which we have in Acts⁴ does not come unexpectedly. Again, it was

¹ Gal. ii. 7, 9.

² Comp. Weizsäcker, p. 164.

³ This is also the view of Weizsäcker, Hort, Conybeare and Howson.

⁴ Acts xv. 6-29.

natural that Peter should take the initiative in this conference, as Acts relates, for he had had an experience in Cæsarea which in the light of what Paul had said in the private conference must take on new meaning. It is also in accord with what we know of James¹ when Acts represents him as bringing the discussion to a close. He was the *first* of the three "pillars." The fact that he was a brother of Jesus seems to have had more weight than the fact of apostleship.

The proposition attributed to James, that the church in Jerusalem should write to the Gentile believers asking that they abstain from four things, is in line with what Paul himself says of James. For he says that the controversy in Antioch between himself and Peter was precipitated by certain persons from James,² who led Peter to withdraw from contact with Gentile believers. This fact shows us a man who would limit the contact of Jewish and Gentile Christians according to the degree in which Gentile believers observed certain Jewish rites, and that is the man who proposes the terms of fellowship in Acts xv.

The proposition attributed to James includes three, perhaps four, of the seven Noachian prohibitions, which according to Jewish teachers every Gentile who

¹ Gal. i. 19; ii. 9; Acts xxi. 18.

² Gal. ii. 12.

dwelt among the Jews must observe.¹ They did not pertain to proselytes simply, or as such, but to all foreigners, and were, theoretically, the basis of intercourse. The four prohibitions of James are: first, to abstain from *pollutions of idols*, such as eating meat that had been offered in sacrifice to an idol; second, to abstain from *fornication*, by which term is probably meant the intermarriage of near relatives which the Jews counted as fornication;² third, to abstain from that which is *strangled*; and, fourth, to abstain from *blood*. These last two prohibitions appear to be modifications of the seventh Noachian commandment, not to eat *living flesh*, that is, flesh with the blood in it.

It is not improbable that these prohibitions already rested upon proselytes in the Dispersion, and that the proposition of James contemplated an extension of their observance to all Gentile converts. But it is an error to suppose that the imposition of these ceremonial observances upon the Gentile converts marked them as "less honorable and less pleasing to God" than the Jewish believers.³ They confessedly did not affect the Gentiles' standing before God in any wise: they were simply a basis of intercourse with Jewish believers. If they had set a stigma upon the Gentile

¹ Schürer, II. 568, 569; Weber, 253, 254.

² Comp. Renan, p. 68; Wendt in *Meyer's Commentary*.

³ See McGiffert, p. 212.

believers, it would scarcely have been said that these "rejoiced for the consolation."¹ And, moreover, it is impossible to suppose that James, who recognized Paul's Gospel and indorsed his work among the Gentiles, straightway went before the church and proposed a measure that put dishonor upon the Gentile believers.

The proposition of James was indorsed by the church in Jerusalem, embodied in a letter and sent to Antioch by the hand of Judas and Barsabbas.² In holding the historical character of this decree, it is not necessary to hold that every detail of the letter is historical. It seems doubtful whether the church in Jerusalem commended Paul and Barnabas to the church in Antioch, and said that they had hazarded their lives for the name of the Lord Jesus. Paul and Barnabas were at home in Antioch, and the church there knew of their work far better than did the church in Jerusalem. But this point is incidental.

This decree, as Luke calls it,³ was really a compromise. The *necessary* things of which it speaks were necessary *if* there was to be fellowship between Gentile and Jewish believers. They were necessary from the point of view of the Jerusalem church. The decree, then, was conditional, or, as we have said, was a compromise measure.

¹ Acts xv. 31.

² Acts xv. 22.

³ Acts xvi. 4.

This compromise was not in the sphere of the essential but of the unessential. The liberty of the Gentile believers in regard to the law of Moses was recognized. Nothing was imparted to Paul as far as his fundamental position was concerned. The purpose of the Judaizers or false brethren was repudiated. But the mother church thought it necessary that the Gentile believers in Antioch and vicinity should make certain concessions to their Jewish brethren. These were not ethical, but ceremonial, and they were in the interest of fellowship. The decree therefore did not touch the specific question which the church in Antioch had brought to Jerusalem, but was concerned wholly with an incidental point. The answer of the Jerusalem church to the main issue was given in the right hand of fellowship which Peter, James, and John extended to Paul and Barnabas, and it was implied also in the addresses of Peter and James before the church. The cause of Gentile freedom as represented by Paul and Barnabas was triumphant.

4. *The Subsequent History of the Decree.*

When the letter from Jerusalem was read in Antioch the church rejoiced for the consolation.¹ Its Gentile majority found that the mother church agreed with it touching the essential thing, and it was willing, in the interest of peace, to regard Jewish convictions on the

¹ Acts xv. 31.

points which were specified in the letter. According to Luke this letter was intended not only for Gentile Christians in Antioch, but also for those in Syria and Cilicia,¹ and it is said that when Paul and Silas went on the second missionary tour from Antioch they took the letter with them.² There is no trace of it in any church that was founded by Paul alone.³ Paul never refers to it in his epistles, and never gives his Gentile converts instructions similar to those of the decree. On the contrary, he told the Corinthian converts that they might eat meat that had been offered to idols, unless in so doing they caused a brother to stumble,⁴ and we may assume that he took the same position with reference to the other prohibitions. And yet it must be admitted that there was nothing in the terms of the decree which was not covered by Paul's principle to become a Jew to the Jews. If there was a prospect that fellowship with Jewish believers would be promoted by the observance of the Jerusalem letter by Gentile Christians, then there was no reason why Paul should not lay its observance upon his Gentile converts. The fact that he never refers to it in his letters is an indication that it did not prove to be of practical value, and that it soon fell into neglect; but it is not good evidence that he never had anything to do with it.

¹ Acts xv. 23.

² Acts xvi. 4.

³ Weiss, *Einleitung*, p. 143, note 3.

⁴ I Cor. viii.

The visit of Peter to Antioch soon after the council in Jerusalem shows that there was no virtue in the letter to bring Jewish and Gentile believers together in a peaceful fellowship, at least in that city. Peter came down to Antioch, and in the spirit of his interview with Paul, in which he had given him the right hand of fellowship, he ate with the Gentile believers.¹ This was a logical step for him to take, but it was open to criticism by the Jewish church. The elder apostles had not changed their position in regard to Jewish believers through their interview with Paul. They recognized him as the apostle of the uncircumcision, but they remained the apostles of the circumcision, and the law from which the Gentile believers are free still rested upon the Jew. It was the observance of this Jewish law by Jews that James had in mind when he sent certain men down to Antioch. From his point of view Peter was in error in eating with Gentile Christians. The letter of the Jerusalem church did not authorize such an act, for in that case James could have said nothing, and Peter would not have been embarrassed. It contemplated a certain measure of intercourse, but not eating together, which was a mark of perfect ceremonial equality.² Hence Peter's act, though right in principle and in line with his recognition of Paul's work, was unlawful if judged by the Jewish statutes regarding

¹ Gal. ii. 12.

² Mark ii. 16; Acts xi. 3.

clean and unclean. This was brought home to him, and he retreated from the high position which his Christian feeling and Christian principle had led him to take. Barnabas and others followed, and the line of cleavage between Jewish and Gentile believers was clearly drawn. Thus was manifest the weakness of the Jerusalem compromise, and an opportunity was given Paul to point out the way of Christian progress, for, as Weizsäcker¹ says, the day in Antioch leads further than the day in Jerusalem. This opportunity Paul did not fail to improve.² There is no longer on his part a silent toleration of legalism for Jewish believers, but he smites it root and branch. Justification by faith in Christ absolutely excludes works of the law. Freedom from the law is not regarded as a concession to Gentile weakness, but as the true Christian position.

What effect Paul's words had upon Peter we are not told. Some scholars think that the purpose of the letter to the Galatians demanded that if Paul had secured an actual victory over Peter, he should announce it,³ while others affirm with equal assurance that the whole force of the argument in Galatians requires us to hold that Paul's rebuke of Peter was successful.⁴ This latter statement appears to be un-

¹ *Das Apostolische Zeitalter*, p. 169.

² Gal. ii. 14-21.

³ So Weizsäcker, McGiffert, etc.

⁴ So, e.g. Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 161.

warrantable, for Paul's aim in Galatians is to show the independence of his Gospel, not to show that he always made the elder apostles think as he did. On the other hand, there is no ground for the affirmation that Paul's reproof embittered Peter most deeply, and that the Judaizing work sprang out of that embitterment.¹ It is natural to suppose that Paul's address in Antioch strengthened the opposition, for it brought out into sharp relief the difference between him and the adherents of the law, but there is no proof that Peter either at this time or later regarded the observance of the law as necessary to salvation.

¹ So Volkmar, *Paulus*, p. 20.

CHAPTER IX

THE INTRODUCTION OF THE GOSPEL INTO EUROPE

1. *The Inception of the European Tour.*

PAUL and Barnabas returned from the conference in Jerusalem and continued their work in Antioch, teaching and preaching with many others.¹ It was in this period that Peter visited Antioch, and the line was drawn between Jewish and Gentile believers, which led to Paul's vigorous protest and to his vindication of every Christian's freedom from the law, Jew no less than Gentile. It is impossible, as Weizsäcker and others hold, to put this controversy anywhere else than soon after the conference in Jerusalem. The fact that there were *many* teachers and preachers in Antioch besides Paul and Barnabas witnesses to the rapid growth and extent of the church, and thus explains why Peter desired to visit it, and why James wished to keep in close touch with it.²

After some time spent in Antioch Paul proposed to Barnabas that they should visit the churches which they had established.³ There is no evidence that he

¹ Gal. ii. 11; Acts xv. 35.

² Gal. ii. 12.

³ Acts xv. 36.

thought at this time of *new* fields of labor. His one purpose was to visit the churches of the first missionary tour, and the new work which came to him as he fulfilled this purpose was a providential appointment.

It may be noticed that neither at this time nor at any other did the church of Antioch, as such, have anything to do with Paul's tours. Certain prophets in that church set him apart to the work among the Gentiles, but as far as we know the church never gave him suggestion or support. It had no sort of official relation to him as a missionary.

Paul summoned Barnabas to go with him, but finally took Silas. The two old friends and collaborators were alienated over the question of taking Mark.¹ Who was the more to be blamed we cannot say. From what we know of the character of the two men at this time we may believe that there was more of gentleness and sympathy in the judgment of Barnabas than in that of Paul. We gather from Paul's own letters that he was not permanently alienated from Barnabas. For when he sends Mark's salutation to the church in Colossæ² (a proof that he was on good terms with Mark³), he introduces and commends him by saying that he is a cousin of Barnabas. The fact that the Colossians are assumed to know who Barnabas is, suggests that he may have worked

¹ Acts xv. 37-39.

² Col. iv. 10.

³ Comp. 2 Tim. iv. 11.

there or in that neighborhood, and this would imply that he was on friendly terms with Paul, for it was Paul who had introduced the Gospel into all that region. Again, in his first letter to the Corinthians, Paul speaks of Barnabas in a way that is scarcely consistent with the idea that they were deeply alienated from each other.¹

2. *Seeking New Fields.*

The narrative of Luke passes rapidly over the tour of the churches by Paul and Silas. It mentions churches in Syria and Cilicia, of whose establishment Luke does not inform us, but which we understand in the light of what Paul says in Galatians.² The account in Acts refers by name to Lystra because Paul took Timothy with him from that city.³ Iconium and Antioch are not mentioned by name, but were doubtless visited. When Paul had visited the churches, he started for a new field; and being in Antioch of Pisidia it was natural that his thought should be turned to the province of Asia. There, but two hundred miles west of Pisidian Antioch, was Ephesus, the chief city of the whole land, and since Paul's habit was to seek the great cities as the fields of his evangelistic labors, it was most natural that he should now turn his thought toward Asia and Ephesus. But the Holy Spirit for-

¹ 1 Cor. ix. 6.

² Gal. i. 21-23.

³ Acts xvi. 1.

bade this course.¹ We are not told how this restraining influence of the Spirit was manifested. There is no ground to think of a vision. Probably the mind of the Spirit was made known to Paul in some such way as it is made known to Christians in all times. It may have been through some person,² or through some event. From the word used, "forbidden," we may perhaps infer that the event, whatever it was, was of a decided character and left Paul in no doubt. When their plan to enter Asia was abandoned, they turned northwest and passed through some part of Phrygia and Galatia.³ Luke does not indicate that they made any stop. The impression of the whole passage is that they were being led of God to the new European field. Yet it is not therefore necessary to suppose that they made absolutely no stop as they journeyed through the region of Phrygia and Galatia. If the North Galatian theory be correct, as I believe it is,⁴ it must have been at this time that Paul preached the Gospel in Galatia.⁵ This work would not require us to suppose that Paul stopped more than a few weeks. Luke may have passed over the Galatian sojourn because it did not mark a forward step in Paul's work, or because he was unacquainted with it. His silence is not strange, for he does not profess to write a continuous history of

¹ Acts xvi. 6.

² Comp. Acts xx. 23.

³ Acts xvi. 6.

⁴ Appendix III.

⁵ Gal. iv. 12-14.

Paul. It is plain that he gives us only fragments and outlines. Thus, for example, he has no word about the Arabian sojourn or the early years spent in Syria and Cilicia. His silence, therefore, in regard to Galatia is quite in keeping with the character of his narrative. Some facts of the work in Galatia may be gleaned from Paul's letter. He tells us that he had not planned to preach there, but that an infirmity of the flesh was the occasion of his Galatian work.¹ That is to say, he was detained in Galatia by sickness, and while thus detained preached the Gospel. As his stop was providential, so his success was altogether remarkable. The Galatians welcomed him as an angel of God, and the Gospel took firm root among them.² They who had served idols began to live a true spiritual life, and endured hardship for their faith.³ They ran well, and the power of the Gospel was very manifest among them.⁴ Thus, when Paul was well enough to continue his journey westward, he had the satisfaction of knowing that through his sickness the salvation of Jesus had come to some of his fellow-men. Whether he preached in more than one community we are not told, neither can we say whether his preaching was in a town or in a rural district.

The next field that Paul sought to enter was Bi-

¹ Gal. iv. 13.

² Gal. iv. 14.

³ Gal. iv. 8; iii. 3, 4.

⁴ Gal. iii. 5; v. 7.

thynia, or Bithynia-Pontus, a Roman province lying on the Black Sea, whose Christian martyrs of a later day are known to us through the letters of the younger Pliny. Again it was made plain to him that he was moving contrary to the divine will.¹ This time he turned westward and continued his journey, not at all knowing where the field of his labor was to be.² As Mysia was a part of the province of Asia³ into which he had been forbidden to enter, he passed it by, or better, *neglected*⁴ it, since Paul must have passed *through* Mysia in order to reach Troas, for Mysia extended as far south as Mt. Temnos. At this time then Paul must have had Europe in mind, for he knew that when he had passed through Mysia he would come to the sea. Yet when he reached Troas he had no definite plan for further journeying.

3. *Paul's Vision in Troas.*

Twice after leaving Antioch of Pisidia Paul's course had been changed by what he recognized as divine authority. But the information which was given him in regard to his field of labor was altogether negative. It was *not* to be Asia and *not* Bithynia. In Troas he gains positive information, for there he has a vision of a Macedonian who entreats him to come into

¹ Acts xvi. 7.

² Acts xvi. 8.

³ Marquardt, I. 334.

⁴ Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller*, pp. 196, 197.

Macedonia.¹ Paul's inference from this vision was that God called him to go into Macedonia. It is not unlikely that Paul had heard, in Troas, that which led him to think there was an opportunity for the Gospel in Macedonia. We may even go further and say that, since Paul recognized the man who appeared in the vision as a *Macedonian*, he had probably become acquainted with him before the vision, and through this man he may have become interested in Macedonia. Then when his mind was full of the subject, he was prepared for the vision.

It has been conjectured that this man of Macedonia was Luke.² In support of this view it is said that Luke seems to have had some connection with Philippi, and was perhaps at home there, for he goes with Paul as far as Philippi and there remains. It is also said that there was nothing distinctive in the Macedonian dress, and therefore since Paul recognized the man of his vision as a Macedonian he must have been acquainted with him; but the only man whom he met in Troas, as far as our narrative goes, was Luke.³ These considerations, however, are scarcely strong enough to give the conjecture a firm basis.

¹ Acts xvi. 9.

² Renan, *St. Paul*, 130-132; Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller*, 202.

³ This of course presupposes that the "we" sections of Acts, viz. xvi. 10-17; xx. 5-xxi. 18; xxvii. 1-xxviii. 16, are from Luke's diary.

Luke's first meeting with Paul, his conversion to Christianity, his home, and even his nationality, excepting the fact that he was *not* a Jew,¹ are points on which we have no certain information.

4. *The First Church in Europe.*

Paul started for Macedonia immediately after the vision, and seems to have had a very favorable passage to Neapolis, for he reached there on the second day, while at a later time, when travelling in the opposite direction, he was five days on the same journey.² The distance from Troas to Neapolis is about one hundred and forty miles, and from Neapolis to Philippi ten miles. Philippi was the first Macedonian city that the travellers reached as they came up from Thessalian Neapolis, and hence the first field which corresponded to the vision. But this is not the meaning of Luke's language³ when he says that Philippi is "the first city of the district of Macedonia, a colony." This apparently means that Philippi, though not the capital of the district, was the most important city in it. Philippi had been made a Roman colony by Augustus in 42 B.C., and consisted of Italians whose lands had been given to the soldiers of the emperor.⁴

The Jewish population in Philippi seems to have

¹ Col. iv. 11, 14.

² Acts xx. 6.

³ Acts xvi. 12.

⁴ Marquardt, I. 92, note 5.

been quite small. There is no mention of a synagogue, and even if the "place of prayer" was not essentially different from a synagogue, as Schürer holds,¹ it was frequented only by a little group of women.² The location of it by the riverside was perhaps for convenience in the performance of ceremonial purifications. The first congregation was composed entirely of women, a fact that was typical of the part that women were destined to have in the church about to be founded there. The first convert was a devout proselyte by the name of Lydia, who, as she was originally from Thyatira in the province of Asia, was manifestly *not* a Macedonian. She appears to have been a woman of some means, for she had a house or lodgings in which she could entertain Paul and his three fellow-laborers. Other notable women whom Paul converted in Philippi were Euodia and Syntyche.³ They were doubtless proselytes like Lydia, and not Jewish wives of heathen men of distinction.⁴ Paul's work in Philippi continued without interruption for *many* days.⁵ The usual hostility from unbelieving Jews was wanting. The opposition which led to his departure from the city was occasioned by his influ-

¹ *Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes*, II. 369-373.

² Acts xvi. 13.

³ Phil. iv. 2, 3.

⁴ Hort, *Judaistic Christianity*, p. 89.

⁵ Acts xvi. 18.

ence over a certain divining maid. This person was impressed by the Christian evangelists, and publicly testified that they were true servants of the most high God.¹ But as she was believed to be possessed by a spirit, Paul felt toward her as Jesus felt toward the demonized ones who recognized his Messiahship. This girl is described by Luke as a *ventriloquist*, for he says that the spirit in her was a *python*,— a Greek designation of a ventriloquist; and her utterances were regarded as prophetic. If she was not a slave, she had at least sold her services to certain men, and they derived much gain from her. Therefore when Paul stopped her soothsaying, he dealt her masters a serious blow, and brought on an assault which put an end to his work in Philippi. This was the first assault upon Paul from a Gentile source. The charge brought against him was twofold: first, that he and Silas, being Jews, were a disturbing element in the city; and, second, that they taught customs which Romans could not lawfully receive.² The first charge reflects the widespread popular sentiment toward the Jews, which was one of hate. The second charge probably refers to the preaching of Jesus as Messiah and King, which was understood to have political significance.

Paul and Silas were given no chance to defend

¹ Acts xvi. 17.

² Acts xvi. 20, 21.

themselves, but were at once beaten with rods and then cast into prison.¹ This was a flagrant violation of their rights as Roman citizens, but for some reason they did not make the fact of their citizenship known. The historical character of this narrative in Acts receives support from Paul's first letter to the Thessalonians in which he refers to his experience in Philippi, and says that he was shamefully treated there.²

The night which Paul and Silas spent in prison was full of remarkable occurrences, but it is not plain that the narrator means to affirm anything miraculous. The earthquake certainly was not miraculous, and its opportuneness was simply *providential*, like the darkness on the day of the crucifixion. The opening of doors and the loosening of bonds fastened to the walls or in the ground are credible results of an earthquake. The jailer's purpose to kill himself, even before he has looked to see whether the prisoners have fled, is natural. He could have but one thought regarding the prisoners, when he saw that the doors were open; and their escape meant certain death to him. His treatment of Paul and Silas, taking them to his house, was no violation of his orders to keep them safely.³ When he had refreshed them, they went back into the prison,⁴ but we need not think that the jailer again

¹ Acts xvi. 22-24.

² 1 Thess. ii. 2.

³ Acts xvi. 23.

⁴ Acts xvi. 36.

put their feet in the stocks. The order which the magistrates sent in the morning, to release the prisoners, is not to be regarded as a result of the earthquake; it is rather an expression of their sober second thought. They saw that their course had been unlawful, and they decided to set the prisoners at liberty. When, in the morning, they heard from their lictors that the men whom they had misused were Roman citizens, they had no resort but to do Paul's bidding, and come to the prison themselves and bring the prisoners forth.¹ They requested Paul and Silas to leave the city, and the missionaries thought it wise to do so. Yet they did not depart precipitately. They went to the house of Lydia, where they had a farewell meeting with the believers, and then they went forth. Thus the first chapter of the work to which the Lord had called them by a vision came to an end. Thus far it had been a work of peculiar suffering and of apparently small fruitage. But the future was to give abundant proof that their coming to Philippi had indeed been of the Lord.

5. *The Work in Thessalonica.*

The capital of the district in which Philippi was situated was Amphipolis. Paul and Silas passed through this without stopping to preach, and in like

¹ Acts xvi. 39.

manner they passed though the large city of Apollonia. Luke's narrative suggests that there may have been no synagogue in either city.¹ If so, that might explain why Paul did not stop, for his order of evangelistic work, even after the conference in Jerusalem, was *to the Jew first*. In that conference a division of fields of labor was made, and Paul was to go unto the Gentiles and the elder apostles unto the circumcision,² but it is plain that this was not understood in strict literalness. For Paul says that the elder apostles recognized that he was intrusted with the Gospel of the uncircumcision even as Peter with the Gospel of the circumcision; but it was well known that Paul in all his preaching hitherto had begun in the synagogue, and Peter on the other hand had preached to the Gentile Cornelius and his household. It is impossible, therefore, to understand Paul as promising the elder apostles in Jerusalem that he would henceforth never preach to a Jew. What he agreed to was simply what he had long recognized as his peculiar mission, namely, that his labor should be especially for the Gentiles.

Having passed through Amphipolis and Apollonia Paul came to Thessalonica, the capital of the second district of Macedonia, about ninety miles southwest from Philippi. Since the year 44 A.D. Thessalonica had been the seat of the government of the province

¹ Acts xvii. 1.

² Gal. ii. 9.

of Macedonia, and bore the title of *metropolis*. It possessed one of the privileges of a Roman colony—local self-government.¹ There was a synagogue in Thessalonica and quite a large Jewish population. There were also many proselytes, and these from the upper class.² According to Acts Paul began his work in Thessalonica in the synagogue, continued there three weeks, and won some Jews to faith in Jesus.³ The historical character of this narrative has been called in question in the light of Paul's own testimony in his letter to the Thessalonians.⁴ There he addresses his readers as former Gentiles,⁵ and makes no reference to a Jewish element in the church. But it must be remembered that, even according to Acts, the church was predominantly Gentile in character,⁶ and it is not apparent why a letter might not be written to this majority, which should make no allusion to the Jewish element.

The impression made by Acts that Paul was in Thessalonica only three weeks can hardly be defended. A longer stay than this is favored by the fact that he was there long enough for his condition to be reported in Philippi and for aid to be sent from that church on two separate occasions.⁷ Again, the language of Paul

¹ Marquardt, I. 90, 320.

² Acts xvii. 4.

³ Acts xvii. 2-4.

⁴ So Weizsäcker and Jülicher.

⁵ 1 Thess. i. 9.

⁶ Acts xvii. 4.

⁷ Phil. iv. 16. The supposition of Zahn, *Einleitung*, p. 152, that the

in his first letter to the Thessalonians seems to imply a much more extended sojourn than is mentioned in Acts. He says that he worked day and night that he might not burden any of the Thessalonians. But it does not seem probable that, if he twice received aid from Philippi, he would have been obliged to work nights unless his stay there was longer than three weeks. Again, when he appeals to his holy, righteous, and unblamable life in Thessalonica, and to the manner in which he had dealt with the converts individually, exhorting, encouraging, and testifying, we have difficulty in supposing that his stay was only three weeks long. In this point, therefore, we may hold that the impression made by Luke's narrative is incorrect. No especial significance should be attached to the fact that in Acts there is a persecution by the Jews, while the letter of Paul does not speak of Jewish persecution, but only of persecution by the Gentiles.¹ The two statements do not interfere with each other. That the hostility of the Jews was manifested toward Paul is just what his previous career leads us to expect, and we have no reason to doubt that persecution was afterward carried on by Gentiles, for Paul expressly affirms it.

Philippian church sent Paul aid even before they had heard from him, is surely improbable.

¹ Acts xvii. 5; 1 Thess. ii. 14.

While Paul was in Thessalonica he lodged with Jason, who, to judge from his name, — which was that of an ancient king of Thessaly, — was a Macedonian, and from the fact that he could give security which satisfied the rulers we may infer that he had means.¹ The success of Paul with the proselytes aroused the jealousy of the Jews, and with a hired mob they assaulted the house of Jason, but Paul fortunately was not there.² Jason and some other believers were dragged before the rulers on the charge of being confederate with Paul, but they were released after Jason had given security. In view of verse 10 we may suppose that Jason gave bond to the effect that Paul and Silas should at once depart from the city, and this they seem to have done that very night. Timothy, who appears to have been with Paul and Silas during the greater part of their stay in Thessalonica, tarried a short time after their departure, and then followed them to Berea.³

The success of Paul in Thessalonica, though his work was broken off by persecution, was very great. The Thessalonians received his word as the word of God⁴ and rejoiced in the midst of afflictions.⁵ They soon became an example to all believers in the provinces of Macedonia and Achaia, and their Christian life was

¹ Acts xvii. 9.

² Acts xvii. 5-7.

³ Acts xvii. 14.

⁴ 1 Thess. ii. 13.

⁵ 1 Thess. i. 6; ii. 14.

everywhere known.¹ Paul was tenderly attached to them, and esteemed them as his joy and crown of glorying.² According to Luke there were two of the Thessalonians, Aristarchus and Secundus, who accompanied Paul the last time that he went to Jerusalem, and one of them went with him to Rome.³

6. *The Work in Berœa.*

Paul and Silas fled by night from Thessalonica, as he had once fled from Damascus, and came to Berœa,⁴ which was about forty-seven miles southwest from Thessalonica by the shortest route. This town also was in Macedonia, whither the vision had summoned Paul. The synagogue in Berœa was the only one in which, thus far, Paul had been truly welcomed.⁵ Many Jews received his word, and those who did not receive it did not persecute him. Here, as in Thessalonica, some of the leading Greeks of the city accepted the Gospel. The work in Berœa was finally checked by Jews from Thessalonica. When they heard of Paul's work, they came on to Berœa, and gained so much influence with the multitude, probably by political charges such as they had brought against the evangelists in Thessalonica, that the brethren sent Paul away. It was thought safe for Silas and Timothy to remain.⁶

¹ 1 Thess. i. 7, 8; iv. 10.

² 1 Thess. ii. 17-19; iii. 1, 5, etc.

³ Acts xx. 4; xxvii. 2.

⁴ Acts xvii. 10.

⁵ Acts xvii. 11, 12.

⁶ Acts xvii. 13, 14.

There is no statement in regard to the length of time that Paul spent in Berœa; but since the opposition to him came from Thessalonica, and not from the people of Berœa, we may assume that his work continued for several weeks. He left a considerable circle of believers, but we do not hear of them again in the New Testament. Luke tells us that one of the men who went with Paul to carry the contribution of the churches to Jerusalem was a Berœan, Sopater, the son of Pyrrhus,¹ and we may infer from this that the church was vigorous at the time of Paul's collection for the poor saints in Judea.

With Berœa Paul's work in Macedonia ended. He had preached and gathered circles of believers in three cities, and had been driven from each by persecution. It is possible that he labored in other places, which Luke does not mention, but we cannot infer this from Paul's statement in Romans,² that he had preached as far as Illyricum. For when he had planted the Gospel in Philippi, Thessalonica, and Berœa, he had taken possession of the province of Macedonia, and therefore could say that he had preached as far as Illyricum, which bounded Macedonia on the west. But even if Paul's personal work in Macedonia was confined to these three cities, its influence was soon widely extended through the province. As early as when he wrote to the

¹ Acts xx. 4.

² Rom. xv. 19.

Thessalonians, he spoke of brethren in *all* Macedonia,¹ and said that the word of the Lord had sounded forth from Thessalonica throughout Macedonia and Achaia. Thus we have to think that the work begun by Paul in Philippi, Thessalonica, and Berœa, as later his work in Ephesus, was soon extended far and wide through the province of Macedonia by the zeal of his converts.

7. *Paul in Athens.*

From Paul himself we have but a single allusion to a visit in Athens. He says that shortly before he wrote to the Thessalonians, which he did from Corinth, he thought it good to be left at *Athens* alone, and so he sent Timothy back to Thessalonica to establish and comfort the church.² He does not speak of work in Athens, and since he was in Corinth when Timothy returned from Thessalonica, the impression which the passage makes is that he did not remain long in Athens.

Weizsäcker³ denies the historical character of Luke's narrative of the Athenian visit of Paul, but in a manner which quite fails to carry conviction. He says that the events which are reported show no trace of being actual occurrences, but are simply a collection of well-known things. But this statement is plainly at variance with the characteristic and unique elements of Luke's

¹ 1 Thess. iv. 10.

² 1 Thess. iii. 1, 2.

³ *Das Apostolische Zeitalter*, p. 265. McGiffert strongly defends the trustworthiness of Luke's narrative. See *The Apostolic Age*, pp. 256-262.

narrative, as, for example, that the Athenians understood Paul to be teaching the existence of new *demons*, when he spoke of Jesus and the *resurrection*. Weizsäcker says further that Paul's silence in regard to a church in Athens is conclusive against the view that he labored there a considerable time and founded a church. But Luke does not at all teach that Paul remained a considerable time in Athens, nor does he claim that Paul founded a church there. On the contrary, his narrative makes the impression that Paul had not planned to work in Athens,¹ and that his activity was almost entirely fruitless. Two believers are mentioned by name, and it is said that there were a few others.²

According to the narrative of Luke the Berean Christians did not suffer Paul to depart from their city alone. Some of their number took the place of Silas and Timothy, and continued with Paul as far as Athens, a distance of about two hundred miles by water.³

The language of Luke suggests that when Paul left Berea there was no definite plan for him further than that he should go down to the seaport, probably Dium, which was about twenty miles distant. His further journey seems to have been regarded as dependent upon the ships to be found there. The view that

¹ Acts xvii. 16.

² Acts xvii. 34.

³ Acts xvii. 15.

Paul went to Athens by land¹ is plainly against Acts xvii. 14, and moreover, had he gone by land, we might have expected that he would have stopped and preached in some of the large towns on the way. On reaching Athens Paul sent back to Berea by his escort of Berean friends and asked that Silas and Timothy should come to him with all speed.² The motive for this is not quite apparent. We learn from 1 Thessalonians that Paul, after leaving Thessalonica, had earnestly sought an opportunity to return. He felt that the church needed him. Once and again he had desired to go, but had been hindered by Satan.³ It was still his prayer that God would direct his way to Thessalonica.⁴ Such was his frame of mind in the interval between his departure from Thessalonica and the composition of the first letter to the church there. We may therefore hold that it was his relation to the Thessalonian church which led him to send for Silas and Timothy. From Luke's account we should infer that Silas and Timothy did not see Paul until they rejoined him in Corinth.⁵ But it appears from 1 Thess. iii. 1, 2 that Paul sent Timothy from Athens to Thessalonica, and therefore we must suppose that he came to Paul in Athens, though Luke does not mention it. The fact that he presently sent him to

¹ Zahn, *Einleitung in das N. T.*, I. 153.

³ 1 Thess. ii. 18.

⁴ 1 Thess. iii. 11.

² Acts xvii. 15.

⁵ Acts xviii. 5.

Thessalonica favors the view that he had summoned him from Berœa for this very purpose. Perhaps, however, it was a longing for the fellowship of Silas and Timothy that led Paul to summon them from Berœa, for in 1 Thess. iii. 1 Paul speaks as though it was a hardship to be left alone in Athens.

The activity of Paul in Athens was due to the idolatry of the city. This led him to speak both in the synagogue and in the market.¹ Of his work in the synagogue it is not said that it bore any fruit at all; and the preaching to the Gentiles was singularly misunderstood, and won few converts. Paul was thought to be a plagiarist,² retailing scraps of learning which he had picked up from the discourse of others, or at best the introducer of new demons. Even the word *resurrection* was thought to be the name of a supernatural being.³ But the very circumstance that he seemed to be teaching about new demons made the Athenians curious for a little time, and occasioned the Areopagus address. It is debated whether we are to understand by *Areopagus* a place or a council, whether Paul was taken to the Hill of Mars,⁴ on which the supreme court had met from ancient times, or taken to the Areopagus council which may have met by the Mar-

¹ Acts xvii. 17.

² Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller*, pp. 242, 243.

³ Acts xvii. 18.

⁴ So Bethge, *Paulinische Reden*, p. 80; Conybeare and Howson, p. 289.

ket.¹ In either case, however, the hearing of Paul was not of the nature of a judicial trial. The fact that he was supposed to be a setter forth of strange demons could not be regarded as a ground for proceeding against him, for there was the utmost liberality in Athens toward all foreign cults. And, furthermore, there is no trace of a formal trial in Luke's account. No charges are brought, no defence is made, and when Paul was interrupted in his address he went forth unhindered. These facts appear to be unfavorable to the view that Paul was brought before the high council.

This Areopagus address is the only one of Paul's recorded addresses which was to an educated Gentile audience. It is marked by liberality of thought in regard to the Gentiles, the same liberality which we see in the Lycaonian address² and in the epistle to the Romans.³ Paul admits that the Athenians worship God, though in ignorance. He says that all nations have one origin and one destiny. He recognizes Greek poets as teaching some truth about God and man; for he quotes with approval the sentiment of Aratus, that all men are the offspring of God. He does not speak of justification by faith or of the second coming of Christ; but, in regard to

¹ So Ramsay, Renan, and Baedeker.

² Acts xiv. 15-17.

³ Rom. ii. 12-16.

this, two remarks may be made: first, Paul seems to have been interrupted before he had finished his address, so that it is only a fragment; and, second, we have no right to demand that Paul should put the same truths into every address.

8. *The Work in Corinth.*

No vision summoned Paul to Corinth, yet his coming thither was fraught with weighty consequences both for himself and for the cause of the Gospel. Luke does not suggest why he left Athens, or why he turned his steps toward Corinth. It is not improbable that when Paul set out for the province of Achaia, he had Corinth prominently in view. For this city, a Roman colony founded by Julius Cæsar,¹ was the capital of the province, a large and important place about fifty miles west from Athens.

When Paul began work in Corinth, he did not expect to remain long. We learn from 1 Thess. iii. 11 that he was praying for a return to Thessalonica. Yet in the ordering of providence he remained in Corinth longer than in any other city except Ephesus. His first concern when he reached Corinth was to find a home, and work by which he could support himself. Fortunately he became acquainted with a Pontian Jew, by the name of Aquila, and

¹ Marquardt, I. 332.

his wife, and they invited him to make his home with them.¹ They also, as well as Paul, earned their support by weaving goat's-hair cloth. It is possible that Paul was in their employ. When Paul had found a home, he began speaking in the synagogue as he had opportunity; and yet his thoughts were drawn away to Thessalonica, and he could not enter with his whole strength into the Corinthian work. This is apparent from Luke's statement that when Silas and Timothy came down from Macedonia, Paul was constrained by the word, and preached with new vigor and success.² We learn from Paul that they brought a good report from Thessalonica, which relieved his mind of much of its anxiety.³ The new vigor of his preaching soon bore fruit in decided opposition from the unbelieving Jews, and Paul accordingly left the synagogue with the announcement that he would go unto the Gentiles.⁴ Titus Justus, a proselyte and probably also a Christian, who to judge from his name was a Roman, opened his house to Paul, and this was near to the synagogue.⁵ Here Paul remained more than a year and a half.⁶ He had some success among the Jews, but apparently it was not very great. The most notable convert was Crispus, the ruler of the synagogue.⁷ Paul tells

¹ Acts xviii. 2.

² 1 Thess. iii. 6.

³ Acts xviii. 7.

⁴ Acts xviii. 8.

⁵ Acts xviii. 5.

⁶ Acts xviii. 6.

⁷ Acts xviii. 11, 18.

us that he himself baptized this man, though not in the habit of administering the rite.¹ A few years later we find in the Corinthian church a faction bearing the name of Peter and another bearing the name of Christ, and it is probable that the nucleus, at least, of each of these factions consisted of Jewish converts. Hence we must hold that Paul had some fruit among his own people in Corinth. But his success among the Greeks was much greater. The Lord told Paul in a vision that He had much people in the city,² and Luke says that many of the Corinthians believed.³ From the letters of Paul to the Corinthians, which were written two or three years after the establishment of the church, we may infer a somewhat numerous company of believers. He speaks of four different factions, and of many spiritual activities.⁴ He speaks of the appointment of *several* of its members to carry their contribution to Jerusalem, which suggests that the church was relatively large.⁵ The language of Paul in 1 Cor. i. 26, 28 indicates that the Greek converts were as a rule from the lower class. Erastus, the treasurer of the city,⁶ and Gaius who entertained Paul and the whole church,⁶ and Chloe and Stephanas,⁷ were exceptions to the rule.

¹ 1 Cor. i. 14.

² Acts xviii. 10.

³ Acts xviii. 8.

⁴ 1 Cor. i. 12; xii. 1-11.

⁷ 1 Cor. i. 11, 16.

⁵ 1 Cor. xvi. 3.

⁶ Rom. xvi. 23.

While in Corinth Paul was unusually oppressed with a sense of weakness and fear.¹ It was necessary that the Lord should appear to him in a vision and encourage him.² This state of mind may have been due in part to the exceptional wickedness of Corinth,³ and to the recent discouraging experiences in Athens. It is perhaps also significant that Paul speaks of this weakness in connection with his resolution to preach the cross in simple words, without any of the arts of worldly wisdom.⁴ He knew that his Gospel would be foolishness to most of his hearers,⁵ for they loved wisdom and eloquence, and this thought may have had a depressing influence upon him.

And yet, though Paul was thus oppressed in Corinth, his success, as we have seen, was great. The Jews sought to drive him away, but failed. They brought him to the judgment-seat with the charge that he persuaded men to worship contrary to the law.⁶ The judge and proconsul was Gallio, a brother of the Stoic philosopher Seneca. He refused to entertain the case against Paul on the ground that it did not lie within his jurisdiction. For him it was a question of the Jewish law only, and they must settle it among themselves. The accusers were then driven from the judgment-seat,

¹ 1 Cor. ii. 3.

² Acts xviii. 9, 10.

³ See Rom. i. 18-32, which was written there.

⁴ 1 Cor. ii. 1-5.

⁵ 1 Cor. i. 23.

⁶ Acts xviii. 13.

and the Greek¹ multitude who stood by seized Sosthenes, the ruler of the synagogue, and beat him without protest from Gallio. This procedure illustrates the popular hatred of the Jews.

Paul remained in Corinth many days² after this attempt to stop his work, and the reason for his departure is not suggested by Luke. One notable event is recorded in Acts which took place just before Paul sailed for Syria. In Cenchreæ, the eastern harbor of Corinth, about eight miles from the city, Paul had his hair cut short in token of the fulfilment of a vow. It is possible, grammatically, to refer this vow to Aquila,³ and it may be urged in support of this that Paul was inclined to keep himself free from Jewish rites, and also that we should expect to hear something of the reason of the vow if it was Paul who took it. Nevertheless it is altogether probable that the vow was Paul's, and not Aquila's. For there is no reason why a vow of Aquila should be mentioned at all. He is a wholly secondary personage in the narrative. Moreover, it is not inconsistent with Paul's principles that he should take upon him a vow. He could do this without sacrificing his Christian liberty, and it was not necessary that he should regard it as in any sense a meritorious work. It is quite probable that he had taken the

¹ Not the *Jews*, as Zahn and Weizsäcker hold.

² Acts xviii. 18.

³ So Wendt.

vow upon him in some hour of special peril or trial in the Corinthian work, certainly not, as Renan¹ supposes, to give solemnity to his resolution to spend the approaching feast in Jerusalem, and to prevent the possibility of changing his mind. The cutting of his hair marks the fulfilment of the vow, not its beginning.²

This first European tour which terminated in Corinth occupied, on a conservative estimate, two and a half years. This estimate includes the time required for the visitation of the churches in Asia Minor and for the entire journey from Antioch around to Antioch again. The distance travelled, if Paul went into North Galatia, may be roughly estimated at twenty-five hundred miles. The result of the tour was a thorough establishment of the Gospel in the two important provinces of Macedonia and Achaia.

9. *Distinguished Collaborers of Paul.*

If Paul was independent in his conception of the Gospel, he was dependent in his work in a marked degree upon the presence and sympathy of friends. He never labored alone, unless it was in Athens. In seven of the ten letters which are pretty generally admitted to be genuine Paul associates with himself one or more of his colleagues as joint authors. Paul was singularly fortunate in the men and women whom

¹ *St. Paul*, p. 279.

² Comp. Wendt in *Meyer's Commentary on Acts*, pp. 400-403.

he took into partnership in the Gospel. If we except two or three of the original apostles, the list of Paul's colaborers probably includes the ablest Christian thinkers and workers of his day. First in the circle, in point of time, is *Barnabas*. Like Paul he was a Hellenist, being a native of Cyprus.¹ He had been prominent in the Jerusalem church before Paul began his work of persecution, and was probably obliged to leave the city when the persecution broke out.² According to Acts he was of service to Paul on his first visit to Jerusalem after his conversion.³ He was sent from Jerusalem to Antioch after the work among the Gentiles in that city began,⁴ and was twice sent to Jerusalem as a delegate from the church in Antioch.⁵ It is doubtless true that he had hazarded his life for the sake of Christ, though it may be doubted whether the church in Jerusalem bore this testimony concerning him.⁶ The Book of Acts calls him an apostle,⁷ and the pagans of Lycaonia thought him an incarnation of Jupiter.⁸ The prophets and teachers in Antioch chose him with Paul to carry on the work among the Gentiles.⁹ The greatness of Barnabas is nowhere more manifest than in the fact that he recognized the superiority of Paul, and quietly yielded to him the leading part in

¹ Acts iv. 36, 37.

² Acts viii. 1.

³ Acts ix. 27.

⁴ Acts xi. 22.

⁵ Acts xi. 30; xv. 2.

⁶ Acts xv. 26.

⁷ Acts xiv. 4, 14.

⁸ Acts xiv. 12.

⁹ Acts xiii. 2.

their joint work, though the prophets in Antioch seem to have put Barnabas first when they set him and Paul apart for the Gentile work.

Silas, or *Silvanus*, whom Paul chose in Antioch after the trouble with Barnabas, was one of the chief men in the church of Jerusalem,¹ and of a kindred spirit with Paul. Like Paul he had the gift of prophecy, that is, the gift of impressive and edifying speech.² Like Paul he was a Roman citizen,³ and like him he was willing to endure hardness for the sake of the Gospel.⁴

A third colaborer of Paul, whom we meet for the first time on the second tour from Antioch, was *Timothy*. He was a native of Lystra, and a convert of Paul.⁵ His father was a Greek, and his mother, Eunice, a Jewess.⁶ His mother had given him careful instruction in the Scriptures from his childhood,⁷ though she had not brought him up in the observance of all the Jewish rites. The child was not circumcised, as the law required. Hence when Paul took Timothy as his companion, he circumcised him,⁸ that he might not needlessly offend any of the Jews to whom he would preach the Gospel. Timothy was with Paul throughout the Macedonian mission, and after a short interval of separation was with him again in Corinth. He accompanied Paul on

¹ Acts xv. 22.

⁴ Acts xvi. 19.

⁷ 2 Tim. iii. 15.

² Acts xv. 32.

⁵ Acts xvi. 1; 1 Tim. i. 2.

⁸ Acts xvi. 3.

³ Acts xvi. 37.

⁶ 2 Tim. i. 5; Acts xvi. 1.

his last trip to Jerusalem,¹ was with him in the Roman prison,² was appointed by Paul to have charge of the important church in Ephesus,³ and was summoned to Rome in the last days of Paul's life.⁴ Paul associates Timothy's name with his own in six of his letters.

Another man who came into association with Paul on the first European tour, and who, as Renan says, seems to have been created expressly to be a companion of Paul, was *Luke*. We meet him first in Troas, on the assumption that those parts of the Book of Acts which are written in the first person are from the diary of Luke. We learn from Paul that Luke was a Gentile⁵ and a physician.⁶ He accompanied Paul from Troas to Philippi, and there he disappears from view until Paul visited Philippi on his last journey to Jerusalem.⁷ He accompanied Paul on this journey,⁸ and also on the journey from Cæsarea to Rome.⁹ He was with Paul in the second imprisonment in Rome, the only one who remained faithful to him.¹⁰ The greatest service that Luke rendered to Paul was the composition of Acts, which has preserved much information regarding Paul's work that we should not otherwise possess. Next to Paul, Luke is the largest contributor to the New Testament.

¹ Acts xx. 4.

² Phil. i. 1.

³ 1 Tim. i. 3.

⁴ 2 Tim. iv. 10.

⁵ Col. iv. 10-13.

⁶ Col. iv. 14.

⁷ Acts xx. 6.

⁸ Acts xxi. 17.

⁹ Acts xxvii. 1.

¹⁰ 2 Tim. iv. 11.

Among the most notable colaborers of Paul and servants of the early Church were *Aquila* and *Priscilla*. From the hour when they received him into their home in Corinth until the end of his life they were devoted to the apostle. Aquila was a Jew of Pontus, and Prisca or Priscilla, though the name is Latin, was probably of the same nationality as her husband. She is always mentioned when Aquila is mentioned, and in four of the six passages her name is before his. Thus she seems to have been no less eminent than her husband. Aquila and Priscilla came to Corinth from Rome shortly before Paul arrived there. They had left Rome in consequence of an edict of Claudius, who, according to both Suetonius¹ and the Acts,² had expelled the Jews from Rome. Orosius puts this edict in the ninth year of Claudius, 49 A.D., but Schürer³ inclines to a date between 50 and 52. It seems doubtful whether all Jews were driven from the city,⁴ but there is no reason to question Luke's statement that the edict caused the departure of Aquila and Priscilla.

Whether Aquila and Priscilla were Christians when they came to Corinth,⁵ or were converted by Paul,⁶ is a matter of pure conjecture, since neither Luke nor

¹ *Claudius*, 25.

³ *Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes*, II. 508, note 69.

² Acts xviii. 2.

⁴ Graetz, II. 202; Schürer, II. 508.

⁵ So Farrar.

⁶ So Conybeare and Howson.

Paul gives any hint as to the time of their conversion. Their attachment to Paul was intimate. He bears witness, when writing from Corinth,¹ that they had hazarded their lives for his sake. When he left Corinth for the east, Aquila and Priscilla went with him and settled in Ephesus.² It is not unlikely that this change was made in order that they might help Paul in Ephesus. This view is confirmed by the fact that when Paul was anticipating a journey to Rome, Aquila and Priscilla seem to have moved from Corinth to that city, as though to coöperate with him there.³ At a later day they returned to Ephesus.⁴ Their eminence as Christian workers and teachers is seen in the facts that both in Ephesus and Rome there was a church in their house,⁵ and that while in Ephesus they had influence over such a man as Apollos, and greatly promoted his Christian knowledge.⁶

It remains to gather up what we know of the Gentile *Titus*, who also was an eminent helper of Paul. His nationality is unknown, but as Paul took him from Antioch, when he went up to Jerusalem to consider the relation of the Gentiles to the law, we may naturally regard him as a Greek or a Syrian. The fact that Paul took him to Jerusalem, apparently as a living argument that his work among the Gentiles was

¹ Rom. xvi. 4.

³ Rom. xvi. 3.

⁵ 1 Cor. xvi. 19; Rom. xvi. 5.

² Acts xviii. 18, 19.

⁴ 2 Tim. iv. 19.

⁶ Acts xviii. 26.

of God, is evidence that he esteemed him highly.¹ Paul seems to have sent him to Corinth with the first letter to the Corinthians,² but whether that be the case or not, Titus was certainly chosen to restore order in the Corinthian church and to promote the Christian life of its members.³ Paul must therefore have regarded him as a very judicious, persuasive, and competent man. The result of his mission to Corinth justified this judgment. Titus took charge of the collection in Corinth and Achaia for the poor of the Jerusalem church.⁴ According to the epistle to Titus, he was put in charge of the work in Crete,⁵ and when Paul was planning to spend the winter in Nicopolis he wrote to have Titus come to him.⁶ He was with Paul toward the close of his imprisonment in Rome, and the last information we have regarding him is that he went from Rome to Dalmatia, a later name for the province of Illyricum.⁷

¹ Gal. ii. 1.

² 2 Cor. vii. 6, 7, 13.

⁵ Titus i. 5.

² 2 Cor. vii. 7, 8.

⁴ 2 Cor. viii. 6, 16, 17.

⁶ Titus iii. 12.

⁷ 2 Tim. iv. 10.

CHAPTER X

PAUL IN EPHESUS

I. *The City.*

EPHESUS was situated on the Cayster River, near its mouth, and for centuries before Paul's time had been the chief of the Greek cities of Asia Minor. From the time when the Roman province of Asia was formed (133 B.C.), which included all the country bordering on the Ægean Sea from Mysia to Caria, and also the western part of Phrygia,¹ Ephesus was its capital. It had a large Jewish population, many of whom were Roman citizens,² and all of whom were citizens of Ephesus.³ If Tarsus was the intellectual centre of Asia Minor in the time of Paul, Ephesus was the religious centre, and the temple of Artemis or Diana was the centre of Ephesus. It is this feature of the city which possesses the chief interest for the student of New Testament times. The temple which stood in Paul's day was more than three centuries old, and according to the measurements of Wood⁴ it was 342 feet $6\frac{1}{2}$ inches long and 163 feet $9\frac{1}{2}$ inches wide.

¹ Marquardt, I. 335, 343.

³ Schürer, I. 745; II. 535.

² *Antiquities*, xiv. 10, 16, 19.

⁴ *Discoveries at Ephesus*, London, 1877.

It was at once a temple, an art museum, and a bank. As a temple, its great treasure was the image of Artemis which fell down from heaven.¹ As a museum of Art, its chief treasure was Apelles' painting of Alexander, which was valued at twenty talents of gold, or about two hundred thousand dollars.² As a bank, it contained immense quantities of precious stones and money.

One of the chief industries connected with the temple was the manufacture of shrines containing an image of the goddess.³ These were made of terracotta, marble, and silver.⁴ Pilgrims to the temple bought these shrines to take home as mementoes, or to dedicate to the goddess.

2. Paul's Arrival in Ephesus and Contact with the School of the Baptist.

When the thought of Paul was first turned toward Asia, the Holy Spirit forbade his going thither.⁵ When he sailed from Corinth for Syria, he touched at Ephesus and was urged to remain. This he would not consent to, but promised to return if the Lord was willing.⁶ After some months this promise was fulfilled. In this interval Paul was for a time in Antioch, and also went through the region of Galatia

¹ Acts xix. 35. ² Lewin's *Life of Paul*, I. 324. ³ Acts xix. 24, 25.

⁴ Ramsay, *The Church in the Roman Empire*, pp. 123-129.

⁵ Acts xvi. 6.

⁶ Acts xviii. 21.

and Phrygia on a pastoral visit to all the churches.¹ According to the common interpretation of Acts xviii. 22, Paul also visited Jerusalem during this interval, but it is difficult to regard this as historical. For it seems improbable, in the first place, that Luke, if he followed a trustworthy source, would refer to a visit of Paul in Jerusalem so indirectly, simply saying that "he went up and saluted the church." Then, after the understanding with the elder apostles, it might be supposed that Paul would not go to Jerusalem empty-handed.² Again, when Paul went with the collection, three years later, he went in fear and trembling, not knowing whether he should be delivered from the disobedient in Judea; and this fact is not favorable to the view that he visited Jerusalem as Acts xviii. 22 is supposed to imply.³

Soon after his arrival in Ephesus Paul fell in with certain disciples whose Christian instruction had been incomplete. Their baptism had been that of John, a baptism of repentance, and they had not heard of the gift of the Spirit.⁴ Apollos, who succeeded Paul as a teacher in Corinth, had belonged to this sect, or had occupied this position. He knew the baptism of John, but not Christian baptism and the gift of the

¹ Acts xviii. 22, 23.

² Gal. ii. 10.

³ Comp. Weizsäcker, *Das Apostolische Zeitalter*, pp. 217, 218; McGiffert, *The Apostolic Age*, p. 274; and Wendt in *Meyer's Commentary on Acts*, 405, note.

⁴ Acts xix. 1-7.

Spirit.¹ Aquila and Priscilla instructed him wherein he was deficient, and it is not improbable that they secured a meeting between Paul and the disciples who shared the views of Apollos. Whether these immature Christians were natives of Ephesus or not, and how they had heard of the baptism of John, are questions for which there is no certain answer. It is possible that they were converts of Apollos, for he had taught boldly in the synagogue before he met Aquila and Priscilla.² It is remarkable that Apollos could have lived in Alexandria all the years since Pentecost, and have known only the baptism of John. Plumptre thinks it possible that he and the twelve also had lived in seclusion.³ But what was there in their position that would lead them to seek seclusion, and then how can we account for their coming forth from their seclusion and mingling with other people in the heart of a great city? However the fact be explained, these men were practically devoid of any knowledge of the Holy Spirit. They apparently accepted Jesus as the Messiah,⁴ but were perhaps in the condition of the disciples in Jerusalem before Pentecost. There was no connection between them and the living Christ. After conference with

¹ Acts xviii. 25.

² Acts xviii. 26.

³ *St. Paul in Asia Minor and at the Syrian Antioch*, p. 109.

⁴ Acts xviii. 25.

Paul they were rebaptized, this time into the name of Jesus, and when Paul laid his hands upon them, they, like the disciples at Pentecost, spake with tongues and prophesied.¹ They were filled with a new and inspiring sense of the greatness and completeness of their salvation in Jesus, which expressed itself in such ecstatic utterances as we hear at a later day in the Corinthian church.² This incident in Ephesus illustrates how far-reaching and permanent was the influence of John the Baptist, and also how vividly and deeply the apostolic age realized the difference between baptism unto forgiveness of sins and baptism into the name and spirit of Jesus.

3. *Extent of the Work in Ephesus.*

Both among the Jews and the Gentiles in Ephesus Paul labored longer without interruption than he had ever yet done in any city. He was tolerated in the synagogue three months, though he spoke boldly, and then for more than two years longer he taught daily in the school of Tyrannus.³ At a later time he referred to his work in Ephesus as having continued three years.⁴ These references in Acts to the length of Paul's work in Ephesus are confirmed by allusions in Paul's epistles. Thus, toward the close of his stay in Ephesus, when

¹ Acts xix. 6.

² I Cor. xiv.

³ Acts xix. 8, 9.

⁴ Acts xx. 31.

writing to his Corinthian converts, he sends salutations from the *churches* of Asia.¹ But he himself planted the Gospel in the province of Asia, and the churches which send salutations are churches which have sprung up by virtue of his preaching, though not necessarily under his personal influence.² But the establishment of these churches implies as long a stay in Ephesus as Luke affirms.³

This reference to the churches of Asia confirms also the statement of Luke that Paul's influence was felt not only throughout Ephesus, but even through the entire province. This region is approximately of the size of New England. The language of Luke is very strong. He says that all they which dwelt in Asia heard the word of the Lord, both Jews and Greeks.⁴ He could not have used this language unless he had possessed evidence that the influence of Paul's work was widely pervasive.

We are to think of this influence as extended through the province in two ways: first, people came from all parts of the province to the metropolis on business or to worship in the temple, and many of them heard Paul; and, second, some of those whom Paul converted went out as evangelists, and thus the seeds of the Gospel were planted far and wide. Philemon of Colossæ, a convert

¹ 1 Cor. xvi. 19.

² Rom. xvi. 5.

³ Comp. 1 Cor. xvi. 8, 9; xv. 32; 2 Cor. i. 8-10.

⁴ Acts xix. 10.

of Paul, though Paul was never in Colossæ,¹ may illustrate how he, while in Ephesus, reached some who lived at a distance; and Epaphras who was a convert of Paul and who was quite probably the founder of the church in Colossæ,² may illustrate the second sort of influence.

The extent of Paul's influence in the city of Ephesus is confirmed by the remarkable story of the collapse of magic.³ For this story need not be wholly discredited because we cannot regard it as altogether historical. We may well believe that Jewish exorcists thought the names of Jesus and Paul good names to conjure with,⁴ and that in more instances than one they made use of them. The very fact that a Jew practised magic showed that he had lost his ancestral religious faith, and though he might have no faith in Jesus or respect for Paul, yet he might use their names for material gain. Luke tells how two Jews, perhaps well known, as they are said to have been sons of a chief priest, sought to exorcise an evil spirit by the names of Jesus and Paul. The use of these names by the exorcists roused the demoniac to a passion, and he wounded the men and made them fly for their lives. The demoniac said that he knew Jesus and Paul; he might fear them, but he had no fear of these unknown pretenders.⁵ This incident became

¹ Col. ii. 1; Philemon 19.

² Col. i. 7.

³ Acts xix. 13-20.

⁴ Acts xix. 13.

⁵ Acts xix. 15, 16.

widely known, and was regarded as a veritable recognition of Jesus by the invisible powers of evil. One consequence was that many magicians voluntarily burned their books on magic.¹ They seem to have felt that demoniac power would succumb to no exorcism save that of Jesus and Paul, and that it was extremely dangerous for any one else to attempt to drive it out. Of course it does not follow that these men became Christians because they burned their books. This act may have been quite as superstitious as anything they had hitherto done. But it witnesses to the power of Paul's personality, and the deep impression made by his Gospel.

4. *Special Features of Paul's Work in Ephesus.*

Luke reports that there were miracles wrought by Paul in Ephesus, and these of an extraordinary sort. Sick persons and demoniacs were healed by the application of handkerchiefs or aprons which had touched the body of Paul.² He does not detail any particular instance, but gives us only this general statement. And, moreover, the narrative does not explicitly affirm any act of Paul in connection with the handkerchiefs and aprons. It is only said that they were taken *from his body*, that is, from contact with his body. If Paul authorized this practice, he must have

¹ Acts xix. 19.

² Acts xix. 11, 12.

known that the particular persons in need had faith to be healed in this way, and this peculiar method must have been a concession to the superstitions of Ephesus. The circumstance is of some weight in this connection that Ephesus was the chief seat of magic in Asia Minor. "Ephesian letters," that is, formulæ of magic, were widely used as charms,¹ and the practice was so deep rooted that some of Paul's converts continued for a time the use of these mystical words.²

And yet the prevalence of superstition in Ephesus does not make Luke's statement altogether credible. Ramsay³ expresses the opinion that "the writer is here rather a picker-up of current gossip than a real historian," and there are some facts that confirm this view. Thus Paul in his own account of the work done by him in Ephesus does not allude to miracles.⁴ Again, miracles are extremely rare in Paul's work. Luke records but three in detail outside the present passage; namely, the smiting of Elymas with blindness, the healing of the cripple in Lystra, and the healing of the father of Publius. Paul in all his letters refers to no single miracle wrought by him, though he says in general that the signs of an apostle were wrought by him,⁵

¹ Comp. Plumptre, *St. Paul in Asia Minor and at the Syrian Antioch*, p. 103; Winer, *Biblisches Real-Wörterbuch*.

² Acts xix. 18.

⁴ Acts xx. 18-35.

³ *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 273.

⁵ 2 Cor. xii. 12.

and in another general passage refers to Christ's working through him in the power of signs and wonders.¹ If Paul meant by the *signs of an apostle* that he actually wrought miracles in Corinth, it is remarkable that Luke, who records three miracles of Paul elsewhere, does not refer to them.

Another feature of Paul's work in Ephesus is his visiting from house to house.² He may well have practised this elsewhere, but it is not recorded. This house-to-house work was not pastoral, a calling upon believers, but evangelistic, and among Gentiles as well as Jews.³ Paul went about teaching repentance and faith, and preaching the kingdom. He shrank not from declaring the whole counsel of God, its threatenings and woes for impenitence, but he did it with a tenderness that reached to tears.⁴

Another detail of the work in Ephesus, learned from his farewell to the elders in Miletus, is the fact that the labor of his hands was more than sufficient for his own support,⁵ so that he was able to contribute to the support of others. This fact heightens the impression of the immense force of Paul. He taught daily in public. He went from house to house. He inaugurated a work which in a comparatively short time was felt throughout Ephesus and the entire prov-

¹ Rom. xv. 18, 19.

² Acts xx. 20.

³ Acts xx. 21.

⁴ Acts xx. 27, 31.

⁵ Acts xx. 34.

ince of Asia, and yet he did enough manual labor to support himself and to aid those who were with him.

Finally, Paul was brought into great and peculiar perils during his stay in Ephesus. In his letters to the Corinthians he refers to two occasions when his life was especially imperilled. Once he fought with beasts, which language, whether taken literally or figuratively, involves extreme danger. For if the "beasts" were men, which is favored by the fact that Paul as a Roman citizen could not be sentenced to death by a provincial governor, and could not be thrown to wild beasts in the arena, and also by the fact that he does not mention this event in the list of his physical sufferings,¹ even then, the very term of the comparison and the fact that fighting with beasts seems to be regarded as a stronger expression than the preceding words, "I die daily," require us to think of some peculiarly savage attack which Paul repelled only with the greatest difficulty.

Again, some months later, while still in Asia and presumably in Ephesus, he was brought into such circumstances that he despaired of life.² His deliverance seemed to him to be plainly of God. Whether this peril came from the plots of the Jews,³ or from the Gentiles, he does not suggest. Besides these two peculiar perils in Ephesus, Paul speaks of stand-

¹ 2 Cor. xi. 23-27.

² 2 Cor. i. 8.

³ Acts xx. 19.

ing in jeopardy every hour,¹ of dying daily,² of having many adversaries,³ and says that the sufferings of Christ abound unto him.⁴ It seems, therefore, that the sufferings and dangers of Paul in Ephesus were commensurate with his extraordinary success as an evangelist.

5. *The Close of Paul's Work in Ephesus.*

As in Philippi, so in Ephesus, the activity of Paul was at length stopped by Gentiles who suffered in a pecuniary way from his preaching. The centre of gravity of Ephesus was the temple, and the central object of religious interest in the temple was the image of Diana, and one of the prominent industries of the city was the manufacture of shrines of this goddess. This was the point at which the Gentile community, as an organism, first deeply felt the influence of Paul, and the point at which hot opposition arose against him. This opposition was led by Demetrius, who made the more expensive kind of shrines, and who appears to have been a large employer of labor.⁵ He was doubtless stirred up by an actual falling off in his sales, for he would hardly have troubled himself to oppose Paul as long as his business was uninjured. He gathered his guild together, and wrought up their passions by

¹ 1 Cor. xv. 30.

² 1 Cor. xv. 31.

³ 1 Cor. xvi. 9.

⁴ 2 Cor. i. 5.

⁵ Acts xix. 24.

telling them that they were losing their means of support through Paul's preaching, and that even their goddess was in danger of being deposed from her magnificence.¹ The very suggestion of this dreadful possibility called out a loud recognition of the greatness of Diana which seems to have been taken up by those outside the meeting and passed on from one to another until the city was filled with confusion.² If the plan of Demetrius was to work up a mass meeting and arouse popular sentiment against Paul and his work, he was eminently successful. It is probable that those who had attended his meeting led the rush to the great theatre, which seated about twenty-five thousand, and that it was they who seized Gaius and Aristarchus, companions of Paul.³ They would doubtless have seized Paul himself if they had found him.

The crowd soon grew so fast that it was not possible for Demetrius and his fellow-agitators to control it and inform it of the real purpose of the gathering. As a result, the greater part of those who thronged the theatre knew not why they were there. The shouting in honor of Diana which had called the multitude together, was kept up, and Demetrius was no longer master of the situation. Some cried one thing and some another, perhaps

¹ Acts xix. 26, 27.

² Acts xix. 28.

³ Acts xix. 29.

trying to get the real subject before the gathering.¹ Word came to Paul in regard to the meeting and the general purport of it, and had not his disciples protested and some of the Asiarchs,² or chief-priests, who were friendly to him, he would have gone to the theatre in his own defence.³

It is evident that voices were heard in the theatre which brought charges against the Jews, for the Jews made an attempt through Alexander to defend themselves.⁴ The charges manifestly connected the Jews with the danger which threatened Diana, for it was of course known that Paul was a Jew; and therefore we must think that Alexander if he had been allowed to make his defence would have sought to show that it was not the Jews in general who endangered the worship of Diana, but only Paul and his followers. But the sight of a Jew produced still greater excitement, for there was a widespread popular hatred of the Jews, and for two hours there was a babel of voices. The dominant note was the assertion of loyalty to Diana, or possibly of worship.⁵

It appears to have been physical exhaustion which at last made it possible for a sane word to be addressed to the whole multitude. This was spoken by the town-

¹ Acts xix. 32.

³ Acts xix. 30, 31.

² Marquardt, I. 505, 506, 513, 514.

⁴ Acts xix. 33.

⁵ Ramsay, *The Church in the Roman Empire*, pp. 135-142; Renan, *St. Paul*, p. 427.

clerk, or secretary of the city, who was clothed with very great authority.¹ He urged, first, that Diana's position was safe beyond a doubt. No one could deny that the image which fell down out of heaven was in the possession of the temple. His second argument was that no valid complaint had been lodged against the Christians; his third, that Demetrius and the craftsmen had ample legal provisions by which to secure their rights; and his last point was that such a riot as that just witnessed might bring grave accusations against the city.² These arguments backed by the authority of the secretary resulted in the dispersion of the multitude, and as in Corinth, so here the attempt to stop the preaching of Paul failed.

Yet soon after this he voluntarily left the city, perhaps fearing that his presence might aggravate the situation and interfere with the progress of the Gospel.

Thus ended the last great missionary enterprise of Paul of which we have knowledge. He continued his labors for some years, but most of the time he was in prison. With the planting of the Gospel in Asia, Paul considered that he had finished his evangelistic work in the East. He had no more room in those regions, and henceforth his face was turned toward Rome and Spain.³

¹ See Wood's *Discoveries at Ephesus, Inscriptions from the Theater*, pp. 47, 49, 53. According to these inscriptions the secretary was sometimes high priest also and gymnasiarch. Hence it is possible that the secretary in Paul's time was one of the high priests who are said to have been favorable to him (Acts xix. 31). ² Acts xix. 35-40. ³ Rom. xv. 23, 24.

CHAPTER XI

PAUL'S SECOND VISIT TO EUROPE AND LAST JOURNEY TO JERUSALEM

I. *The Collection for the Poor Christians in Jerusalem.*

WHEN Paul left Ephesus, he had a definite and far-reaching plan in mind. He proposed to visit Macedonia and Achaia, thence go to Jerusalem, and after that to Rome and Spain.¹ There is no reason to question the correctness of Luke's statement that the purpose to go to Rome was formed before Paul left Ephesus, for a little later Paul himself writes to the Roman church that he plans to visit them, and that he has longed to do so for *many years*.² In anticipation of the trip through Macedonia, Paul sent Timothy and Erastus on ahead, probably to make collections among the Christians of Macedonia. The collection had already been begun in Achaia,³ and Paul had given orders regarding it to the churches of Galatia.⁴

¹ Acts xix. 21; Rom. xv. 24; 1 Cor. xvi. 5, 6.

² Rom. i. 13; xv. 22, 23.

³ 2 Cor. ix. 2.

⁴ 1 Cor. xvi. 1.

His present purpose was to complete the collection and convey it to Jerusalem. This collection was in response to the desire of the apostles, which had been expressed in the conference at Jerusalem,¹ though it was doubtless also prompted by Paul's own Christian sympathy and the hope that such an offering would help to keep the peace between the Jewish and the Gentile churches. There had been friction in the past, suspicions and alienations, and since Paul knew how conscientiously the Jewish and Gentile believers held to their respective points of view, he could not avoid being apprehensive for the future. Paul also felt that it was quite right for the Gentiles to contribute to the mother church of the Jews. The Gentiles were indebted to the Jews for the Gospel, and so might well contribute in turn to their physical needs. Such a ministration would help to convince the Jewish believers of the sincerity of the Gentiles' acceptance of the Gospel, and so would lead them to glorify God on their behalf.²

This collection seems to have been general throughout the churches established by Paul. The participation of the churches of Galatia, Macedonia, and Achaia is mentioned,³ and if Tychicus and Trophimus went with Paul on the last journey to Jerusalem as delegates to convey the offering, then the churches of the prov-

¹ Gal. ii. 10.

² 2 Cor. ix. 12, 13.

³ 1 Cor. xvi. 1; 2 Cor. ix. 2-4.

ince of Asia were also represented, for Trophimus was an Ephesian,¹ and Tychicus was from some place in the province,² perhaps also from Ephesus.

Paul seems not to have received into his own hands any of this money, and there is no reference to his making personal solicitations except by letter. As Timothy and Erastus seem to have been sent into Macedonia to work for the collection, so Titus together with the unnamed brother whose praise was in all the churches,³ and a second man whose name is not given, had charge of the matter in Corinth.⁴ Paul speaks of having given order to the churches of Galatia,⁵ either when he was last there before coming to Ephesus, or perhaps by letter from Ephesus, and this language may naturally cover the appointment of delegates to take charge of the funds. But though Paul delegated this work to others, he had a deep interest in it, as appears especially from the second letter to the Corinthians,⁶ and from the fact that his journey to Jerusalem was chiefly for the purpose of carrying the collection.⁷

Several circumstances imply that the collection was large. Thus there is the fact that it came from all the Gentile churches of Paul and was being gathered

¹ Acts xxi. 29.

³ 2 Cor. viii. 18.

⁵ 1 Cor. xvi. 1.

² Acts xx. 4.

⁴ 2 Cor. viii. 6, 22.

⁶ 2 Cor. viii., ix.

⁷ Rom. xv. 25.

through an interval of about two years;¹ also the fact that a company of at least seven men were appointed to go with Paul to carry the offering to Jerusalem.² Paul tells us that the churches of Macedonia gave far beyond their power, and he made a strong effort to secure a generous contribution from Corinth and other churches in Achaia. All these circumstances indicate that the gift of the Gentile believers was a large one.

2. *The Troubles in Corinth.*

A second motive which determined Paul's course when he left Ephesus was his anxiety for the church in Corinth. Certain persons belonging to the household of Chloe had come to Ephesus, and had brought him a sad report of the state of the church.³ This report may have been to some extent counterbalanced by the presence and gifts of three devoted members of the church in Corinth, namely, Stephanas, Fortunatus, and Achaicus;⁴ but still the facts reported were alarming. Even before Paul heard through the household of Chloe, he had once received bad news regarding the Corinthian church, to which he replied in a letter no longer extant.⁵ But the second report seems to have been worse than the first. There was now a partisan

¹ 2 Cor. viii. 10.

³ 1 Cor. i. 11.

² Acts xx. 4.

⁴ 1 Cor. xvi. 17, 18.

⁵ 1 Cor. v. 9. Comp. Zahn, *Einleitung*, I. 245.

spirit which threatened the peace and growth of the church; there was fornication and going to law before unbelievers; there was eating of meat which had been offered to idols, though brethren were caused to stumble thereby; and there was drunkenness, and profanation of the Lord's Supper, and unprofitable speaking with tongues, and a denial of the resurrection. Paul replied to this report by the composition of our first letter to the Corinthians. It is still debated whether he did not also visit Corinth in the interval between the two visits which Luke reports. Such a visit is inferred from statements in the second letter. It is there said,¹ "Behold, this is the *third* time I am ready to come to you," and again, "This is the *third* time I am coming to you." The language of Paul in 2 Cor. ii. 1 is also thought to argue a third visit, for he says there, "I determined this for myself, that I would not come to you again with sorrow." This is held to imply that he had already come to them once in sorrow, which of course was not true of the first visit, when he established the church. But it appears doubtful, on examination, whether a single one of these passages necessarily bears witness to a third visit. Thus the thought of 2 Cor. ii. 1 may be: I determined this for myself, that I would not come *back* to you with sorrow. Likewise the language of 2 Cor. xii. 14 may refer to a

¹ 2 Cor. xii. 14; xiii. 1.

purpose to go to Corinth, and not to a veritable visit. He had been ready twice before; now for the third time he is ready. Once he had planned to come to Corinth by way of Macedonia,¹ and when he had this in mind he seems to have hoped that his letter would restore order in the church in Corinth, so that his coming would be in joy. Again, he was minded to come to Corinth, pass into Macedonia, and then return a second time to Corinth.² This purpose was never realized. He received such intelligence from the church that he counted it wise to postpone his visit. This postponement and change of plan was used against him by his enemies in Corinth,³ but he justified it on the ground that, had he come as he intended, his coming would have been with sorrow for him and for them.⁴ It would have been necessary for him to deal severely with those who opposed him.⁵ Instead of carrying out the purpose to visit Corinth, to which he refers in 2 Cor. i. 15, 16, he seems to have sent Titus to represent him in Corinth and to uphold his authority against the adversaries.⁶ Titus was largely successful in this mission, and returning met Paul in Macedonia with a report which occasioned the second letter to the Corinthians.⁷ Thus it appears that the language of

¹ 1 Cor. xvi. 5-9.

² 2 Cor. i. 15, 16.

³ 2 Cor. i. 19.

⁴ 2 Cor. ii. 1.

⁵ 2 Cor. i. 23.

⁶ 2 Cor. xii. 18.

⁷ 2 Cor. ii. 13; vii. 5-16.

Paul in 2 Cor. xii. 14 refers rather to a *purpose* to visit Corinth than to an actual visit. Now if that is the meaning of 2 Cor. xii. 14, then in 2 Cor. xiii. 1, which is manifestly parallel, we must hold that the "third time" refers not to a third visit, but to a third *plan* to visit. And this interpretation suits the context. The second plan to come was abandoned in order to spare the Corinthians. A man was sent to meet and overcome the opposition which was being shown to Paul's authority. This agent had accomplished a good deal, but there was still hostility toward the apostle. He accordingly wrote a strong letter from Macedonia, a part of which is especially addressed to the opposing minority, and concluded with the threat that he would come and deal sharply with any who continued in their evil course toward him.¹

Since therefore there is no certain basis in 2 Corinthians for the inference that Paul made a visit to Corinth of which Luke does not speak in the Acts, and since this hypothesis is not plainly necessary to the explanation of any passages in 2 Corinthians, we decline to supplement the narrative of Luke.

When Paul started for Ephesus at the close of his long sojourn there, he had been in Corinth but once. Nor was he ready now to turn his steps immediately toward Achaia. He must first see Titus and learn

¹ 2 Cor. xiii. 2, 10.

the results of his mission. It appears that he expected to meet Titus in Troas, and when he arrived there and did not find him, he was greatly troubled.¹ There was a favorable opening for the Gospel in Troas, but he was in such suspense and solicitude that he could not preach. He left Troas therefore and came into Macedonia.² His distress continued. "Without were fightings, within were fears."³ But Titus at length arrived from Corinth, and Paul was comforted. Titus reported a greatly improved state of the Corinthian church. Many of the members were longing to see the apostle, and were zealously following the counsel which he had given in his first letter.⁴ In these circumstances, then, while Paul was of good courage regarding the Corinthians, he wrote his second letter to them. In that part of the letter which is directed against the Judaizers in Corinth, there are several points of biographical interest. Thus, it appears that while he was establishing the church in Corinth, he had received aid from Macedonia, as he had received aid from Philippi while he was in Thessalonica.⁵ We know that he worked at his trade in Corinth,⁶ and that he was nevertheless sometimes in want.⁷ However, he did not burden the

¹ 2 Cor. ii. 12.

² 2 Cor. ii. 13.

³ 2 Cor. vii. 5.

⁴ 2 Cor. vii. 7, 11; i. 14.

⁷ 2 Cor. xi. 9.

⁵ 2 Cor. xi. 9.

⁶ Acts xviii. 3.

Corinthian Christians, for his wants were supplied from Macedonia.

Again, we learn from this letter of sufferings which had befallen Paul that are mentioned nowhere else. He speaks of having been in *prisons*, but we know of only *one* imprisonment prior to the second letter to the Corinthians. He speaks of having been five times scourged by the Jews, but we have no other knowledge of any one of these scourgings. He says he had been beaten with rods three times, and we know of but *one* occasion where he was thus beaten. He says that he had suffered shipwreck three times, and on one of the three occasions had been in the water twenty-four hours. Of these experiences also we have no further knowledge. How many interesting but unwritten chapters of Paul's history are alluded to in these brief sentences!

Finally, it is in this letter to the Corinthians that Paul speaks of the thorn in his flesh.¹ This was given to him to prevent undue exaltation because of the revelations which he had received. He speaks of it in connection with a vision which he had fourteen years before the composition of second Corinthians; that is, in the year 43 or 44. At that time he was in Antioch, and according to Acts went to Jerusalem with Barnabas as a delegate from the church of Antioch to carry their

¹ 2 Cor. xii. 7.

contribution to the famine fund. But whether the vision was in Jerusalem or in Antioch cannot be said; neither do we know anything about its occasion. We know only that the vision was extraordinary even for Paul, and that after the vision something befell him whose providential purpose was to keep him humble. It was not at once regarded in this light, for then Paul would not have besought the Lord that it might depart from him. But he afterward came to look upon it as serving this end. His prayer for its removal, though most earnest, was unavailing: the thorn remained. And since it led Paul to a new realization of the grace of Christ, he rejoiced in it. He refers to it as a *weakness*, and classes it with injuries, necessities, persecutions, and distresses for Christ's sake.¹ The passage leads us to think of some sort of physical suffering, but affords no certain clue to its particular character. Epilepsy, malarial fever, headache, disease of the eyes, and other forms of physical ailment have been thought of, but they are mere conjectures. The important fact, however, for the biography of Paul is that he was subject to some form of suffering which was severe and humiliating.

3. *In Macedonia and Achaia.*

Luke tells us that Paul after leaving Ephesus visited the believers in Macedonia and gave them much exhortation.² From Paul himself we learn that this tour

¹ 2 Cor. xii. 10.

² Acts xx. 2.

among the churches *followed* the return of Titus from Corinth, and very likely also the composition of the second letter to the Corinthians. For until he saw Titus and heard his report, he was in no condition to visit and exhort the churches.¹ But after his mind had been relieved in regard to the church in Corinth, he went through Macedonia, visiting the churches which he had founded and perhaps others which had been established by his converts. There is no evidence that he preached in any new fields at this time. He not only exhorted believers and encouraged them in the Christian life, but he seems to have given considerable thought to the collection for the poor in Jerusalem.² While he travelled in Macedonia, he sent Titus to Corinth in the interest of the collection, and with him two others whose names are not given.³ Of one of these it is expressly said that he was appointed by the churches, that is, the churches of Macedonia, and the other also seems to have been appointed, as he is called a "messenger" of the churches. Thus there was a committee of three men who had charge of the collection in Achaia.

From Macedonia Paul went into Greece, where he spent three months.⁴ If the desire which he communicated to the Corinthians from Ephesus was

¹ 2 Cor. ii. 13; vii. 5-16.

² 2 Cor. viii. 3, 4.

³ 2 Cor. viii. 18, 22.

⁴ Acts xx. 3.

realized, he spent most of this time in Corinth.¹ While there he was entertained by Gaius, who seems to have kept an open house for all believers.² His old hosts, Aquila and Priscilla, were now in Ephesus. We are not told how Paul spent these months in Achaia. He hoped that the contribution would be ready before he should arrive in Corinth,³ but we do not know whether it was. It is natural to suppose that Paul found much to do in confirming and perhaps harmonizing the membership of this church, notwithstanding all that had been done by his letters and by Titus. In this period, too, falls the composition of the epistle to the Romans. That Paul was active during these three months and that his influence was deeply felt may further be inferred from the fact that the Jews conspired to kill him.⁴ The discovery of this plot changed his plan of travel, and instead of starting for Jerusalem by boat, as he had planned, he determined to go back through Macedonia. It is possible that the plot was to be executed on shipboard, and for that reason Paul changed his plan.

4. *The Fifth and Last Journey to Jerusalem.*

Paul set out from Corinth accompanied by at least seven men who are to be regarded as delegates from

¹ 1 Cor. xvi. 6. ² Rom. xvi. 23. ³ 2 Cor. ix. 5. ⁴ Acts xx. 3.

the churches to carry their contribution to Jerusalem.¹ He had spoken of the appointment of such delegates while yet in Ephesus,² and we have an incidental reference to the presence in Jerusalem of one of the men who are named.³ Moreover, the fact that the seven men represent the larger part of Paul's missionary field is evidence that they were with him on this journey in an official capacity. Sopater was from Berea, and possibly had been with Paul in Corinth.⁴ Aristarchus and Secundus were from Thessalonica. The former had been with Paul in Ephesus,⁵ and later we find him with Paul on the voyage to Rome.⁶ Gaius was from Derbe, in the heart of Asia Minor, and Timothy from Lystra. Tychicus and Trophimus were from the Roman province of Asia, and Trophimus at least from its capital.⁷ Achaia is not represented in this list by name, nor are the churches of Galatia, unless we hold the South Galatian theory. It is possible that Paul himself was to represent the Corinthian church,⁸ and possible also that Luke, who went from Philippi and joined the party in Troas, represented the Philippian church.⁹

The journey toward Jerusalem was a leisurely one, at least the earlier part of it. The party stopped for a

¹ Acts xx. 4.

² I Cor. xvi. 3, 4.

³ Acts xxi. 29.

⁴ Rom. xvi. 21.

⁵ Acts xix. 29.

⁶ Acts xxvii. 2.

⁷ Acts xxi. 29.

⁸ I Cor. xvi. 4.

⁹ Acts xx. 5, 6.

week in the Roman colony of Troas,¹ where there was a company of believers, and Luke relates how the last night of their stay was spent.² The disciples of Troas and the Christian travellers were gathered together on the first day of the week to keep the Lord's Supper. The meeting was on the third floor of a building. Paul discoursed until midnight. About that time a young man named Eutychus, having fallen asleep in a window to which he may have retired on account of the heat produced by the *many lights*, fell out upon the ground, and was taken up apparently dead. Ramsay³ supposes that Luke had satisfied himself that the young man was actually dead, and since Luke was a physician he of course ought to know. And yet the language of Luke may mean only that they who lifted Eutychus from the ground supposed that he was dead. This, indeed, seems to be required by the language of Paul, for he checked the weeping of the friends with the words "his life is in him." There is no suggestion that Paul thought of restoring a dead person to life. He did not pray, as did Peter at the bedside of Dorcas;⁴ he simply embraced the unconscious one, and then reported that his life was in him. Nor is it said that the lad arose *at once*, as might have been expected had he

¹ Acts xx. 6.

² Acts xx. 7-12.

³ *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 290.

⁴ Acts ix. 40.

been miraculously restored. When Paul was assured that his life was in him, he went back upstairs; and the young man is not mentioned again until morning, when it is said that his friends *led him alive*, that is, perhaps, led him forth to his home.

From Troas Paul went on foot about twenty miles to Assos, while the rest of the company went by ship.¹ Rejoining them at Assos, the company came on the third day to Miletus at the mouth of the Mæander River about thirty-five miles from Ephesus.² This was the metropolis of Ionia. Paul stopped here long enough to send to Ephesus and have the elders of the church come down to see him. The address³ which he made to them, from which we have already drawn, reflects the feelings which filled Paul's soul as he went toward Jerusalem. The apprehension which he had felt when writing from Corinth to Rome⁴ seems to have deepened, and now he has the conviction that bonds and afflictions await him. He does not know just what his fate will be, but he is sure that suffering is before him. And yet though foreseeing this he feels an inner constraint to go to Jerusalem.⁵ What circumstances had produced this conviction in Paul we do not know. It may have come from his experience of the plots of the Jews, who in various cities had sought to kill him,

¹ Acts xx. 13, 14.

³ Acts xx. 18-35.

⁵ Acts xxi. 12-14.

² Acts xx. 14, 15.

⁴ Rom. xv. 30, 31.

and from his knowledge that the hostility of his countrymen toward him was keenest in Jerusalem. It was natural that his apprehension should deepen as he came nearer to the goal of his journey. When in Miletus, he was so burdened with the thought of his approaching fate that he told his friends they would not see his face again. This is not to be regarded as an inspired prediction, but rather as a strong expression of the feeling which filled Paul's heart. The departure from Miletus is biographically interesting, for it shows us that Paul won the hearts of men no less than their minds. The elders wept sore and embraced Paul with kisses.¹

At Patara, one of the chief cities of Lycia, Paul and his companions changed ships, taking a boat which had a cargo for Tyre.² There they stopped again for a week, and to this visit is due our knowledge that there was a church in Tyre at this time. The Tyrian Christians urged Paul not to go to Jerusalem,³ and they seem to have thought that the Holy Spirit gave them this counsel. We may suppose that Paul had told them of his apprehensions, as he had the friends in Miletus, and the result was that they sought to dissuade him from his purpose. We must think, however, that it was the Tyrian Christians rather than Paul who misunderstood the Spirit.

¹ Acts xx. 37.

² Acts xxi. 1-3.

³ Acts xxi. 4.

From Tyre a sail of twenty miles brought Paul to Ptolemais,¹ which had recently been made a Roman colony by Claudius, and after tarrying a day with the disciples he went on by land to Cæsarea, a distance of about twenty-five miles. Here the company remained some days, though Luke has previously said that Paul was hastening in order to be in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost. Here Paul met a prophet from Judea by the name of Agabus, probably the same who came to Antioch when Paul and Barnabas were preaching there. He threw a little fresh light upon Paul's future, for he assured him by the Holy Spirit that the Jews would deliver him into the hands of the Gentiles.² There is no evidence that Agabus foresaw what would be the outcome of Paul's arrest; he saw only that he would come before the Roman authorities. It is to be noticed that Agabus did not seek to dissuade Paul from going to Jerusalem. He told him what was in store for him; but it was the companions of Paul and his friends in Cæsarea who based upon the announcement of Agabus the inference that Paul ought not to go to Jerusalem. Paul believed that this was a wrong inference, and so withstood the entreaties of his friends. His later history seems to justify the correctness of his view, though of course we cannot tell how much he would have ac-

¹ Acts xxi. 7.

² Acts xxi. 11.

complished for the kingdom of God had he heeded the advice of his friends and remained at a distance from Jerusalem.

From Cæsarea the escort of Paul was larger than before, as some of the disciples from that place accompanied him.¹ It was arranged before starting from Cæsarea that Paul and his companions should lodge in Jerusalem with a Cypriote Jew whose name was Mnason.

¹ Acts xxi. 16. The Western text represents that Mnason lived in a village between Cæsarea and Jerusalem. See Blass, *Acta Apostolorum*, 1896. Ramsay adopts this text, and thinks that the friends from Cæsarea did not accompany Paul further than this village. See *St. Paul the Traveller*, pp. 302, 303. But I see no good ground for adopting the Western text of this passage.

CHAPTER XII

ARRESTED IN JERUSALEM, IMPRISONED IN CÆSAREA

I. *The Concession to Jewish Prejudice.*

LUKE says that Paul and his companions were gladly received by the brethren in Jerusalem,¹ and this brief statement is all that we learn regarding the recognition by the Jerusalem church of the notable offering from the Gentile brethren. Whether Paul's hopes were fulfilled, that his ministration might be acceptable to the saints,² whether the offering made a deep impression upon the Jerusalem Christians, whether any expression of gratitude was sent to the Gentile churches, and whether it had an influence in the subsequent years to strengthen the bond of sympathy between the Jewish and Gentile believers, are questions to which we have no answers. But the fact that the Jerusalem church is not said to have expressed any sympathy with Paul during his long imprisonment in Jerusalem and Cæsarea, and to have made no efforts in his behalf, is an indication that he was not regarded as a Christian brother, and so an

¹ Acts xxi. 17.

² Rom. xv. 31.

indication that the offering had largely failed to accomplish the desired ends.¹

On the day after his arrival in Jerusalem Paul and his companions went in unto James, the acknowledged head of the church, and in the presence of all the elders Paul spoke of his work among the Gentiles.² The reason for this rehearsal before James and the elders is not indicated. Paul may have been asked to tell of his work, or the report may have been prompted by his desire to forestall hostile criticism by showing the Jewish brethren how God had wrought through him, and how genuine was the conversion of the Gentiles unto Christ. It became manifest at once that Paul was regarded with suspicion by the majority of believers in the mother church. They had heard that he taught the Jews abroad to forsake Moses, and they manifestly believed the report. The elders after a few words of recognition and thanksgiving to God, proposed that Paul should set himself right with the church in Jerusalem by the public performance of a Levitical ceremony. The elders apparently assumed that the report regarding Paul was false, and thought it expedient that he should give a conspicuous disavowal of it. And they had something definite to recommend. There were four Jewish Christians who had been for a time under a vow. The time of the

¹ Comp. Weizsäcker, p. 368.

² Acts xxi. 18, 19.

vow was now expired, and it was obligatory upon them to cut their hair, and obtain Levitical purification. It was thought to be a pious act to defray the expense of such a purification. Thus it is said in praise of Agrippa that he paid the expense of purification for a large number of Nazirites.¹

Paul's consent to this proposition was in accord with his position at the council of Jerusalem some years before, in accord also with his missionary practice, and in accord with his principle to become all things to all men and to be careful not to cause a brother to stumble.² At the council of Jerusalem he admitted that the Jews might continue to observe the rites of the law, though not thereby to secure salvation.³ The Gospel of the circumcision was to remain by the side of the Gospel of the uncircumcision. If then the report had been true, and Paul had taught the Jews to forsake Moses, he would have violated the understanding which he had with the elder apostles. But Paul according to his letters and the Acts had not done this thing of which he was accused. He had sought to bring the Jews to faith in Jesus as the Messiah, and had taught that salvation was by grace and not by works of the law. Thus he of course antagonized the *Pharisaic* view of the law, but it was still true that no part of his energy was given to

¹ *Antiquities*, xix. 6. 1.

² Rom. xiv. 21.

³ Gal. ii. 7, 9.

positive teaching that Jews should forsake Moses. This was the report, and this was untrue. Paul might well engage in a Levitical rite by which he would declare that this report was false. He could not affirm that he kept the law, as the Jewish brethren said that the proposed act would indicate,¹ but we are not to hold that he consented to the proposition in order to prove this. He consented to the proposition in order to show that the report concerning him was false; and the report was not that he taught the Gentiles that they were free from the law, and not that he himself failed to observe the Jewish rites, but that he taught the Jews to forsake Moses. His act accordingly was not an admission that the observance of the Mosaic law was necessary to salvation even for a Jew. It was at most an admission that Mosaic rites might be means of grace. But while Paul could thus with good conscience consent to the proposition of the Jewish brethren, his act might easily be misunderstood. For to the believing Jews in Jerusalem, who were zealous for the law, its observance was doubtless a matter of *conscience*. If then they saw Paul go through a Levitical rite, as one of them would do, they would naturally attribute to him their own conviction regarding its importance. But their liability to misunderstand his act was not a sufficient reason why he should refuse to perform it.

¹ Acts xxi. 24.

2. *Paul assaulted by Jews and saved by Romans.*

The well-meant proposal of the elders came very near having fatal results for Paul. When the seven days appointed for the purification were nearly past, certain Jews from Asia, and probably from Ephesus, for they knew Trophimus the Ephesian, recognized Paul in the temple, and raised a tumult against him.¹ As Paul was seized in the temple, two charges were made against him: first, that he taught all men against the people (*i.e.* the Jews) and the law and the temple; and second, that he had defiled the holy place.² The first charge was obviously false. Instead of alienating his Gentile converts from the Jewish believers, he had done everything in his power to secure from them a generous contribution for the poor saints in Jerusalem; and though his teaching of the Gospel implied that the law and the temple were not necessary to salvation, it had never been his practice to make propaganda against Judaism. The second charge, that he had defiled the temple by bringing Greeks into it, had no other foundation than the fact that Trophimus had been seen in the city in company with Paul. And apart from Luke's statement, it is altogether improbable that Paul took an uncircumcised Gentile into the temple. There was no motive for such an act, and it would have exposed Trophimus to death as well as Paul himself. There was a law³

¹ Acts xxi. 27-29.

² Acts xxi. 28.

³ *Jewish War*, V. 5. 2; VI. 2. 4.

against the entrance of a Gentile into the court of Israel, and it would have been wrong as well as foolhardy for Paul to violate that law. But the Jewish attachment to the temple was fanatical, and these charges were sufficient to raise a violent tumult. Moreover, there was probably a pretty general acquaintance with the name of Paul in Jerusalem, and a general feeling that he was a renegade. The mob dragged Paul into the court of the Gentiles, and sought to kill him.¹ His fate would soon have been like that of Stephen had not the Roman guard that was stationed in the strong tower of Antonia² at the northwest corner of the temple area interfered. Only the most prompt and decided action of the captain, Claudius Lysias, saved Paul from death at the hands of an infuriated mob.³ The temple guard consisted of a cohort, one tenth of a legion,⁴ and numbered from five to six hundred men. It was trained to act swiftly and with decision. The character of the outbreaks in Jerusalem had taught the Romans that no other method would avail. The soldiers could reach the courts of the temple on an instant's warning, for the tower had entrances into the west and north cloisters.⁴ Their intervention, when Paul was being mobbed, was of course not out of sympathy with Paul, but only because

¹ Acts xxi. 31.

² *Antiquities*, xv. 11. 4; *Jewish War*, V. 5. 8.

³ Acts xxi. 32.

⁴ Marquardt, II. 455, 456.

they feared a tumult. A recent insurrection under the lead of an Egyptian may have made the Roman force especially watchful. According to Josephus,¹ Felix the procurator had slain four hundred Jews at the time of this insurrection, but the leader had escaped. The captain thought that the tumult over Paul might be a continuation of the recent rebellion, and that Paul was the Egyptian.²

3. *Paul's Speech from the Castle Stairs.*

The enemies of Paul in Corinth declared that his presence was weak and his speech of no account,³ but these charges are proven false by the speech from the stairs of Antonia. There must have been something singularly impressive in the manner and speech of Paul or he could not have quieted a howling mob who were thirsting for his life. It is also an evidence of remarkable courage and quickness of thought that he asked the captain to allow him to address the mob, and that in his condition, bruised and but just snatched from beneath the feet of his foes, he could at once secure their attention. His tact and perfect self-possession are manifest throughout the address. He spoke in a respectful and reverential tone to the common people and the rabbis before him, who had scarcely recovered their breath from their attempt to kill him. He spoke

¹ *Antiquities*, xx. 8. 6.

² Acts xxi. 38.

³ 2 Cor. x. 10.

of his Pharisaic training and his hostility toward Christianity ; then of his experience on the way to Damascus, and the Lord's commission to him to go to the Gentiles. This was the course of his apology. They had said that he taught men against the Jews and the law and the temple. His reply was that what he had done he had done because of a divine commission laid upon him by the Messiah of the Jewish people.

Paul's reference to his commission to the Gentiles was the signal for a fresh outbreak of wrath which put an end to the address.¹ The thought was intolerable to Jewish pride that the Messianic deliverance should be freely offered to the Gentiles, and so all their time-honored rites and ceremonies be ignored. They did not believe that Jesus was the Messiah, but it was not His name that roused their passions. It was the sight of a Jew who claimed that the Jewish Messiah had come, and had sent him to set up His kingdom among the Gentiles. It is not unlikely that Paul's reference to Stephen² as the Lord's witness had begun to excite the anger of the hearers, for they believed that Stephen was an enemy of God and had deserved his terrible fate.

When the tumult again broke out, Paul was taken in to Antonia, and Lysias, in hope of eliciting the offense of which his prisoner was guilty, commanded that he should be scourged.³ It is manifest from this that the

¹ Acts xxii. 22.

² Acts xxii. 20.

³ Acts xxii. 24.

captain had not understood Paul's Aramaic address. In that case he would have seen that Paul's only offense was a religious belief which differed from that of his persecutors. Paul was saved from scourging and secured a certain power over the captain by the declaration of his Roman citizenship, for Lysias had exceeded his authority in commanding Paul to be bound and scourged.¹

This address as it stands in Acts, like the other addresses attributed to Paul, is doubtless in its form an artistic product, but there seems to be no ground to regard it as a free composition. The setting of the address is circumstantial, as though from an eyewitness, and it may well have been, as Bethge supposes,² that the author of the "we" passages was present. The conversation between Paul and the captain, the question whether Paul knew Greek, and whether he was not the Egyptian, and Paul's reply that he was a Jew of Tarsus, a citizen of no mean city,³ — all this bears the stamp of genuineness. The statements that Paul stood on the stairs of Antonia when he spoke, that he beckoned with the hand and secured great silence, and that when he spoke of his mission to the Gentiles the crowd interrupted him, throwing off their garments, and casting dust into the air, — these make a favorable impression

¹ Acts xxii. 25-29.

² *Die Paulinischen Reden*, p. 174.

³ Acts xxi. 37-39.

regarding the trustworthiness of the entire narrative. The address is also in keeping with the situation, and the new matter in verses 17-21 can least of all be attributed to Luke, for in his account of Paul's first visit to Jerusalem after his conversion he says nothing of a trance, but gives the hostility of the foreign Jews as the reason why Paul left the city. And since he had recorded that Paul at his conversion became convinced that his mission was to the Gentiles, it is unlikely that he would represent him as desiring to remain in Jerusalem. The entire address therefore appears to be in keeping with the situation in which it is placed.

4. *Paul in the Sanhedrin.*

Since it was illegal for Lysias to seek to find out Paul's offense by scourging, he brought him before the sanhedrin. This was on the day after the assault upon Paul in the temple.¹ The fact that Lysias expected any real information from the sanhedrin shows that he was ignorant of Paul's career and of the hatred which the Jews cherished toward him. There was no examination of Paul, and from the nature of the case there could be none. Even the form of a trial was not reached, for Paul arrayed the Pharisees and Sadducees against each other, and the dissension which arose led the captain to remove Paul.² The events of the meeting are exceedingly

¹ Acts xxiii. 30.

² Acts xxiii. 1-10.

dramatic, and they are also difficult. Paul had apparently begun his defense, and had begun it with the statement that in all which he had done he had acted conscientiously. To the high priest Ananias this statement seemed worthy of censure, and he commanded those who stood by to smite Paul on the mouth. This Ananias was appointed high priest by Herod, king of Chalcis, and at the outbreak of the Jewish war he miserably perished at the hands of the Jews.¹ Paul replied to the injustice of the high priest with such words as Ananias was probably not used to hearing in regard to himself. He called him a whited wall, accused him of acting against the law, and threatened him with judgment from God. In this reply, though the provocation was very great, Paul seems to have fallen below the high standard of his own teaching. He did not seek to overcome evil with good. His answer did not illustrate a love that is not provoked, and that takes not account of evil. His bearing is quite unlike that of Jesus in similar circumstances. When one of the officers struck Him, He replied with dignity, "If I have spoken evil, bear witness of the evil; but if well, why smitest thou me?"² When Paul was called to account for disrespectful speech toward the high priest, he seemed to admit that he had done wrong,

¹ *Jewish War*, ii. 17. 9.

² John xviii. 22, 23.

but he plead ignorance. He says he did not know that it was the high priest. Farrar¹ thinks that Paul may have had imperfect vision, and so have failed to recognize that the words came from the high priest. But evidence that Paul's vision was so imperfect is of an unsatisfactory character. Meyer² takes the words of Paul as ironical. It is as though he had said, "I did not suppose that one who acted in such a manner could be high priest!" But this view does not suit the following citation from the law, which teaches that the ruler, whether worthy or unworthy, must be respected for the sake of his office. Wendt³ holds that Paul must have known that it was the high priest who issued the order, and that the historian, failing to understand the situation, has misrepresented it. Bethge defends Paul's words on the ground that the high priest did not always preside.⁴ But it does not seem probable that at this meeting, called by the Roman authority to consider the case of a man so notorious as Paul, the high priest would be lacking, or that any one acquainted with the sanhedrin, as Paul was, would assume that he might be absent. It seems to be established that

¹ *The Life and Work of St. Paul*, p. 541.

² *Commentary on Acts*, 4th ed., pp. 486-488.

³ *Meyer's Commentary on Acts*, 7th ed., pp. 481, 482.

⁴ *Paulinischen Reden*, pp. 214-217.

the high priest presided over the sanhedrin, certainly on all important occasions.¹

The professed ignorance of Paul, therefore, cannot be very satisfactorily explained; but that he *was* actually ignorant rather than merely made to *appear* so by Luke seems on the whole probable.

After this unpropitious opening Paul is said to have taken advantage of the well-known hostility of Pharisees and Sadducees, and to have turned it to his own defense. He declared that he was a Pharisee and sprung from a Pharisaic ancestry, and that he was now on trial because of his belief in the resurrection. The immediate result of this utterance was a great clamor and dissension between Pharisees and Sadducees, and then the removal of Paul by the captain lest he should be torn in pieces. This incident also is one which is extremely difficult to understand and to justify. Was it ingenuous in Paul to say that he was a Pharisee? And was it quite true that he was on trial because of his belief in the resurrection of the dead? And, finally, was it right to provoke a quarrel between Pharisees and Sadducees in order to deliver himself?

An affirmative answer to the first of these questions is relatively easy. In relation to the Sadducees and their faith Paul must say that he was a Pharisee. On

¹ Schürer, II. 155-158.

the doctrine of the resurrection he shared the common Pharisaic view.

It is more difficult to understand how Paul could say that he was on trial because of his belief in the resurrection of the dead. This statement indeed appears to be partially defensible on the ground that Paul regarded the doctrine of resurrection as central in Christianity, and therefore since he was obnoxious to the Jews because he was a *Christian*, he might with some propriety say that the hostility was due to his position on this central teaching. But this, after all, is a poor defense. It would account only for the hostility of the Sadducees, and there is no evidence that the opposition to Paul had come from Sadducees. On the contrary, it is plain that it came from the zealous defenders of the law, and they were Pharisees. Then, further, it is a poor defense, because Paul says in substance that he is on trial for holding the faith of the Pharisees. He makes the doctrine of the resurrection central in Christianity, and then practically identifies his position on this doctrine with the position of the Pharisees. But it is certain that the Jewish persecution of Paul had sprung out of the radical *difference* between the Pharisees and himself.

Finally, it is doubtful whether much can be said in defense of Paul's course, when, to deliver himself, he threw down an apple of discord between the ranks of

the Pharisees and Sadducees. Had he been torn in pieces, as the chief captain feared he would be, one would have been obliged to say that his destruction was due to his own mistake. He had invoked the mutual hostility of Pharisees and Sadducees, and had himself been consumed by the flame. We must therefore admit, if we hold the account in Acts to be historical, that, as Peter made a serious mistake in Antioch, for which Paul called him to account in a public way, so Paul, before the sanhedrin, made a mistake, for which Peter, had he been present, might have called him to account. The event then illustrates what the apostle said to the Lycaonians, "We also are men of like passions with you," and what he said to the Philippians at a later day, "I count not myself yet to have apprehended."

5. *Paul's final Departure from Jerusalem.*

The shield which the Pharisees of the sanhedrin extended over Paul did not bring safety to him. It is quite possible that it was withdrawn as suddenly as it had been extended. However that may have been, the next day brought forth a conspiracy to assassinate Paul in which more than forty men were banded together.¹ This did not originate with members of the sanhedrin, for the conspirators asked the chief priests and elders to aid them,² but it may well have originated with those

¹ Acts xxiii. 12, 13.

² Acts xxiii. 15.

Jews from Asia who had sought to kill Paul in the court of the temple, and had been baffled in their attempt. We may suppose that the aid which the conspirators asked was promised as far as the chief priests and elders could render it, for two years later the chief priests and the principal men of the Jews were themselves authors of a conspiracy to kill Paul.¹

But as on so many former occasions, so now, Paul was providentially saved from the wrath of the Jews. His nephew, apparently a young lad,² learned of the plot, perhaps because his mother was one of the unbelieving Jews, though this of course cannot be affirmed. A plot of more than forty men in a city where the popular sentiment was nearly all one way might easily leak out. The boy, who had learned of the plot, made it known to his uncle, and then to the captain. In the meantime Paul had become assured that his life was not to be terminated in Jerusalem, as he had feared in the last weeks,³ and that he was to witness for Christ in Rome.⁴ This assurance came to him in a night vision. The act of the captain in providing prompt and adequate escort for Paul to Cæsarea is worthy of all praise.⁵ He gave his prisoner the full benefit of his Roman citizenship. The size of the escort, four hundred foot-soldiers and seventy mounted men, measures

¹ Acts xxv. 2, 3.

² Acts xxiii. 19.

³ Acts xxi. 13.

⁴ Acts xxiii. 11.

⁵ Acts xxiii. 23, 24.

his sense of the danger of an attempt to seize Paul. The entire escort went as far as Antipatris, forty-two miles, and from that place the infantry returned. From Antipatris to Cæsareà, a distance of twenty-six miles, Paul was guarded by the seventy mounted soldiers.¹ The letter which was sent with the prisoner declared that he had done nothing worthy of death, or even of bonds.² And yet the captain felt that he could not at once dismiss the case and release Paul.

6. *Two Years in Cæsarea.*

The official residence of the procurators of Judea was Cæsarea, a city built by Herod the Great, named for the emperor, and adorned with a splendid temple for his worship.³ When Paul was brought a prisoner to Cæsarea, the palace of Herod, which was now the residence of the procurator, was occupied by Antonius Felix. He had been appointed by Claudius, and according to Josephus⁴ in the twelfth year of that emperor, hence in 52 A.D. He was married to Drusilla, daughter of Agrippa I., whom he had alienated from her husband Azizus by means of the wiles of a certain magician named Simon. This woman and her only son, Agrippa, perished in the eruption of Vesuvius⁵ in 79 A.D. Felix had been a slave, and Tac-

¹ Acts xxiii. 32.

² Acts xxiii. 29.

³ *Antiquities*, xvi. 5. 1.

⁴ *Antiquities*, xx. 7. 1.

⁵ *Antiquities*, xx. 7. 1, 2.

tus¹ says that he retained the temper of a slave after he had been set free and clothed with great power. He was a man of lust and blood. The only remedy which he had for the disorders and crimes of Judea was force. He crucified great numbers of robbers, but this seemed to intensify the bitterness of the Jews toward Rome.²

The Jews of Jerusalem who led the opposition to Paul followed him to Cæsarea as soon as possible. As they were to bring their case before the Roman procurator, they took with them a trained advocate, who, to judge from his name, Tertullus, was a Roman. According to Luke's abstract of the case, Tertullus preferred three charges against Paul: first, he created insurrections among the Jews everywhere; second, he was a leader of the Nazarenes; and third, he tried to profane the temple.³ The charges of Tertullus were supported by Ananias and the elders. The defence of Paul involves four points:⁴ first, the charge that he is an insurrectionist cannot be proven; second, he admits that he is a Nazarene, but denies that this is contrary to the law; third, he was in the temple in a lawful manner, and the Jews of Asia who charged him with defiling the temple ought to have been present to make their accusation; and fourth, the

¹ *History*, v. 9.

² *Jewish War*, ii. 13. 2, 7.

³ Acts xxiv. 5, 6.

⁴ Acts xxiv. 10-21.

council in Jerusalem had found nothing against him. The accusation of Tertullus and the defence of Paul agreed essentially with the letter of Lysias, and Felix had no ground for continuing Paul in prison. If he had previously had only vague notions regarding Christianity and its political significance, he was now better informed, having heard Paul's defense, and yet for some unknown reason he deferred judgment. He promised to determine the matter when Lysias should come to Cæsarea,¹ although Lysias had already expressed his opinion and had declared Paul innocent. This reference to Lysias may have been a device for turning away the Jews, an excuse for the temporary dismissal of the case, and need not imply that Felix was in doubt regarding Paul's innocence and was waiting for further light. There is no record that Lysias ever came down to Cæsarea, or that Felix made any effort to have him come. It is not probable that the Jews waited long in Cæsarea on such an uncertainty. They returned to Jerusalem with the small satisfaction that if Paul was still alive, he at least was not preaching and destroying the influence of Moses. They seemed to have attempted nothing further for two years.

During this period Paul had large liberty. He was constantly guarded by a centurion, but his friends had

¹ Acts xxiii. 22.

unimpeded access to him.¹ Luke records nothing out of these two years save that Felix summoned Paul several times and heard him concerning the faith in Christ, and communed with him.² On one occasion, Drusilla, the wife of Felix, was present, and Paul preached so directly and forcibly to the conscience of the procurator that he was terrified. The impression, however, was superficial, like that which the Baptist made upon Herod Antipas. Paul's reasoning upon righteousness did not deter Felix from seeking bribes from his prisoner.

There is no evidence that Paul did any evangelistic work during the Cæsarean imprisonment, as he did later when imprisoned in Rome; neither do we know of any letters that were written from the palace of Felix.³ Indeed, it is altogether doubtful whether he would have felt at liberty to preach in Palestine, unless to Gentiles, for his agreement with the elder apostles at the conference in Jerusalem was that he should go to the Gentiles. Thus the two years in Cæsarea are an almost complete blank in our knowledge of the career of Paul.

¹ Acts xxiv. 23.

² Acts xxiv. 24-27.

³ See Zahn, *Einleitung*, I. 310-319, for the latest statement of the argument that the letters to the Colossians, Philemon, and the Ephesians were written from Rome.

CHAPTER XIII

THE JOURNEY TO ROME IN BONDS

I. *The Appeal to Cæsar.*

PORCIUS FESTUS¹ succeeded Felix by the appointment of Nero, and this, as we seek to show in Appendix II., was somewhere between the years 58 and 60 A.D. As a matter of policy, he at once visited Jerusalem, the most important city of his province, and the chief priests and principal men besought him to have Paul sent to Jerusalem for trial.² It is quite plain that they had not forgotten Paul, but were only waiting for a favorable opportunity to destroy him. They may well have hoped that Festus would grant their request. He had just reached his province, and would naturally desire to gain the favor of the people. Moreover, the request came from the principal men of Jerusalem, whom Festus, if he desired a calm administration, would be loth to offend. It is plain that the Jews had no longer any hope of securing the condemnation of Paul in a fair trial before a Roman ruler; for when they

¹ *Antiquities*, xx. 8, 9; *Jewish War*, ii. 14. 1.

² Acts xxv. 1, 2.

besought Festus to transfer him to Jerusalem, it was that they might kill him on the way.¹ It is to the credit of Festus that he had sufficient firmness to refuse this request. Of course he knew nothing of the plot, and may have known nothing of the particulars of Paul's case. But his official residence was in Cæsarea, and Paul was a Roman citizen. Plainly, therefore, that was the appropriate place for his trial, and the procurator may have felt that there would be danger of a tumult if the prisoner was taken to Jerusalem. He could easily see from the spirit and tone of the accusation that there was intense feeling against Paul, and he doubtless had some knowledge of the fanatical character of the Jewish people of his time. So he refused the request of the principal men, and gave the becoming reply that they should come to Cæsarea, and there make their accusation against Paul.² It appears from what Festus afterwards said to Agrippa that, in his thought, to have sent Paul to Jerusalem as the Jews requested would practically have been to surrender him to his accusers without trial.³

The trial came off as soon as Festus had returned to Cæsarea. This time the Jews had no hired advocate, as in the trial two years before, but presented their own case. The "many and grievous" charges

¹ Acts xxv. 3.

² Acts xxv. 4, 5.

³ Acts xxv. 15, 16.

which they brought against the prisoner may be inferred from Luke's outline of Paul's reply. He declared that he had not sinned against the law of the Jews, the temple, or Cæsar.¹ Therefore we judge that their charges had concerned these points, and so were partly religious and partly political. But the evidence which the Jews presented was not strong enough to justify the condemnation of Paul, as Festus himself told Agrippa at a later day.² Indeed, he said that he had no certain thing to write unto Cæsar, that is, of all the charges that the Jews had brought against Paul there was not one which Festus was willing to send up to the supreme court with the prisoner.³ According to Luke's report of the words of Festus he might have set Paul at liberty after this first hearing of the case, and indeed ought to have done so. If nothing was proved against the prisoner which rendered him obnoxious to the Roman law, then Festus had no right to keep him in bonds. But he withheld judgment to please the Jews, and asked Paul whether he would go to Jerusalem and there be judged, that is, have his case transferred to the Jewish court. What he at first refused, he now proposes. He had come to see how formidable the opposition to Paul was, and seemed ready to swerve

¹ Acts xxv. 8.

² Acts xxv. 25.

³ Acts xxv. 26.

from the plain course of right in order to gain favor with the Jews.¹

In these circumstances there was but one thing left for Paul to do. To go to Jerusalem was death. Therefore since he could not secure acquittal in Cæsarea, he must appeal to Cæsar. Accordingly, after declaring that his case could not be transferred from the Roman judgment seat, since it had not been proven that he had done any wrong to the Jews, he pronounced the words which as a Roman citizen he was entitled to speak,² "I appeal to Cæsar." Festus conferred with his councillors, apparently to ascertain whether there was any reason why Paul's appeal should not be granted. Having become assured that the prisoner might appeal to Cæsar, Festus returned to the judgment seat and formally transferred the case to the supreme court in Rome.

A single notable event took place in the interval before the prisoner could be sent to the capital. King Agrippa II., a great-grandson of Herod the Great, came to Cæsarea with his sister Bernice, with whom he lived in an unlawful manner.³ As he was devoted to Rome he had come down from his capital, Cæsarea Philippi, to salute the new procurator.

¹ Acts xxv. 9.

² Mommsen, *Römisches Staatsrecht*, II. 269; Schürer, II. 539; I. 388-391.

³ *Antiquities*, xx. 7. 3.

Agrippa heard of Paul's case from Festus, and expressed a desire to hear him. Festus of course granted the king's request, and did it with especial gladness because he hoped to get from the hearing before Agrippa something definite to write to the emperor.¹ Agrippa was expert in all customs and questions of the Jews, according to the testimony of Paul, which is confirmed by the fact that Josephus conferred with him in regard to his *Jewish War*.² The apology of Paul before Agrippa traverses ground with which we have already become familiar. As in the address from the castle stairs, Paul speaks of his early life and education, of his career as a persecutor of the Christians, and of his conversion on the way to Damascus, and of his mission to the Gentiles. His statement of the ground of his accusation by the Jews is remarkable. It is manifestly not the ground which his enemies urged, but Paul may have regarded it as the real underlying cause of their hostility. He says he is accused concerning the hope of the Messianic promise, a promise to whose realization all the tribes hoped to attain.³ For him that promise has been realized in Jesus, whose Messiahship is proven by his resurrection. Therefore he is accused because he sees the fulfilment of Israel's hope in Jesus. No such formal charge had ever been brought against Paul, it is true,

¹ Acts xxv. 26.

² Schürer, I. 500.

³ Acts xxvi. 6, 7.

but in his judgment the various accusations made against him, as that he taught the people against Moses, that he was an insurrectionist, and had profaned the temple, all sprang out of this root. The Jews had seized him and tried to kill him because in obedience to a heavenly vision he had preached Jesus as Messiah to Jew and Gentile alike. This is Paul's analysis of the reason of Jewish hostility. The real reason is no one of the superficial charges which they have brought against him: it is the fundamental fact that he holds Jesus of Nazareth to be the promised Messiah, and is giving his life to the propagation of that belief.

This apology was not expected to alter the legal status of Paul's case, and as far as can be seen it did not furnish Festus with any clear charges to send to Rome with the prisoner. Indeed, Festus seems to have become more deeply convinced that Paul was merely a religious fanatic. His story of the resurrection of Jesus was probably that which made the Roman think he was insane.¹ As for Agrippa, he pronounced Paul innocent.²

2. *From Cæsarea to Myra.*

The military escort that conducted Paul to Rome consisted of a centurion by the name of Julius, and a considerable, though indefinite, number of soldiers.³

¹ Acts xxvi. 24.

² Acts xxvi. 32.

³ Acts xxvii. 31, 42.

Julius belonged to the *Augustan* cohort, a common honorary designation of a company of soldiers,¹ which in this instance may have distinguished the cohort from the other four which were stationed in Cæsarea.² Julius appears in the narrative as a high-minded man. He appreciated the nobility of his prisoner, and treated him with kindness and consideration. He gave heed to the master and to the owner of the ship, in the matter of setting sail from Fair Havens, rather than to Paul, but this was altogether natural.³ He acted on Paul's advice when the sailors sought to escape from the ship, and ordered his soldiers to cut the ropes and let the boat fall into the sea.⁴ It was his regard for Paul that led him to oppose the counsel of the soldiers, when the ship began to break up, which was to kill the prisoners lest they should escape.⁵

Paul was accompanied on his voyage to Rome by Luke, the physician, and Aristarchus, a Macedonian of Thessalonica, both old and tried friends.⁶ Ramsay thinks they must have gone as *slaves* of Paul, but this is not quite self-evident, and there is no proof of it. The case of Arria, wife of Pætus, who was not allowed to accompany her husband when he was sent to Rome

¹ Schürer, I. 385; Marquardt, II. 435, note 5.

² *Jewish War*, iii. 4. 2.

⁴ Acts xxvii. 30-32.

³ Acts xxvii. 11.

⁵ Acts xxvii. 43.

⁶ Acts xxvii. 2; xx. 4.

for trial, surely cannot be taken to prove that *no* prisoner sent to Rome was allowed to have friends go with him unless, forsooth, they were willing to go as slaves. Ramsay also argues that Luke and Aristarchus must have gone as slaves from the fact that much respect was shown to Paul, such as a "penniless traveller without a servant to attend on him" would never receive, either in the first century or the nineteenth! We are of the opinion, on the contrary, that a man like Paul is sure to gain the respect of all fair-minded people such as Julius, and that the circumstance of having or not having a servant is too trivial to be thought of. And we remember that Paul gained the respect of many worthy people throughout the eastern provinces of the Roman empire, Jews, Greeks, Syrians, and Macedonians, and at that time, far from having servants to wait on him, he usually supported himself by his own hands.

When Julius and his prisoners — for there were others besides Paul — embarked at Cæsarea, it was in a ship of Adramyttium which was on its homeward voyage.¹ There was no ship in the Cæsarean harbor that was bound for Rome, but the centurion might expect to find such a vessel in some one of the larger ports on the coast of Asia. On the second day out from Cæsarea the ship touched at Sidon, and Paul was allowed to go on shore and to receive attention from Christian brethren.

¹ Acts xxvii. 2.

ren.¹ These were the last whom he saw, excepting his companions in travel, until he arrived in Puteoli.

The second harbor which their ship made, as they sailed through the sea of Cilicia,² with Cyprus on the left, was that of Myra in Lycia. By a direct course this was a voyage of 500 miles. Here Julius found a large vessel of Alexandria which was bound for Italy, and he transferred his prisoners to it.³ We can judge of the size of the ship from the fact that it carried 276 passengers besides a cargo of wheat.⁴ It is computed to have been of 500 tons' burden,⁵ a light tonnage when compared with modern steamers some of which have a displacement of 10,000 tons. But still the ships of the Mediterranean in Paul's time were large to be navigated with sails, and the sailors were courageous to cross the Mediterranean without chart or compass.

3. *From Myra to Malta.*

The Alexandrian ship set sail for Italy, but after a slow voyage of 325 miles it was glad to find shelter from strong head winds in the harbor of Fair Havens on the south of Crete. Here they were constrained to remain until the season was so far advanced that it was considered dangerous to cross the sea. The

¹ Acts xxvii. 3.

³ Acts xxvii. 6.

² Acts xxvii. 4, 5.

⁴ Acts xxvii. 37, 38.

⁵ Conybeare and Howson, *The Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, p. 627, note 2.

Fast, that is, the Day of Atonement, was past,¹ and navigation of the Mediterranean was regarded as closed. But as the harbor of Fair Havens was not a desirable one in which to winter, and as there was a better one about forty miles further west,² it was decided, after considerable consultation, to try to gain it. It is suggestive that the prisoner Paul had an opinion regarding the wisdom of leaving Fair Havens, and also that he was allowed to express it.³ We are to suppose that this counsel was based on Paul's nautical knowledge. He seems to have had a good deal of experience on the sea, for in his second letter to the Corinthians he says that he had suffered shipwreck three times.⁴ His counsel was wise, as the result showed, but his prediction that there would be a loss of life was not fulfilled. Soon after putting to sea from Fair Havens the ship was struck by a hurricane from the northeast, and for fourteen days it was driven, partly unrigged and helpless.⁵ The sailors did not see the sun by day nor the stars by night, and so could not calculate where they were, or whither they were going.⁶ The single bright incident in the dark and hopeless days was Paul's vision and consequent words of cheer.⁷ An angel appeared to him in

¹ Acts xxvii. 9.

² Acts xxvii. 12.

³ Acts xxvii. 9, 10.

⁴ 2 Cor. xi. 25.

⁵ Acts xxvii. 15, 27, 29.

⁶ Acts xxvii. 20.

⁷ Acts xxvii. 21-26.

his dream and gave him the twofold assurance that he should reach his destination, and that all other persons on the ship should be delivered from the storm and sea. This vision as far as it concerned Paul was a repetition of the one which he had had two years before in Jerusalem.¹ As regards his fellow-voyagers it contradicted the announcement which Paul had made in Fair Havens,² that there would be a loss of life. The next day after this vision Paul exhorted all on board to be of good cheer. He added, as though on his own authority and not as a part of the angel's message, that they must be cast upon a certain island. He seemed not to know the name of the island, but only to be assured that the ship, instead of making any port, would run aground, and that on the shore of an island.

Another incident which shows that Paul, though a prisoner, was the leading person on the ship, occurred in the middle of the fourteenth night after they left Crete.³ The sailors had lowered the life boat under pretence of laying out anchors from the foreship, and intended to push off and abandon the ship.⁴ They felt sure that land was not far away, and knew that it was safer to approach it in a small boat than in the ship. Paul saw the plan of the sailors, and immedi-

¹ Acts xxiii. 11.

² Acts xxvii. 10.

³ Acts xxvii. 27.

⁴ Acts xxvii. 30.

ately exposed it to the centurion, and he ordered the soldiers to cut the boat's ropes and let it fall into the sea.¹ Thus it appears that Paul, though he had received angelic assurance that he should reach Rome, and that no lives should be lost, was on watch at midnight, and felt that it was necessary to keep the sailors on board, if all were to be saved.

In the same night another event took place which was equally characteristic of Paul. He besought all on board to take food. He declared that not one should perish or suffer any physical loss.² Then when he had given thanks for the food, he began to eat, and the others inspired by his example took food and were of good cheer.³ In the morning, as they were seeking to bring the ship to the shore, it grounded, and soon began to be broken by the violence of the waves. At this juncture the soldiers were in favor of killing the prisoners lest any of them should escape when the ship went to pieces, for if the prisoners escaped the guards would be held responsible. Julius, however, refused the proposal of the soldiers, and chose rather to take the risk of the prisoners escaping from him.⁴ And thus by interposing to save Paul's life, Julius repaid in part the service which Paul had rendered to all on board. His confidence seems to

¹ Acts xxvii. 32.

² Acts xxvii. 34.

³ Acts xxvii. 35, 36.

⁴ Acts xxvii. 43.

have been rewarded, for though all were separated and each got to land as best he could, there is no record that any of the prisoners attempted to escape from Julius.

4. *From Malta to Puteoli.*

The island of Melita on which the shipwrecked people found themselves has been almost universally identified with *Malta*, an island $17\frac{1}{4}$ miles long and $9\frac{1}{4}$ miles wide, lying south of Sicily about 58 miles; and *St. Paul's Bay* on the north side of the island has been shown to answer in a remarkable way the requirements of the narrative for the very place of the wreck.¹ The direction of the wind which struck the ship off the coast of Crete and drove it under the lee of Cauda² points to Malta. The fact that an Alexandrian ship wintered in one of the harbors of the island points to Malta, which had excellent harbors, rather than to *Meleda*, the only other island whose name allows it to be considered as the scene of the wreck of Paul's ship. For this Meleda is far up on the coast of Illyria, and not a likely place for a ship to winter that was bound from Alexandria to Puteoli and other ports on the west coast of Italy. Moreover, the identification of Melita with Malta is further some-

¹ James Smith, *The Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul*, 4th ed. 1880, pp. 129-147.

² Acts xxvii. 14-16.

what confirmed by the discovery of an inscription on Malta in which a certain Roman is called *the first* of the Melitæans, the very term which Luke uses when he speaks of Publius.¹

Paul and his fellow-passengers were obliged to remain on Malta until the opening of navigation, about three months after their arrival, which may have been the early part of February.² The inhabitants of the island, called *barbarians* because not a Greek-speaking people, were descendants of a Phœnician colony, or a kindred people from Carthage. The island had been a Roman possession for two and a half centuries, and belonged to the province of Sicily, having the rights of a Roman *municipium*.³ The inhabitants received the unfortunate people with kindness, kindling a fire for protection against the rain and the cold.⁴ Then the Roman magistrate, the highest officer on the island, entertained the company for three days; and when they embarked in the spring, the people of the island provided them with such things as they needed for the journey.⁵ This kindness both of Publius and the inhabitants in general was richly repaid by Paul, who healed the father of Publius of a severe illness and cured others who were sick with various diseases.⁶ In healing the father of Publius, Paul prayed, as

¹ Acts xxviii. 7.

³ Marquardt, I. 246.

⁵ Acts xxviii. 10.

² Acts xxvii. 9; xxviii. 11.

⁴ Acts xxviii. 2.

⁶ Acts xxviii. 8, 9.

Jesus did in connection with His miracles, and laid his hands on the patient, as the Lord sometimes did. What was done in the case of Publius, we may assume was done in the other cases, that is, Paul wrought his cures by the power of God which was granted in response to prayer. We must also suppose that in all these cases, as when Jesus wrought cures, there was faith,—here faith in Paul as the servant of God and of Jesus Christ.

The incident of the viper on Paul's hand appears to be wholly trustworthy.¹ The circumstance that vipers are not found on the island at present is no proof that they may not have been found there eighteen centuries ago. The judgment of the barbarians when they first saw the viper on Paul was as natural as was their later judgment when they saw that he experienced no ill result. Paul was a prisoner and doubtless manifest as such, and when people saw a viper on his hand, it was easy to think that this was a righteous punishment for some crime. When he shook the reptile off and took no harm, they reasoned just as the Lycaonians did when Paul and Barnabas healed the cripple. They said that he was a super-human being, a god. The thing seemed to be miraculous, and the pagan inference from a miracle was that the worker of it was divine.

¹ Acts xxviii. 3-6.

This story is also characteristic of Paul. It was like him to be active for the comfort of others, as he was in gathering sticks for the fire. And then it was like Paul not to make any ado over the bite of the viper, but simply to shake it off into the fire. He had been in scores of perils equally great, and the Lord had delivered him. And moreover he had been divinely assured that he should bear witness in Rome: therefore he had no fear of the viper. How he escaped harm, and whether his escape was supernatural, one cannot say.

The ship which took the prisoners from Malta, like that which was wrecked, was from Alexandria, but had wintered in one of the harbors of the island.¹ It touched at the military colony of Syracuse in Sicily, some 90 miles from Malta, and again at Rhegium in Italy, the capital of Lucania and Brittium, which was 63 miles further. From there on the second day they came with a good wind to Puteoli,² 212 miles from Rhegium.

5. *From Puteoli to Rome.*

In Puteoli, the principal port of southern Italy, where one of the first temples for the worship of Augustus was erected,³ Paul and his companions were refreshed by the presence of Christian brethren,⁴ at whose solici-

¹ Acts xxviii. 11.

² Acts xxviii. 13.

³ Marquardt, I, 201, note 2.

⁴ Acts xxviii. 14.

tation they remained a week. Evidently Julius had respect for the wishes of his prisoner, and indeed after the experiences of the past winter he may well have felt that, excepting in the political sense, he was dependent upon Paul rather than Paul upon him. In any case he was willing to grant him signal favors, as is proven by the visit in Puteoli.

There had long been a Jewish colony in Puteoli, perhaps because it was a flourishing seaport,¹ but nothing is known of the founding of the church there. It is possible that the brethren had heard of Paul, and so were urgent that he should tarry with them a few days: possible also that their entreaty rested simply on the fact that he was a Christian and a prisoner.

From Puteoli (the ancient Dicearchia) Julius and his prisoners went the remaining 129 miles by land, which seems to have been the customary route for travellers from the East who were bound for Rome. Josephus mentions at least three cases where Jews who were journeying from Palestine to Rome disembarked at Puteoli.² The week spent in Puteoli brought Paul other encouragement than that which he found on the spot, for word was sent to Rome of his coming, and certain Christian disciples came out on the road to welcome him, one party travelling 40 miles to the Market of Appius, and another awaiting him at The Three Tav-

¹ Schürer, II. 512.

² *Antiquities*, xvii. 12. 1; xviii. 7. 2.

erns, 30 miles from Rome. This was a happy omen for his arrival in Rome, and Paul thanked God and took courage.¹ In Jerusalem, when he had been on trial for his life, there was no effort of the Jewish church, as far as the narrative informs us, to deliver Paul or to comfort him; but now from these brethren, chiefly Gentiles, to whom he had written two years before, he receives tokens of liveliest sympathy, though he comes as a prisoner to be tried on grave charges.

This Roman congregation was by no means unknown to Paul, and it is allowable to think that among those who came to The Three Taverns and the Market of Appius to greet him were some whom he had known here and there in his great eastern field. For the sixteenth chapter of Romans, with its long list of names, must, I think, be regarded as a part of the letter, and not as a separate writing to the church of Ephesus which by mistake became incorporated with the epistle to the Romans. The chief argument of those who think that this chapter² does not belong to the epistle to the Romans is that Paul *could* not have known so many persons in Rome as are greeted, and moreover could not have known their circumstances so minutely as he knew the circumstances

¹ Acts xxviii. 15.

² Either verses 1-20, or 1-23, or 3-20, or 3-23, according to different writers.

of the people who are saluted in the sixteenth of Romans.¹ But this is an assertion rather than an argument. It is simply an opinion, and over against it is documentary evidence which dates from the time of Paul. To assert that Paul *could* not have known twenty-seven people in the metropolis is to assert something which plainly cannot be proven, and which may appear quite as improbable to one mind as it seems probable to another. For surely to some it seems altogether probable that the most famous missionary of the greatest missionary century, a man who had travelled widely for thirty years, who had become acquainted with hundreds of people in the leading centres of Greece, Macedonia and Asia Minor, should have known the names of twenty-seven Christians in Rome and something about the circumstances of many of them, especially when we consider that there was lively intercourse between the cities of the provinces and the great metropolis. But this is a matter of opinion, and opinion does not settle questions of history, unless solely for those who hold the opinion. It is said however that Aquila and Priscilla were living in Ephesus at the time of the composition of the first letter to the Corinthians,² and it is improbable that they had moved to Rome before the letter to the

¹ So, in substance, Weizsäcker, Jülicher, McGiffert, and others.

² 1 Cor. xvi. 19.

Roman church was written. It is true that they were living in Ephesus when Paul wrote to the Corinthians. It is also true that they were living in Corinth three years earlier,¹ and in Rome a little earlier still, and it is no stranger that they should have moved from Ephesus after a brief stay than that they remained only a short time in Corinth.

Again, Epænetus is saluted in Rom. xvi. 5, who was the firstfruit of Asia unto Christ, and it is said that he was probably in Ephesus, not in Rome. Of course it was more likely that an Asiatic convert would be in Asia than in Rome, and yet there is nothing improbable in the supposition that a particular convert had gone to Rome. People were continually going from Ephesus to Rome. Why not Epænetus?

The fact that Andronicus and Junias are saluted as fellow-prisoners of Paul² does not point to Ephesus in particular, for it is not known that Paul was ever in prison in Ephesus. Of the other names in Rom. xvi. and the circumstances connected with them there is not one which suggests Ephesus rather than Rome. Indeed, we know of an Aristobulus and a Narcissus in Rome among whose slaves, perhaps now manumitted, those persons may well have been whom Paul salutes,³ and as many as eight other names in the list have been found in Roman inscriptions.

¹ Acts xviii. 2.

² Rom. xvi. 7.

³ Rom. xvi. 10, 11.

There still remains the unexplained and seemingly inexplicable circumstance that a letter of recommendation for Phœbe to take to Ephesus should have been incorporated in a letter to the Romans. Weizsäcker thinks this might easily happen,¹ for the letters were written in the same place and perhaps by the same amanuensis. But this statement does not at all touch the difficulty of the case. If the twenty-seven persons saluted in Romans xvi. were *not* in Rome, how could the church there tolerate this blunder of the copyist in Corinth? They must certainly know that it *was* a blunder, and they would naturally rectify it, and thus the copy of the epistle which would circulate in Rome would be one without the sixteenth chapter. But of such a text there is no evidence.² I hold therefore that Romans xvi. is part of the original letter to Rome, and accordingly when Paul walked up from Puteoli to the capital, and companies of Christian believers met him at the Market of Appius and The Three Taverns, we may well think that there were among them some familiar faces, for example, those of Aquila and Priscilla, of Andronicus and Junias, of Epænetus and Rufus, and that while the great city was new and strange to him, there were not a few men and women in it of whose Christian activity he had heard, and in whom he felt that he had friends.

¹ *Das Apostolische Zeitalter*, p. 334.

² Zahn, *Einleitung*, I. 267-298, for a full discussion of this subject.

CHAPTER XIV

AT THE BAR OF NERO

1. *The Character of Paul's Roman Imprisonment.*

WE cannot say to whom Paul was delivered by Julius, nor where he was held while awaiting trial. The Revisers' text omits the Greek word *stratopedarch* from Acts xxviii. 16. Ramsay who still retains this word¹ thinks of the *princeps peregrinorum*, or captain of the "legionary centurions" from abroad, who resided on the Cælian Hill in the "barracks of the foreigners." But according to Marquardt² the "*princeps peregrinorum*" was the officer in charge of such soldiers as had been ordered to Rome from the provinces, and therefore not one to whom a prisoner would be delivered.

When Paul wrote to the Philippians,³ he spoke as though he might be in the Prætorian Camp, which was before the Viminal Gate. The word *prætorium* designated the emperor's quarters as commander of the army, and also the emperor's guard;⁴ but accord-

¹ *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 348.

³ Phil. i. 13.

² *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, II. 494.

⁴ Marquardt, II. 475, note 6.

ing to Mommsen¹ it was never applied to the emperor's palace in Rome. Therefore if Paul was kept for a time in the *prætorium*, we have to think of the great barracks on the east of the city where from the time of Tiberius the nine cohorts² of prætorians were stationed.

Luke's narrative makes the impression that Paul spent the two years in a *private* house. It was a place which he rented and could call his own.³ It is this private dwelling of which we are to think when Luke says in Acts xxviii. 16, that Paul was suffered *to abide by himself* with the soldier that guarded him. If then, when Paul wrote to the Philippians, he was in the prætorian barracks, it is plain that he was not in his own hired house. But it does not necessarily follow from Philippians i. 13, that Paul was in the prætorian camp. He says that his bonds became manifest there, but also to all the rest. His bonds may have become manifest through the various soldiers who guarded him during the two years, just as they became widely known elsewhere in the city through the persons who visited him. Paul was constantly guarded by a soldier, and apparently was bound to him by a chain.⁴ Aside from this surveil-

¹ *Römisches Staatsrecht*, II. 863, 864; 807, note.

² Marquardt, II. 476.

³ Acts xxviii. 30.

⁴ Acts xxviii. 20; Phil. i. 13; Philemon I, 9, 10, 13; Col. iv. 3, 18; Eph. iii. 1; iv. 1; vi. 20.

lance, Paul's liberty was complete. He could preach and write, and could receive whomsoever he would.

2. *Evangelistic Labors in Rome.*

Paul had a meeting with the chief Jews of Rome on the third or fourth day after his arrival.¹ It is likely that he needed some time to find suitable lodgings, and time was also necessary in order to communicate with the leading Jews and to invite them to his house. So the meeting seems to have been held at the earliest possible hour. The purpose of Paul in calling this meeting was to explain his situation.² He naturally desired to secure the sympathy of his fellow-countrymen, and to anticipate the false reports which were sure to come from Palestine as soon as they could be sent. It seems quite probable that Paul's name was known in the Jewish quarter of Rome, for otherwise it would be strange that the chief men should have come together at once on the invitation of a prisoner. It is true, the Jews denied that they had received letters from Judea concerning Paul, and they said that none of the brethren had reported or spoken any harm of him,³ but these statements are naturally limited by the preceding verse to the events of recent times. They do not imply that the Jews had never heard anything about Paul.

¹ Acts xxviii. 17.

² Acts xxviii. 20.

³ Acts xxviii. 21.

The first meeting between Paul and the Roman Jews was personal, but this led to a second in which he presented his message of salvation. They requested him to speak of the *new sect* which was everywhere spoken against.¹ This language implies that they had no knowledge of it at first hand. If they told the truth in this, then we must suppose that they had kept quite aloof from the Christian community in Rome. It is easy to believe that the recent experiences under the edict of Claudius had made the believing and the unbelieving Jews alike extremely careful how they discussed the new sect. As they valued their residence in the city, they would avoid meetings which might end in riot and in a breaking of the peace.

At the second meeting there were a large number of Jews present, and Paul discoursed the entire day.² From the solemn warning with which Paul closed the meeting³ we infer that most of the Jews here as elsewhere did not receive his message.

In regard to the work of Paul among the Gentiles in Rome we can form but a meagre outline from Acts and the scattered allusions in the epistles. The impression which is made by Paul's letters is that the cause of the Gospel received great help from his work. Luke⁴ says that Paul preached with all boldness, and Paul asks

¹ Acts xxviii. 22.

² Acts xxviii. 23.

³ Acts xxviii. 24-28.

⁴ Acts xxviii. 31.

his friends in Asia to pray for him,¹ that he may speak boldly as he ought to speak. This request closes a victorious passage about the armor of the Christian, which we can more easily think was written when Paul was himself successfully active than when he was inactive, or unsuccessful in his work. Paul tells the Philippians that his imprisonment in Rome, his state and experience, has worked for the progress of the Gospel.² And this *progress* is then somewhat specifically indicated. It became manifest through the prætorian barracks and elsewhere that he was in bonds for the sake of Christ.³ Many became convinced that Paul was not in bonds for any crime, but that it was his religion, his zeal in preaching Christ, that had brought him into this state.

Further, Paul says that his experience encouraged most of the evangelists of the city to speak the word without fear.⁴ The protection given to Paul made them courageous. Even certain brethren who were opposed to Paul were stirred to new activity by his success. They preached Christ in their way vigorously, thinking thereby to trouble Paul. It is manifest that their view of the Gospel was such that Paul would be grieved to have men accept it as true. It is probable, therefore, that they were of the Judaizing

¹ Eph. vi. 20.

² Phil. i. 12.

³ Phil. i. 14.

⁴ Phil. i. 15-18.

party, men who preached Christ but preached Moses also, and said that circumcision was necessary to salvation.

These statements regarding the influence of Paul suggest that, though he was in bonds, the word of God as he proclaimed it was not bound. In the letter to the Colossians¹ he speaks of the Gospel as bearing fruit and increasing in all the world, which naturally includes Rome. In the same letter he speaks of God as energizing in him mightily, and speaks of himself as laboring intensely. Of individual conversions in Rome little is known. Onesimus,² a slave of Philemon, was among Paul's Roman converts,—perhaps also Jesus-Justus.³ They of "Cæsar's household" may or may not have been converts of Paul.⁴

Paul was aided in his Roman work by old friends and fellow-laborers, and also received material help from afar. Luke and Aristarchus were with him, as has been already pointed out. Others who were with him in Rome for a longer or shorter period were Tychichus,⁵ Mark,⁶ and Timothy.⁷ Material aid was received from the church in Philippi by the hand of Epaphroditus,⁸ and Onesiphorus of Ephesus refreshed Paul, whether by material or spiritual gifts, or both,

¹ Col. i. 6.

⁴ Phil. iv. 22.

⁷ Col. i. 1; Phil. i. 1.

² Philemon 10.

⁵ Col. iv. 7.

⁸ Phil. iv. 10, 18.

³ Col. iv. 11.

⁶ Col. iv. 10.

is not said.¹ There is no reference to Paul's working with his hands for his own support while in Rome, as he did in Corinth, Ephesus, and elsewhere. At the same time, he is able to hire lodgings commodious enough so that a large number of Jews could come in.² These facts taken together suggest that Paul had some new source of supplies, but it is idle to speculate what it may have been.

3. *The Trial.*

The causes of "the law's delay" in Paul's case are not known. The letter of Festus, who confessed that he had no definite thing to write to his lord,³ would naturally leave the matter in suspense. The case would be deferred until the prosecutors appeared, and it might well take considerable time for them to procure witnesses. Their failure in Cæsarea would make them more careful not to appear in Rome without some plausible evidence. Then, as Paul was at a great distance from his prosecutors and also a prisoner, they might not push the case as vigorously as they would in other circumstances.

The trial of Paul is in strongest contrast to that of Jesus. Of the latter we have a multitude of details; of the former, scarcely any at all.

Paul had appealed to Cæsar, but it is quite doubtful

¹ 2 Tim. i. 16.

² Acts xxviii. 23.

³ Acts xxv. 26.

whether his case was brought before Nero in person. It was probably given over to a representative of the emperor, as were multitudes of cases.¹ What prosecutors appeared when Paul's case was heard, what charges they preferred against the prisoner, and what defense Paul made, we do not know. The one thing which is tolerably certain is that Paul was acquitted. The hearings before Felix, Festus, and King Agrippa lead us to expect acquittal in Rome. Paul's assurance that he should be set at liberty is also an argument that his trial ended in acquittal. When he wrote to Philemon and the Philippians, his trial was near, and he was confident that he should be released.² Now he was surely in a position to know something of the course of events. He had been long in Rome, and had Christian brethren in Cæsar's household. If he was confident that he should be acquitted, he probably had good grounds for his confidence. Again, the internal evidence for the genuineness of the Pastoral Epistles, taken with the fact that there is no place for them within the life of Paul as recorded in Acts and in his own epistles, is an argument that his trial ended in acquittal. The evidence for the genuineness of these writings cannot be given here. It is both external and internal. The latter evidence is

¹ Mommsen, *Römisches Staatsrecht*, II. 983.

² Philemon 22; Phil. ii. 24; i. 25.

manifold. There are some difficulties arising from the language, the teaching, and the situation of the letters, but these do not appear to me to be as great as the difficulties which are created by the hypothesis that they are not genuine.¹ Finally, the statement of Clement of Rome, which belongs in the last decade of the first century, that Paul went to "the bound of the West," in his missionary work, is an argument for the position that his trial ended in release. Clement wrote from Rome, and he could not have meant that this was "the bound of the West." The limit of the West was the Atlantic Ocean or Spain.

Over against this substantial evidence for Paul's acquittal there is no historical proof whatsoever that he was put to death in the year 62 or 63.²

¹ Zahn, *Einleitung*, I. 457-489, defends the genuineness; Harnack, *Die Chronologie der altchristlichen Literatur*, 1897, pp. 480-485, admits Pauline elements but denies Pauline authorship; Jülicher, *Einleitung*, pp. 112-128, denies the genuineness.

² See Appendix II.

CHAPTER XV

THE CLOSE OF PAUL'S LIFE

I. *The Tour from Rome Eastward.*

THE close of Paul's life, like that of all the apostles except James, is almost entirely hidden from us. The only New Testament data which concern his movements after he was acquitted by the court of Nero, are to be found in the Pastoral Epistles. To these may be added a like traditional information which has good roots in the first century.

The allusions of the Pastoral Epistles to a trip in the East are the following. Paul speaks of a journey into Macedonia, prior to which he exhorted Timothy to tarry in Ephesus.¹ This seems to imply that he himself had been in Ephesus, and was journeying thence into Macedonia. He hoped to return again to Ephesus soon.² It may have been during this visit in Ephesus that Onesiphorus ministered to Paul.³ He rendered services which Paul says were well known to Timothy, and it is easier to suppose that these services were of

¹ 1 Tim. i. 3.

² 1 Tim. iii. 14; iv. 13.

³ 2 Tim. i. 18.

recent date than that they had been rendered several years before when Paul labored in Ephesus. And further, if Onesiphorus was a notable helper of Paul in Ephesus in the period covered by Luke's narrative in Acts, we might expect some reference to him there. There is a reference in the Pastoral Epistles to a stop of Paul in Miletus which cannot be identified with the visit recorded in Acts.¹ Paul writes to Timothy that he left Trophimus at Miletus sick.² Trophimus was from Ephesus, and when Paul visited Miletus on his way to Jerusalem, Trophimus was *not* left behind sick. He went on with Paul to Jerusalem, and was seen with him in the city.³ Therefore the reference in 2 Timothy implies another visit of Paul in Miletus, and that must have been after the Roman imprisonment.

Again, the Pastoral Epistles speak of a recent visit of Paul in Troas.⁴ In writing to Timothy from Rome Paul asks for the cloke which he had left with a certain Carpus in Troas. But the last visit in Troas of which we know was that which Paul made when on his way from Corinth to Jerusalem with the offering of the churches.⁵ This was more than four years previous to the composition of 2 Timothy on the lowest calculation consistent with the genuineness of that writing. Now it is not probable that Paul was sending to Timothy for

¹ Acts xx. 17.

³ Acts xxi. 29.

⁵ Acts xx. 6.

² 2 Tim. iv. 20.

⁴ 2 Tim. iv. 13.

a cloke which had been left in Troas four years before. It is more likely by far that he had been in Troas quite recently, and either because of the haste of his departure, or for some other unknown reason, left his cloke in the house of Carpus. He sends for it now in view of the approaching winter.¹ This fact also is evidence that Paul had not left the garment in Troas on the last visit there which is mentioned in Acts, because he had now spent two winters in Rome, and if he had needed it for winter he would probably have sent for it before.

On this eastern trip subsequent to the Roman imprisonment Paul seems also to have visited Corinth.² For in immediate connection with the reference to Miletus, he refers to Corinth, saying that Erastus abode there, that is, remained there while Paul went on. The two places were manifestly visited on the same journey, and if the visit in Miletus finds no place in the Book of Acts, so neither does this particular visit in Corinth. Again, the epistle to Titus presupposes a visit of Paul in Crete,³ but there is no room for this in that part of Paul's life which is covered by the Acts. It is true, the ship which took Paul to Rome a prisoner touched at Fair Havens on the coast of Crete, not far from the city of Lasea;⁴ but it is of course impossible to think

¹ 2 Tim. iv. 21.

² 2 Tim. iv. 20.

³ Titus i. 5.

⁴ Acts xxvii. 8.

of this visit, for when Paul left Crete at that time he was going to Rome, while he expected, when he left Titus in Crete, to spend the approaching winter in Nicopolis.¹ Paul had been in Macedonia twice, but it is impossible to put a visit in Crete just before either of these Macedonian tours.² Therefore if it be historical that Paul was once in Crete and departing left Titus there, he must have made this trip after his imprisonment in Rome.

Since we find Paul planning to spend a winter in Nicopolis, and also hear him urging Timothy to come to him in Rome *before winter*, and to bring a cloke because he was not prepared for winter weather, it is natural to think that his plan was frustrated, that he was arrested in Achaia or in Macedonia, and taken off to Rome.

To this outline based on the Pastoral Epistles may be added two details from the letters which Paul wrote out of his first Roman imprisonment. He told the Philippians that he hoped to come to them soon,³ and he asked Philemon to prepare a lodging.⁴ If then Paul was set at liberty soon after writing these letters, we may suppose that he carried out his plan to visit Philippi and Colossæ.

Such is the outline of an eastern trip of Paul sub-

¹ Titus iii. 12.

² Acts xvi. 11; xx. 1.

³ Phil. ii. 24.

⁴ Philemon 22.

sequent to his first imprisonment in Rome. No one of the allusions necessarily implies a protracted stay. Paul had been in Ephesus long enough to discipline Hymenæus and Alexander,¹ but not long enough to give Timothy the numerous instructions which he wished to give him. It is perhaps natural but not necessary to suppose that the churches in Crete, over which Titus at Paul's order was to appoint elders, were churches that Paul himself had established. Paul made it a principle not to build upon other men's foundations; but if the churches in Crete had been founded by Titus or some other convert of Paul, we cannot say that he would have refused to assume any responsibility for them.

2. *The Second Imprisonment and Death of Paul.*

On what grounds Paul was arrested a second time, and where he was seized, whether in the East or in the West, we do not know. If he went eastward immediately after his release, as he hoped to do, then the Spanish trip, if it was carried out, came later;² but on the order of the tours we have no certain information. We know only that the accusation against Paul was of such a character that the first part of his

¹ 1 Tim. i. 20.

² Spitta, *Zur Geschichte und Literatur des Urchristenthums*, p. 107, puts the Spanish tour before the eastern trip. So also Zahn, *Einleitung*, I. 435-444.

trial passed off favorably,¹ and therefore it can hardly have been the simple accusation that he was a Christian.²

The second imprisonment was altogether unlike the first. Thus it appears that his friends and fellow-workers forsook him and fled, while in the first imprisonment they continued with him. He mentions by name Phygelus and Hermogenes who with others from Asia turned away from him.³ Demas forsook him.⁴ No one took his part at his first defense.⁵ Luke only remained with him.⁶ The Roman Christians did not entirely abandon him, for in the lull that followed his first defense, when he was writing to Timothy, they visited him and sent greetings in the letter.⁷ The fact that so many are said to have turned away from him indicates plainly that he was in extreme peril. His physical state also seems to have been unlike that of the first imprisonment. Then he was able to hire a house; now he sends a thousand miles for a garment which he needs for winter. He speaks frequently of hardship, as though his confinement was full of discomfort and pain.⁸

Furthermore, this second imprisonment is regarded

¹ 2 Tim. iv. 16, 17.

² So Conybeare and Howson, p. 764.

³ 2 Tim. i. 15.

⁴ 2 Tim. iv. 10.

⁵ 2 Tim. iv. 16.

⁶ 2 Tim. iv. 11.

⁷ 2 Tim. iv. 21.

⁸ 2 Tim. i. 8, 12, 16; ii. 3, 9, 10, 11, 12.

by Paul as leading certainly to his death, while the first, he was sure, would be followed by release. He speaks now of his course as finished.¹ He is already being offered, and the crown of righteousness seems near.² There is a little respite, and it may perhaps continue a few weeks or even months,³ but the end is in sight and the time of his departure at hand. Whether Paul lived to greet Timothy and to read in the precious books which Timothy was directed to bring, cannot be determined. Nothing is known of the time or circumstances of the final trial.

Regarding the death of Paul we have an early and reliable tradition to the effect that he died as a martyr, and died in Rome in the reign of Nero. Beyond this we have no knowledge whatever. Clement of Rome, who speaks of Peter and Paul as belonging to his own generation, testifies that Paul suffered martyrdom under the prefects.⁴ This connects his martyrdom with Rome, but it does not suggest the year. A century later than Clement, Caius, a presbyter of Rome, witnesses to Paul's martyrdom in that city, and adds the particular that he was put to death on the Ostian Way.⁵ Eusebius, at the beginning of the third century says that Paul was beheaded under Nero.

¹ 2 Tim. iv. 7.

² 2 Tim. iv. 6, 8.

³ 2 Tim. iv. 13, 21.

⁴ Clement's first letter to the Corinthians, chapter 5.

⁵ Eusebius, *Church History*, II. 25.

This early tradition that Paul suffered martyrdom in Rome under Nero is the only tradition regarding his death, and it only affirms what the second letter to Timothy leads us to expect.

Thus the close of Paul's life is veiled from our eyes, but no cloud dims, or ever can dim, the splendor of the services of that life for God and for humanity.

APPENDIX I

THE SOURCES

ON the two great sources of information regarding Paul—the Epistles ascribed to him and the Book of Acts—recent investigation has been abundant. Regarding the first source, there has been a notable increase of confidence in the trustworthiness of certain parts of it; while on the second there is still a very wide divergence of views. It is not my purpose to review the various investigations, or to discuss the sources, but briefly to indicate the position which underlies the present volume.

The epistles of Paul must of course be regarded as the *primary* source of information, and if the Book of Acts presents data which are inconsistent with these epistles, such data must not be allowed to disparage the value of the primary source. Where Paul reports his own experiences and movements, his word must be held to be final. He knew the facts as no one else could, and was competent to bear witness concerning them. The only question which must be answered before accepting the testimony of his epistles is the

question of their genuineness. The doubtful section of these has been narrowed down to the Pastoral Epistles, and there seems to me to be a very strong probability that at least certain parts of these, namely the personal data, are fully trustworthy. They have not been accounted for as the free invention of a later time, and are not likely to be. To accept those parts as historical is of course to accept the view that Paul was released from his imprisonment in Rome, and that he was imprisoned there a second time. Zahn, Spitta, and even Harnack do not hesitate to accept the testimony of the Pastoral Epistles on this point.¹ For the present purpose this is all that we care to maintain, for it is the life of Paul, and not his teaching, with which we are concerned.

Regarding the second source of information, the Book of Acts, the following points have been regarded as established. First, that the author relied both upon written sources and upon his own observation. For the first twelve chapters in particular a written source or sources must be assumed. The language of these chapters, as has often been pointed out,² has a strong Hebraizing stamp, which is foreign to the subsequent chapters. This is most easily accounted for by the

¹ For the arguments in favor of the genuineness of the entire epistles see Zahn, *Einleitung*, I. 457-489; for the other side, Holtzmann, *Einleitung*, 304-326.

² Weiss, *Einleitung*, Zweite Auflage, p. 570.

supposition that the author was dependent upon written Aramaic sources. Such sources are presupposed also by the long addresses of these chapters, notably those of Peter and Stephen. If we concede historical value to these addresses,¹ we shall think of them as supported by written evidence to which the author of Acts had access. It is difficult to believe that a speech like Stephen's would have been preserved through a generation otherwise than by writing. Yet we have no right to affirm that the author was *wholly* dependent upon written sources for the early history of the Jerusalem church. If the author was Luke, as the great majority of independent scholars hold,² then he may have gathered information from men who were personally acquainted with the events which are described in the first chapters of Acts. In this way he may have learned, for example, the names of the two candidates for the place of Judas in the apostolic circle, and the names of the seven deacons, and a multitude of other facts. These *living* sources were Jewish-Christians, and it was inevitable that a document which faithfully preserved their view of events should have a Jewish-Christian stamp.

If it is manifest that the author depended in part upon

¹ Jülicher, *Einleitung*, p. 268, regards them as free inventions.

² Jülicher and some others ascribe the third Gospel and Acts to an unknown author.

written sources in the first twelve chapters of Acts, it is also manifest that in chapters xiii.-xxviii. he drew in part from his own experience and observation. For the parts which are written in the first person are from one who was not only a companion of Paul, but was also the author of the Acts. This latter point is required by various considerations which can merely be mentioned. The author of the third Gospel and the Acts was evidently a man of rare literary ability, and it is altogether unnatural to suppose that he incorporated in his history, in an unchanged form, the diary of some other man. There is nothing of this sort elsewhere in his writings. Again, the literary character of the "we" passages,¹ is that of the rest of the book, if we make a partial exception of the first twelve chapters. This fact offers stubborn resistance to any attempt to make the author of the book different from the author of these sections which are written in the first person.

Second, it has been regarded as demonstrable that the materials used in the composition of Acts cannot be held to be of absolutely equal value. The facts do not seem to justify so strong statements as Jülicher, Clemen, and some other scholars make, but at the same time it must be conceded that there is an element of truth in their claims. For example, Acts i. 18, 19 suffers by comparison with the narrative of Matt. xxvii.

¹ Acts xvi. 10-17; xx. 5-xxi. 18; xxvii.-xxviii.

3-5, and the story of speaking with *other* tongues, Acts ii. 4, can hardly be maintained by the side of that phenomenon which is spoken of in Acts x. 46, and fully described by Paul in 1 Cor. xii.-xiv. namely the phenomenon of speaking *with tongues*, or ecstatic speech. In addition to a few instances of this sort, there is a small class of passages which furnish evidence either of inadequate sources, or of misunderstanding on the part of the author. Even so conservative a scholar as B. Weiss fully concedes this.¹ An illustration of the point in mind is furnished by a comparison of Acts xv., in its setting, with the narrative of the same events which is given by Paul in Gal. ii.²

But to admit that the materials and the statements of Acts are not of absolutely equal value is by no means to admit that the book as a whole is not historical and trustworthy. This is the third point which has been regarded as fixed. None of the recent investigations require us to regard the general trustworthiness of Acts as doubtful. The author of the third Gospel and the Acts tells us that in regard to the Gospel at least, he made careful investigation with reference to the alleged facts; and the character of both writings, of Acts as a whole no less than of the Gospel, amply

¹ *Einleitung*, p. 565.

² Clemen, *Chronologie der Paulinischen Briefe*, p. 23 f.; Holtzmann, *Einleitung*, p. 412 f.

sustains his claim. There are differences between the Acts and the epistles of Paul, and some of them are quite important, but nevertheless the historicity of the book as a whole not only does not suffer when tested by Paul's epistles but is confirmed. The theory of conscious, intentional tampering with facts of history, or even the invention of facts, in order to bridge a gulf, largely imaginary, which separated Peter and Paul, the Jewish and the Gentile sections of the Church, is still a theory, waiting for substantiation. That there was a real and deep difference between the Jewish and the Gentile conception of the Gospel is plain even in Acts, but not so an intentional manipulation of facts for the purpose of obliterating that difference.

The "judaizing of Paul" which Clemen¹ regards as the most strikingly incorrect feature in the entire Acts is scarcely proven by the facts to which he refers. That Paul generally preached to Jews first is doubtless to be accepted, even though the first letter to the Thessalonians treats the readers as Gentiles. The errors in that church were such as flourished among the Gentiles in particular, and it is not strange, therefore, if the short letter designed to deal with these errors makes no reference to the Jewish element, which, even according to Acts, was in the minority. Another example of Clemen's "judaization" of Paul is found in Acts

¹ *Chronologie der Paulinischen Briefe*, p. 21 f.

xxiii. 6. It is claimed that Paul could not have confessed himself a Pharisee, as he is represented to have done in the sanhedrin, and it is also said to be absolutely inconceivable that the Pharisees took sides with Paul. Now, even if these claims were granted, it would not follow that the author of Acts was endeavoring to make Paul as Pharisaic as possible. But it is not at all self-evident that these claims are true. In a certain sense Paul was a Pharisee and remained a Pharisee to the end of his life. He might confess that he was a Pharisee in the presence of the Sadducees; and the fanatical enmity between Pharisees and Sadducees might conceivably have turned to Paul's advantage, as the narrative in Acts records. In view of these counter considerations it seems doubtful whether this passage should be regarded as evidence that the author "judaizes" Paul.

We must judge in the same manner in regard to Clemen's assertion that Paul could not have participated in the fulfilment of the Nazirite vow in the temple as Acts affirms that he did. He declares that this was not an act of accommodation, but of confession, and therefore impossible. But what did he thereby *confess* according to Acts? Simply that the report regarding his attitude toward the law was false. He did not confess that Levitical ceremonies are binding upon Christians.

The account of the circumcision of Timothy¹ is put on a level with the above instances, and it is said to be impossible that Paul could have made this concession to Jewish feeling *after* the council in Jerusalem. There he withstood the circumcision of Titus, and therefore he would not straightway have circumcised Timothy. Certainly not if it had been *demande*d as a matter of principle; but as a voluntary act of Paul, which is the representation of Acts, it is perfectly intelligible. Paul did not cease to have Christian tact and love for his people after the council in Jerusalem.

The last example of Clemen is that of Acts xv. compared with Gal. ii. He uncovers certain difficulties here, and we may agree with him that the two accounts are not wholly consistent with each other; but it is not apparent that Acts xv. was written with the design of making a Jewish-Christian out of Paul. But this point is discussed further in another connection and need not be dwelt upon here.²

This evidence, therefore, for the statement that the most incorrect feature of Acts is its "judaizing" of Paul does not appear to be conclusive; and I repeat that no recent investigations require us to regard the general trustworthiness of Acts as doubtful.

Acts is not a history in the modern sense of that

¹ Acts xvi. 3.

² See pp. 87-94.

term,—a history of the apostolic age or of Paul. Within the compass of some forty or fifty pages of ordinary size it takes us through the richest and most influential period of all the Christian centuries. Of necessity it presents only a few salient facts which bear upon some special aspects of the earliest age of the Church. Its narrative is sometimes modified, sometimes corrected, by Paul, and in places it may give an inadequate picture of events; but yet it remains a monument of inestimable historical value, and its representations, though of course to be tested, are not to be judged unreliable except on the best of grounds.

R

APPENDIX II

THE CHRONOLOGY OF PAUL'S LIFE

ON the *relative* chronology of Paul's life we have many data in the Book of Acts and in Paul's epistles. Certain periods are definitely marked off, as those from his conversion to his first and second visits in Jerusalem;¹ other periods are of unknown length, as for example, the missionary tours from Antioch. A single period of indefinite duration of course renders it impossible to compute the exact length of his Christian career.

On the *absolute* chronology of Paul's life there is even greater uncertainty than on its relative chronology. We do not know the year of his birth, his conversion, his death, or indeed of any individual event in his life with a single exception. The year which he spent in Antioch with Barnabas synchronizes wholly, or in part, with the year 44 A.D., for Luke² indicates that Herod died in Cæsarea while Paul was in Antioch, and Herod's death fell in the year 44, not long

¹ Gal. i. 18; ii. 1.

² Acts xii. 19-23.

after the Passover.¹ But this year in Antioch was preceded and followed by a period of uncertain length, for it was preceded by the work in Syria and Cilicia and followed by the first missionary tour from Antioch.

Professor Ramsay attempts to derive a fixed point for the chronology of Paul's life from Acts xx. 6-11.² His argument proceeds on this wise. Paul and his companions left Troas on Monday after a seven days' visit. Hence they arrived in Troas on the preceding Tuesday. But they had been five days on the trip from Philippi to Troas, and therefore must have left Philippi on the second Friday preceding their departure from Troas. Now Luke says that they started from Philippi "after the days of unleavened bread." Ramsay assumes that they left on the very next day after the feast, and therefore that the Passover was on Thursday. Now since the Passover came on Thursday in the year 57, but not in any year immediately before or after that, Ramsay holds that this was the year of Paul's last journey to Jerusalem, and so the year of his arrest. Accordingly he makes the Cæsarean imprisonment end in 59, and the Roman imprisonment in 61.

¹ *Antiquities*, xix. 8. 2; Acts xii. 3; Schürer, *Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes*, I. 469.

² *Expositor*, 1896, Vol. III. pp. 336-345.

But it will be seen that this theory absolutely requires us to suppose that Paul left Philippi on Friday, and Luke neither says this nor does his narrative necessarily imply it. He simply says that they sailed away from Philippi "after the days of unleavened bread," and while his narrative speaks of *hastening*¹ in order to be in Jerusalem at Pentecost, this seems to mean only that they were unwilling to make long stops on the way. They tarried a week in Troas, several days in Miletus, a week in Tyre, a day in Ptolemais, and an indefinite number of days in Cæsarea.² Therefore we must say that it is quite uncertain whether Paul left Philippi on the day immediately following the feast. A firmer basis than this is necessary if we are to arrive at satisfactory chronological results.

Many writers have thought that they had a safe point of departure for reckoning the chronology of Paul's life in the date of the removal of Felix and the appointment of Festus. Paul was arrested two years before the removal of Felix, and was sent to Rome soon after the appointment of Festus. But here again it is difficult to establish the point of departure. Harnack³ following Eusebius puts the removal of Felix and the appointment of Festus in

¹ Acts xx. 16.

² Acts xx. 6, 17; xxi. 4, 7, 10.

³ *Die Chronologie der altchristl. Literatur*, I. 233-239.

the second year of Nero, October 55 to October 56. Oskar Holtzmann¹ and McGiffert² adopt the same year for the appointment of Festus, but do so on the basis of Tacitus and Josephus.

The common view has been that Festus was not appointed until about the year 60.³ It is necessary, therefore, to consider the evidence for these two dates. Harnack accepts the testimony of Eusebius who says that Festus succeeded Felix in the second year of Nero. He admits that Eusebius is not always right in his chronological statements, but thinks that it could not have been difficult to learn the exact time of the accession of Felix and Festus, in Palestine, at the beginning of the third century. He holds that the date of Eusebius is confirmed by Josephus and Tacitus, for Josephus⁴ says that Felix, when accused in Rome by certain of the principal men of Cæsarea, was defended and saved by his brother Pallas who had great power at court, and Tacitus⁵ records that Pallas fell from the emperor's favor in the year 55. Accordingly, unless Pallas was afterward restored, Felix must have been removed from office not later than 55. Finally, Harnack thinks that the chronology of Paul's life prior to his imprisonment under Felix

¹ *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, pp. 129, 130.

² *The Apostolic Age*, pp. 356-359.

⁴ *Antiquities*, xx. 8. 9.

³ Schürer, I. 477-484.

⁵ *Annals*, xiii. 14, 15.

is favorable to the date of Eusebius. Let us consider these points one by one, beginning with the last. Harnack thinks that the recorded history of Paul before his arrest in Jerusalem can be compressed into the years before 53 or 54; but in order to do this he carries back the conversion of Paul to the year 30. Bousset¹ points out, as a great objection to this view, that, at the time of Paul's conversion, there were Christian churches scattered over the land as far as Damascus. Now it is not probable that the year 30 A.D. saw the Gospel so widely extended.

Moreover it appears impossible to bring within a single year the events of Acts i.–viii., especially the spread of the Gospel among the priests, the events which led to the appointment of the deacons, and *after* these things the persecutions of Paul, which involved many trials by the sanhedrin,² and various journeys to points at a distance from Jerusalem.³ This history cannot all be reasonably compressed into a single year; and therefore one of the outposts of Harnack's position must be abandoned.

Again, Harnack, as also O. Holtzmann and McGiffert, lays much stress on the argument formed by coupling together a statement of Josephus and a statement of Tacitus. Josephus says that Felix, when accused of

¹ *Theol. Rundschau, Erstes Heft, 1897.*

² Acts xxvi. 10.

³ Acts xxvi. 11.

misgovernment, was saved through the intervention of Pallas, and Tacitus says that Pallas fell into disfavor in the year 55. The inference is drawn that Felix must have been removed from office as early as 55. Schürer's supposition¹ that Pallas was restored to favor is regarded by Harnack as precarious, and therefore we will not build on it. Still the inference which is drawn from the happy conjunction of Josephus and Tacitus is anything but necessary. Suppose that Pallas had been dismissed by Nero in order to humble Agrippina, he was not thereby stripped of influence. Tacitus says that he had amassed a fortune of some fifteen millions of dollars, and that he had received extravagant honors from the senate for his service in proposing a law to prevent the intermarriage of free Roman women with slaves.² Now this man, though no longer in Nero's employ, was doubtless one of the most powerful men in Rome, and there is nothing improbable in the statement of Josephus that his solicitations saved the life of Felix.³ Josephus may be in error in saying that Pallas was at that time had in the greatest honor by Nero, but he may be right in the essential point, that Pallas saved Felix. The "importunate solicitations" of a man with the immense wealth of Pallas could hardly fail to have weight with

¹ *Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes*, I. 484.

² *Annals*, xii. 53.

³ *Antiquities*, xx. 8. 9.

the unprincipled Nero, even though he had removed Pallas from office.¹ And it is to be remembered that according to Tacitus, Nero removed Pallas in order to humble Agrippina, and not primarily because of personal animosity. It appears, therefore, that we may with good grounds reject the inference which Harnack and others draw from the combined testimony of Tacitus and Josephus.

There remains then the bare statement of Eusebius, that Festus succeeded Felix in the second year of Nero. Now Schürer says that the statements of the *Chronicle* of Eusebius are often arbitrary, and even Harnack admits that they must be tested.² For example, Eusebius says that Paul was put to death in the fourteenth year of Nero, and Harnack thinks it demonstrable that the ancient historian was four years out of the way.

The opinion of Harnack that it could not have been difficult at the beginning of the third century to learn, in Palestine, the exact time of the accession of Felix and Festus, will probably not be shared by many of his readers. For if the Roman historians failed to preserve the exact dates of the accession of Roman officials in Palestine, it is not likely that the Jews of

¹ I find that Ramsay expresses the same opinion. *Expositor*, 1897, Vol. V. p. 210.

² *Chronologie*, p. 235.

that land preserved these dates for two and a half centuries.

But there are some objections to this specific statement of Eusebius which puts the appointment of Festus in the second year of Nero. First, Felix was sent to Judea in 52,¹ but Paul said to him, two years before he was removed from office and succeeded by Festus, "Forasmuch as I know that thou hast been of *many years* a judge unto this nation, I do cheerfully make my defense." Could he have used that language if Felix had been in office but a single year, or even two years? Harnack supposes that Felix had been in office three or four years when Paul stood before him. In order to get so long a period he accepts the year 51 as the year when Felix was appointed, and the year 54 as that in which Paul stood before him. But against the year 51 is, first, the fact that the Armenian manuscript of the *Chronicle* puts the appointment of Felix in the eleventh year of Claudius,² that is, the year 52; and second, the fact that Josephus³ seems to put it in the twelfth year of Claudius. Moreover, if Festus succeeded Felix in the summer of 56, as Harnack believes, and if Luke's statement be true that Paul was a prisoner under Felix two full years,⁴ then we are brought back

¹ *Antiquities*, xx. 7. 1.

² *Chronologie*, p. 234.

³ *Antiquities*, xx. 7. 1.

⁴ Acts xxiv. 27.

to the summer of 54, and from the summer of 54 back to the year 52 is not a space of "three or four" years. At the outside, it is only two years and a half, and it is not likely that Paul would have spoken of this period as one of *many years*. Harnack says that three or four years are not few *for a procurator*, and so seems to take Luke's language as though it read, "Since thy procuratorship has been an unusually long one." But that is plainly impossible.

O. Holtzmann and McGiffert seek to justify this language of Luke by the use of a remark of Tacitus that Felix was over a part of Palestine contemporaneously with Cumanus. But Josephus knows nothing of this division of the land. He regards Felix as the successor of Cumanus, and not as a contemporary ruler in Palestine.¹ This testimony of Josephus is set aside, and that of Tacitus is adopted. Harnack, on the other hand, makes no appeal to the testimony of Tacitus, and therefore probably does not regard it as preferable to that of Josephus. Schürer² prefers the report of Josephus, as it is more definite than that of Tacitus. Here, then, we face a contradiction between Josephus and Tacitus. We cannot discredit the account of Josephus on the ground that this part of his narrative contains many palpable inaccuracies, for the nar-

¹ *Antiquities*, xx. 6. 1-3; 7. 1.

² *Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes*, I. 477, note 14.

rative of Tacitus also has its improbable features. One thing is plain. The testimony of Tacitus, on whose worth scholars hold opposite views, cannot be brought into court and held to settle an important question in controversy. A chronological result which rests even in part upon such evidence as this cannot be regarded as a final result. We must say that the language of Luke in Acts xxiv. 10, is still a grave objection to the acceptance of the second year of Nero as that of the appointment of Festus.

But while the evidence is against this year as the date of the appointment of Festus, no year can be *definitely* substituted for it. There is, however, a convergence of testimony upon the period between 58 and 60. Schürer¹ states somewhat as follows the argument for 60 as the *latest* year in which the removal of Felix can be put. It appears from Acts xxvii. 7 that Felix was removed in the *summer*. Now since Albinus became procurator in the summer of 62 at latest, we cannot put the removal of Felix in the summer of 61, since that would leave too little time for the procuratorship of Festus who preceded Albinus.²

On the other hand, the chronology of Paul's Christian career seems to require, for the removal of

¹ *Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes*, I. 484.

² *Antiquities*, xx. 8. 9-11.

Felix, a date as late as 58. If we allow three years for the events of Acts i.-vii., and with McGiffert allow seven or eight years for the interval between the conference in Jerusalem and the arrest of Paul, these periods with the three years and fourteen years of Gal. i., ii. bring us to the year 57 or 58. In like manner, if we start from the year 44 in which Agrippa I. died, we reach the year 57 as the date of Paul's arrest in Jerusalem. We assume that the year 44 was spent in Antioch.¹ Then if we allow three years for the first missionary tour, and one year for the events of Acts xv. 1-35, and eight years for the interval between the council and the arrest in Jerusalem, we come to the year 57.

It may be held, therefore, that the internal and external evidence point to the latter third of the sixth decade as the period in which Felix was succeeded by Festus, and I regard the year 58 as more probable than the year 60.

Starting from the summer of 58 as the date of the appointment of Festus, we have the following approximate dates for Paul's life:—

The arrest of Paul in Jerusalem in the summer of 56.

Three months in Achaia, winter of 55-56.

Visit in Macedonia, autumn of 55.

The work in Ephesus, 52-55.

¹ Acts xi. 26.

From Antioch through the "upper country," 52.

Second missionary tour from Antioch, 49-51.

Council in Jerusalem and work in Antioch, 48.

First tour from Antioch, 45-47.

In Syria and Cilicia, 35-44.

In Arabia, 32-35.

Conversion, 32.

Again, assuming the year 58 as the date of the appointment of Festus, it follows that Paul was sent to Rome in the fall of that year.¹ He reached Rome in the early part of 59, about four months having been spent on the way.² The two years of imprisonment of which Luke speaks³ carry us forward to the spring of 61. The date which is assigned for Paul's death depends not only upon the date which is adopted for his arrival in Rome, but also upon the view which one holds regarding a second Roman imprisonment. Harnack holds a second imprisonment which terminated in the death of the apostle in the year 64.⁴ McGiffert thinks that Paul was put to death at the end of the imprisonment of Acts xxviii. 30, and this he assigns to the year 58.⁵ O. Holtzmann⁶ and Jülicher⁷ put the death of Paul in 64, though Holtzmann thinks the imprisonment of Acts xxviii. 30, terminated in 58, and

¹ Acts xxvii. 9.

⁵ *The Apostolic Age*, p. 419.

² Acts xxvii. 27; xxviii. 11.

⁶ *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, p. 128.

³ Acts xxviii. 30.

⁷ *Einleitung*, p. 26.

⁴ *Die Chronologie*, p. 239.

Jülicher that it terminated in 64. Ramsay¹ thinks there can hardly be any doubt that Paul's martyrdom took place about the year 67. Zahn² holds a release from the Roman imprisonment of Acts xxviii. 30, a period of activity, and a second imprisonment which terminated in the year 66 or 67 in the death of Paul. Spitta³ also holds a second imprisonment in Rome, and puts the death of Paul late in Nero's reign, though not assigning a definite year.

I hold that Paul was released from the imprisonment of Acts xxviii. 30, for (1) the Book of Acts leads us to anticipate a release. Lysias, Felix, Festus, and Agrippa all declared that Paul had done nothing worthy of death or of bonds. These previous decisions would not be reversed by the supreme court without good evidence against Paul, and what evidence could the Jews bring which they had not already brought? (2) Paul felt sure that he should be released, and this was toward the close of the two years.⁴ He says he *knows* that he shall abide in the flesh, and he asks Philemon to prepare for him a lodging. (3) The Pastoral Epistles presuppose a release, and even if these letters are not from Paul's hand, they bear witness to the fact that there was a

¹ *Expositor*, 1896, Vol. III. p. 343.

² *Einleitung*, I. 443.

³ *Zur Geschichte und Literatur des Urchristenthums*, p. 107.

⁴ Phil. i. 25; ii. 24; Philemon 22.

tradition of his release in the earliest church.¹ If the church had known that Paul was executed at the close of the imprisonment of Acts xxviii. 30, no disciple of Paul, writing in his name at the beginning of the second century, would have ventured to assume that Paul was released at that time. So the Pastoral Epistles, whether genuine or not, must be reckoned with in the settlement of this question. (4) There is a tradition reaching back to the first century that Paul went to Spain. Clement of Rome² says that Paul preached in the East and the West, and that he came to the limit of the West. Harnack³ regards that expression as referring to Spain. Spitta affirms that no Roman writer (*i.e.* no writer living in Rome) ever said that he lived on the boundary of the West;⁴ and that we cannot take the language as from *Paul's* point of view because the Roman church knew well that in Paul's thought the limit of the West was not Rome but Spain.⁵ Zahn also holds that the language of Clement refers to Spain. Thus the ancient tradition has illustrious supporters among the most recent writers.

In connection with the testimony of Clement refer-

¹ Zahn, *Einleitung*, I. 438.

² *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, chapter v.

³ *Die Chronologie*, p. 239.

⁴ *Zur Geschichte und Literatur des Urchristenthums*, p. 53.

⁵ Rom. xv. 24, 28.

ence may be made to the Muratorian Canon, which dates from the close of the second century, but which must be regarded as the crystallization of beliefs much older than that. This Canon represents that Paul went to Spain.

We cannot argue that Paul never labored in Spain from the fact that there are no traces of such labor. What traces of his work in Berœa and Athens and Lystra and Derbe are to be found outside the New Testament? He labored long in Syria and Cilicia, but there is no clear trace of it save in Tarsus and Antioch.

On the above grounds, therefore, the release of Paul from the imprisonment of Acts xxviii. 30 seems to rest securely. But this result takes us only one step toward the determination of the date of his death. The geographical and chronological references of the Pastoral Epistles imply an eastern journey which on a conservative estimate requires a year. Assuming that Paul was released in the spring of 61, we thus come to the spring of 62 without taking account of the traditional journey to Spain. It is certain that Paul's death occurred before June of the year 68, for it is the unanimous tradition of the early Church that he suffered martyrdom under Nero, and Nero died June 8, 68. Thus the period within which Paul's death occurred is narrowed down to five or six years in the middle of the seventh decade.

We have already said that Harnack, O. Holtzmann, and Jülicher put the death of the apostle in the year 64. Holtzmann does not argue the point but simply says that the two years' imprisonment of Paul *cannot* have continued beyond the Neronian persecution of 64. Jülicher says that "according to the unanimous tradition of the early Church Paul was beheaded in Rome and indeed in the Neronian persecution, therefore in the summer of 64." Harnack speaks of Paul's death in the summer of 64 as certain, and seems to put it there for the reason that according to Tacitus the persecution by Nero began in the summer of 64, and Eusebius in his *Chronicle* puts the death of Paul in the first year of the persecution. One must, however, challenge the statement of Jülicher that the unanimous tradition of the early Church puts Paul's death "in the Neronian persecution, *therefore in the summer of 64.*" Clement of Rome does not mention Nero's name at all in connection with Paul's death. Eusebius quotes from Dionysius of Corinth to the effect that Paul and Peter suffered martyrdom in Rome,¹ and he himself puts it under Nero,² but he does not connect it with the particular persecution of the year 64. Zahn whose minute acquaintance with early Christian literature is well known declares that there is not in the entire early tradition any certain support for the view that Paul

¹ *History*, ii. 25. 8.

² *History*, ii. 25. 5; iii. 1. 2.

was executed in the year 64.¹ Harnack² appeals to Eusebius, but must correct the statement of the early historian before it can be used. For Eusebius says that Paul was put to death in the fourteenth or thirteenth year of Nero, that is, in the year 68 or 67; but he also says that it was in the same year in which the persecution began. Harnack sets aside the first statement, but holds the second. It seems, however, impossible to suppose that Eusebius, who surely knew the Roman historians, could have made a mistake of four years in the date of the persecution of 64. If his *Chronicle*, preserved in an Armenian and a Latin translation which vary greatly from each other, actually said that Paul was put to death in the fourteenth or thirteenth year of Nero, and that this was the *first* year of Nero's persecution, then we have here palpable reason why we should not build upon this statement of Eusebius at all.

But aside from the silence of early tradition there is other evidence against connecting the death of Paul with the persecution of the summer of 64. Tacitus³ tells us that Nero put the Christians to death with exquisite cruelty. Some were burned, some crucified, some given to wild beasts, some covered with inflammatory material and burned as torches in the gardens of

¹ *Einleitung*, I. 437.

² *Die Chronologie* etc., p. 241.

³ *Annals*, xv. 44.

Nero. But early tradition says that Paul was *beheaded*. This suggests a legal execution rather than the tortures of the Neronian persecution.

Again, the Pastoral Epistles do not allow us to think that Paul perished simply because he was a Christian, for it surely would not have been difficult to prove *this* charge against the venerable apostle, but it *was* difficult to convict him on the charges which were brought. There was a first defense, and then at least one more hearing.¹ Now whether this writing is from the hand of Paul or from one of his disciples, it presupposes a tradition two hundred years older than the words of Eusebius. We conclude, therefore, that the evidence is against connecting the death of Paul with the persecution by Nero in the summer of 64. Paul died a martyr, for he had done nothing worthy of death or of bonds; but he did not fall a sacrifice to the rage and cruelty of Nero, as did those who perished in the summer of 64. The exact year of his death cannot be determined, but we may, with a high degree of probability, assign it to the last three or four years of Nero's reign, that is, to the period from 65 to 68 A.D.

¹ 2 Tim. iv. 16.

APPENDIX III

THE CHURCHES OF GALATIA

WHERE were the churches of Galatia? Three answers have been given to this vexed question. The first locates the churches to which Paul wrote his letter, in Galatia proper, the district in North-central Asia Minor on the Halys and Sangarios rivers, whose chief cities were Pessinus, Ancyra, and Tavium. The second locates them in Pisidia and Lycaonia, that is, in the region where Paul and Barnabas labored on the first missionary tour from Antioch. They were the churches of Antioch, Iconium, Lystra, and Derbe. The third answer to the question locates the Galatian churches both in the southern and the northern part of the Roman province of Galatia. According to this view the chief of the Galatian churches were those of Antioch, Iconium, Lystra, and Derbe, but there were other unnamed communities in the region north of Antioch. The first view is described as the *North Galatian* theory; the second, as the *South Galatian*; and we may call the third the *Pan-Galatian* theory. There have been and still are eminent advocates of each

theory. For the first, we may mention, out of many well-known names, those of Lightfoot, Zöckler, Schürer, Sieffert, Holtzmann (H. J.), Holsten, and Wendt. For the second view, the names of Ramsay, Weizsäcker, Holtzmann (O.), Hausrath, Perrot, Renan, and McGiffert, may be mentioned. And for the third view we have the name of Zahn. The question has been under discussion for three quarters of a century, and has been positively settled many times, but it does not remain settled.

There is comparatively little tangible evidence for or against either theory, and therefore the discussion abounds in opinions and airy inferences. Most briefly stated, the argument for each theory is as follows, and in stating it we will begin with the last, the *Pan-Galatian* theory. This is presented with great thoroughness and fairness by Zahn.¹ He holds that Acts xvi. 6, grammatically interpreted, requires us to think that Paul and Silas worked in the region of Galatia north of Antioch. He agrees with Chase² that the *South Galatian* theory is shipwrecked on the rock of Greek grammar. But on the other hand, he holds, on the basis of Pliny, Tacitus, and Ptolemy, that the name *Galatia* was applied in the first century to the entire region over which King Amyntas had ruled, and

¹ *Einleitung in das N.T.*, I. 123-138.

² *Expositor*, 1893, Vol. VIII. p. 411.

consequently that the cities were properly Galatian in which Paul had labored on his first tour from the Syrian Antioch. The letter to the Galatians was a letter to the churches of Antioch, Iconium, Lystra, and Derbe together with certain churches in the regions further north. He thinks we are required by various considerations to include the South Galatian churches. Thus it would be strange, he says, that the well-known churches of South Galatia should disappear from the New Testament after we pass from Acts, and that the churches of North Galatia, of whose establishment we know nothing, should come into prominence as they do if we refer to them Paul's letter to Galatians, 1 Cor. xvi. 1, and 1 Peter i. 1.

Again, it would be strange, Zahn says, if Judaizers passed by the churches of South Galatia and penetrated to the distant region of North Galatia. Furthermore, he thinks that Gal. ii. 5 implies that Paul at the council in Jerusalem had the Galatian believers in mind; but if so, then it must have been the South Galatian believers for up to that time Paul had not been in North Galatia. Paul also mentions Barnabas in his letter to the Galatians in a way which is most naturally explained if the readers were personally acquainted with him. And finally, there are two passages in Galatians which find their best explanation in the narrative of Paul's work in South Galatia.

Thus Paul says that the Galatians received him as an angel of God,¹ and in Acts xiv. 11-14 we read how the people of Lystra believed that Paul and Barnabas were gods, and wished to offer sacrifice to them. Again, in Gal. v. 11, Paul speaks of "preaching circumcision," and Zahn thinks this is best explained by the narrative of Acts xvi. 1-3, which records that Paul circumcised Timothy.

The argument for the *South Galatian* theory is as follows. It was Paul's habit to use the official Roman names of countries, and therefore when he says *Galatia*² we naturally think of the province of that name.³ In his letter to the Galatians Paul speaks as though when at the council of Jerusalem he had had the Galatians in mind, and if so, it must have been the Galatians of Pisidia and Lycaonia. Again, the fact that Judaizers from Antioch and Jerusalem appeared in the Galatian churches points to South Galatia, for it is improbable, to say the least, that they would have penetrated into North Galatia. Once more, certain particulars of the narrative in Acts and in the letter to the Galatians require us to think of South Galatia. Thus, in Acts xx. 4, Luke mentions no delegate from the Galatian churches, though according to 1 Cor. xvi. 1 the Galatians had a part in

¹ Gal. iv. 14.

² 1 Cor. xvi. 1; Gal. i. 2.

³ So Zahn, Weizsäcker, Pfeleiderer, Ramsay, and McGiffert.

the contribution. Luke does, however, give the names of two men from South Galatia as among the delegates to convey the contribution to Jerusalem. Again, it is hazardous to insert in Acts xvi. 6 so important a work as the establishment of the Galatian churches; and how can Paul have preached the Gospel in North Galatia on account of an infirmity of the flesh?¹

Finally, the advocates of this theory hold it improbable that so important a document as the epistle to the Galatians should have been addressed to churches of whose establishment Luke says nothing; and that the churches of South Galatia, whose establishment he describes at length, should not be alluded to in the New Testament outside the Book of Acts.

For the *North Galatian* theory, the following arguments are brought forward.² Luke uses the geographical, not the political, names, and therefore if we had Acts only, no one would ever have thought of the *South Galatian* theory. For Luke plainly separates between Galatia, on the one hand, and Pisidia and

¹ Gal. iv. 13.

² See, among other writers, Zöckler, in *Studien und Kritiken*, 1895, pp. 51-102; Holsten, *Das Evangelium des Paulus*, 1880, pp. 35-45; Wendt, *Commentary on Acts*, 7th ed.; H. J. Holtzmann, *Einleitung in das N. T.* 1886, p. 241; Jülicher, *Einleitung in das N. T.*, pp. 47-49; Zahn, *Einleitung in das N. T.*, 1897, I. 123-129; Sieffert, *Commentary on Galatians*, 7th ed.; Lipsius, *Hand-Commentar*, Zw. Band, Zw. Abtheilung, 1891; Lightfoot, *Commentary on Galatians*.

Lycaonia, on the other. The grammatical exegesis of Acts xvi. 1-6 requires us to hold that Luke did not put Antioch, Iconium, Lystra, and Derbe in the Galatian land of which he speaks together with Phrygia. Again, the epistle to the Galatians represents Paul as the sole founder of the Galatian churches; but in the establishment of the churches of South Galatia Barnabas was with Paul, set apart unto the work no less than Paul. Once more it is held that the epistle to the Galatians requires the *North Galatian* theory. Thus, if the epistle was addressed to the churches of South Galatia, it would be very strange that Paul does not mention Galatia with Syria and Cilicia, for his work there belongs in the same period in which he was in Syria and Cilicia.¹ And then in Galatians Paul reports to his readers, as if for the first time, what was done at the council of Jerusalem. But he had been in South Galatia long before the composition of the letter, and had handed to the churches the letter of the council. Therefore, the epistle to the Galatians presupposes a different circle of readers from the membership of the South Galatian churches. Moreover, the Galatians to whom the letter of Paul was sent were pressed by the "false brethren" to be circumcised. But if they had been the Christians of South Galatia, they could at once have met the Juda-

¹ Gal. ii. 1.

izers with the letter of the council in which the necessity of the circumcision of the Gentiles was tacitly repudiated.

Such, briefly, are the arguments urged in support of the respective theories. Each theory has something to stand upon, and neither one can be arbitrarily ruled out of court. Yet the theories do not seem to me to be equally well grounded, and it is a matter of considerable importance for the life of Paul which theory we adopt.

The *Pan-Galatian* theory does justice to Acts, for it interprets xvi. 1-6 in keeping with Luke's usage and in keeping with Greek grammar. But it does not seem to do justice to the epistle to the Galatians. Holsten argues with much force that the churches to which the letter was sent cannot have been established on the first missionary tour. Paul speaks of the council in Jerusalem as though his readers had not heard of it; but it is certain that the churches of South Galatia knew all about it. Paul and Silas had reported it to them.¹ Then the churches of South Galatia had the letter of the council in which it repudiated the doctrine of the Judaizers of Antioch, and it is hardly conceivable that, with this letter in their possession, they could have fallen under the influence of the Judaizers. And then if the letter to the

¹ Acts xvi. 4.

Galatians was addressed chiefly to the churches of South Galatia, as Zahn holds, it is strange that Gal. i. 21 does not mention Galatia with Syria and Cilicia. If *Galatia* means *South Galatia*, then Paul must have worked there in the same period in which he worked in the neighboring provinces of Syria and Cilicia. But if he spent the time in Syria, Cilicia, *and* Galatia, why did he omit Galatia, especially when writing to the Galatians?

There are, however, certain points in the letter to the Galatians which Zahn regards as favorable to the *South Galatian* theory. Thus the apostle speaks as though he had the Galatians in mind when he was contending in Jerusalem for Gentile liberty.¹ But as Zöckler says, this language was natural though the Galatian churches had not yet been established, and even Ramsay lays no stress on this point.² Ramsay also says that he sees "no great value" in the argument that the epistle to the Galatians speaks of Barnabas as though the readers were personally acquainted with him.³ Paul speaks of Barnabas in the same way when writing to the Corinthians, but there is no evidence that the Corinthians were personally acquainted with him.

Zahn thinks that Gal. iv. 14, and v. 11, are best

¹ Gal. ii. 5.

² *The Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 101.

³ *The Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 97.

explained by the narrative of Paul's work in South Galatia. In Gal. iv. 14, Paul says that the Galatians received him as an angel of God, as Christ Jesus, and this is thought to refer to his remarkable experience in Lystra, where the people regarded Paul and Barnabas as gods.¹ Ramsay refers to this point as made by Lightfoot, but apparently he does not attach much value to it.² Surely it is a difficult argument. The Lycaonians thought that Paul was the god Hermes, and they had no conception whatever of his message of salvation. But Paul says that the Galatians received him as an angel of God, as Christ Jesus. Now assuming that the Lycaonians were afterward converted, as Zahn does, one cannot readily see how Paul could say that receiving him as the god Hermes was after all equivalent to receiving him as Jesus Christ.

The other passage is Gal. v. 11, and this is said to be best explained in the light of Acts xvi.1-3. Ramsay regards this passage as an unmistakable reference to the case of Timothy.³ Now it must be admitted that Paul's enemies might have used his circumcision of Timothy in the way implied in Gal. v. 11; but one fails to see why they could not have used it against him in Corinth or Judea or North Galatia. In other

¹ Acts xiv. 8-18.

² *The Church in the Roman Empire*, pp. 101, 102.

³ *The Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 102.

words, granting that Gal. v. 11 refers to Paul's circumcision of Timothy, it by no means follows that the letter must have been written to the Christians of Lystra and Derbe, Iconium and Antioch.

These objections to the *Pan-Galatian* theory are also an answer to some of the points which are enumerated above in favor of the *South Galatian* theory. But there are still other points in the *South Galatian* theory which appear to be open to criticism. Thus we may grant that, if we had not the Book of Acts, our first thought on reading Gal. i. 2 would be that Paul meant the Roman province of Galatia, because he was in the habit of using the official Roman names instead of the ordinary geographical designations. It seems plain that the term *Galatia* in the first century *might* refer to the entire region which Amyntas had ruled. But of course it does not follow that it *must* always be taken in that sense, and that it ceased to be used to designate Galatia proper. The presumption is that Paul and his colaborer Luke, who had travelled and worked together for years, used the word in the same sense. Again, it is not plain that the appearance of Judaizers in the churches of Galatia favors the *South Galatian* theory. Sieffert says it was easier to reach Galatia proper, for a traveller from Jerusalem, than to reach Lystra and Derbe; and Zöckler remarks that it was no farther in a straight line from Antioch in Pisidia

to Pessinus than from Antioch to Iconium. It is thought that the journey cannot have been as difficult as that from Perga to Pisidian Antioch. The Judaizers may have passed by the South Galatian churches because in these the letter of the Jerusalem church had been promulgated. This would naturally make it more difficult for the Judaizers to gain influence.

Again, the argument for the *South Galatian* theory based on Acts xx. 4 is of doubtful value. It assumes that Luke gives us a *complete* list of the delegates to Jerusalem, and assumes also that the contribution from the churches of Galatia was sent at the same time with that from Achaia and Macedonia. But if no delegate from Achaia is mentioned, which is really the case, though Achaia certainly contributed, it need not be regarded as strange that none is mentioned from Galatia. Even Ramsay¹ admits that this argument based on Acts xx. 4 has "very little value," and it need not be further considered.

Nor can we safely argue for South Galatia from the fact that Luke refers to the establishment of churches in North Galatia only in Acts xvi. 6 and xviii. 23, if at all. He says nothing of the establishment of the church in Rome to which Paul's most elaborate letter was written. He says nothing of Paul's sojourn in Arabia, and nothing of the years

¹ *The Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 98.

which he spent in Christian work in Syria and Cilicia. He gives as much space to Paul's voyage to Rome as he does to his great work of three years in Ephesus which profoundly stirred all Asia. It is, therefore, quite in keeping with Luke's method if it be true that he makes only a brief reference to the work in North Galatia; and this same line of argument answers the point that we cannot well suppose an important letter written to a church of whose establishment we know so little.

The fact that Paul preached to the Gentiles on account of an infirmity of the flesh is held to argue for the *South Galatian* theory. But Luke gives us a full description of the establishment of the South Galatian churches and yet makes no allusion to the sickness of Paul. Further, if it is conceivable that Paul, when he turned north from Antioch¹ and before he came to the boundary of Bithynia,² passed through a part of Galatia proper—and this of course cannot be denied—then it is conceivable that he was detained in Galatia by sickness, and that while thus detained he preached the Gospel. Paul does not suggest that he took the journey to North Galatia *on account* of sickness, as Ramsay strangely affirms,³ but only that when he preached to the Galatians it was

¹ Acts xvi. 6.

² Acts xvi. 7.

³ *Expositor*, 1892, Vol. VI., p. 373.

not of purpose, but because his journey had been interrupted by illness.

The argument, therefore, for the *South Galatian* theory does not seem to me conclusive. I cannot discover in it anything that seriously weakens the North Galatian position. The grammatical exegesis of Acts xvi. 1-6 sends Paul through some part of Galatia proper, where, according to Acts xviii. 23, he won converts to the Christian faith. There is no evidence that these converts were in Ancyra and Tavium, as has sometimes been assumed.¹ It seems most in accordance with the facts regarding the second missionary tour from Antioch to suppose that they were in the west or southwest part of Galatia, for example, in the region of Pessinus and Germa.

The use of the term *Galatia* by Paul offers no opposition to the exegetical argument, for he would surely use that term if addressing churches in Galatia proper, though he *might* also use it if addressing churches in Pisidia and Lycaonia. The exegetical argument seems to be corroborated, as has been indicated above, by the situation and thought of the epistle to the Galatians.

And so the balance of probability appears to me to be strongly in favor of the view that the Galatian churches were in Galatia proper.

¹ *E.g.*, Lightfoot on *Galatians*.

INDEX OF PASSAGES FROM ACTS AND THE PAULINE EPISTLES

| CHAPTER | ACTS | PAGE | CHAPTER | PAGE |
|------------------------|------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|
| | | | XI. 19, 20 | 73 |
| I. 18, 19 | | 236 | 19, 20, 22-26 | 59 |
| II. 4 | | 237 | 22, 30 | 136 |
| 10 | | 77 | 26 | 54, 62, 67, 252 |
| IV. 1 | | 21 | 27, 28 | 62 |
| 36, 37 | | 136 | 27-30 | 87, 88 |
| 37 | | 73 | XII. 3 | 243 |
| V. 17 | | 21 | 12 | 73 |
| 34-40 | | 14, 24 | 19-23 | 242 |
| VI. 1-3, 9, 11, 13, 14 | | 22 | XIII. | 54 |
| 9 | | 5, 23 | 1 | 70 |
| VII. 2 | | 30 | 2 | 136 |
| 2, 30, 58 | | 23 | 5 | 73 |
| VIII. 1 | | 23, 59, 136 | 5, 6-12 | 74 |
| 1-3 | | 25 | 13 | 77 |
| IX. 1-19 | | 27 | 16, 43 | 7 |
| 2 | | 7, 24 | 42, 43 | 80 |
| 3, 4 | | 33 | 49 | 81 |
| 7, 9, 10-12, 17, 18 | | 32 | XIV. | 54 |
| 11, 10-17 | | 40 | 4, 14 | 70, 82, 136 |
| 13, 21 | | 25 | 8-18 | 268 |
| 18 | | 41 | 8-18, 13 | 84 |
| 19, 20, 23, 26 | | 43 | 11-14 | 263 |
| 19, 23 | | 44 | 12 | 136 |
| 23-25, 25 | | 45 | 15-17 | 129 |
| 27 | | 136 | 21, 22 | 85 |
| 27, 28, 29 | | 46 | 23 | 86 |
| 29 | | 48, 50 | XV. 1 | 94 |
| 30 | | 52 | 1, 10, 24 | 89 |
| 40 | | 170 | 1-29 | 87, 88, 89 |
| X. | | 60 | 2, 31, 23 | 90 |
| 9-16, 45 | | 60 | 2, 26 | 136 |
| 46 | | 237 | 7-11 | 91 |
| XI. 3 | | 104 | 22-29 | 93 |
| 18 | | 61 | 22, 31 | 101 |
| 19 | | 95 | 22, 32 | 137 |

| CHAPTER | PAGE | CHAPTER | PAGE |
|-----------------------|------------------------------|--------------------|--|
| XV. 23 | 56, 103 | XIX. 6, 8, 9 | 146 |
| 31 | 102 | 10 | 147 |
| 35, 36 | 107 | 11, 12, 19 | 149 |
| 36 | 76 | 13, 13-20, 15, 16 | 148 |
| 37-39 | 108 | 18 | 150 |
| 37-40 | 77 | 21 | 157 |
| 41 | 55 | 24 | 153 |
| XVI. 1 | 85, 109 | 26, 27, 28, 29 | 154 |
| 1-3 | 263 | 29 | 169 |
| 1-6 | 265, 266 | 30, 31, 32, 33 | 155 |
| 1, 3, 19, 37 | 137 | 31, 35-40 | 156 |
| 3 | 240 | 35, 24, 25 | 143 |
| 4 | 101, 103, 266 | XX. 1 | 228 |
| 6 | 110, 143, 261, 264, 270, 271 | 2 | 166 |
| 7 | 271 | 3 | 167, 168 |
| 7, 8 | 112 | 4 | 85, 123, 124, 138, 159, 160, 169, 201, 270 |
| 9 | 30, 113 | 5-XXI. 18 | 113, 236 |
| 10-17 | 113, 236 | 6 | 114, 138, 170, 226 |
| 11 | 228 | 5, 6 | 169 |
| 12 | 114 | 7-11 | 79, 243 |
| 13, 18 | 115 | 7-12 | 170 |
| 17, 20, 21 | 116 | 13, 14, 15, 18-35 | 171 |
| 22-24, 23, 26 | 117 | 16, 6, 17 | 244 |
| 39 | 118 | 18-35 | 150 |
| XVII. 1 | 119 | 19 | 152 |
| 2-4, 4 | 120 | 20, 21, 27, 31, 34 | 151 |
| 5 | 121 | 23 | 110 |
| 5-7, 9, 14 | 122 | 31 | 146 |
| 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 | 123 | XXI. 1-3, 4 | 172 |
| 15 | 127 | 4, 7, 10 | 244 |
| 15, 16, 34 | 126 | 7, 11 | 173 |
| 17, 18 | 128 | 10, 10-11 | 62 |
| 28 | 3 | 12-14 | 171 |
| XVIII. 2 | 139, 214 | 13 | 190 |
| 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 18 | 131 | 16 | 174 |
| 3 | 164 | 17 | 138, 175 |
| 5 | 127 | 18 | 99 |
| 8, 10 | 132 | 18, 19 | 176 |
| 9, 10, 13 | 133 | 24 | 178 |
| 14 | 7 | 27, 28, 29 | 179 |
| 18 | 134 | 29 | 159, 169, 226 |
| 18, 19, 26 | 140 | 31, 32, 38 | 180 |
| 21 | 143 | 37-39 | 183 |
| 22, 23 | 144 | 39 | 4 |
| 23 | 270 | XXII. 3 | 10, 12 |
| 25, 26 | 145 | 5 | 24 |
| XIX. 1-7 | 144 | | |

| CHAPTER | PAGE | CHAPTER | PAGE |
|----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|----------------|
| XVI. 3, 4, 5 | 140 | II. 13 | 167 |
| 5 | 147 | IV. 6 | 27 |
| 7, 10, 11 | 214 | V. 8 | 18 |
| 21 | 169 | 16 | 19 |
| 23 | 168 | VII. 5, 7, 11 | 164 |
| | | 5-16 | 162, 167 |
| I CORINTHIANS | | 6, 7, 8, 13 | 141 |
| I. 11 | 160 | VIII.-IX. | 159 |
| 11, 12, 14, 16 | 132 | 3, 4, 18, 22 | 167 |
| 23 | 133 | 6, 16, 17 | 141 |
| 26, 28 | 132 | 6, 18, 22 | 159 |
| II. 3, 1-5 | 133 | 10 | 160 |
| V. 9 | 160 | 19 | 86 |
| VII. 7, 8 | 20 | IX. 2 | 157 |
| VIII. | 103 | 2-4, 12, 13 | 158 |
| IX. 1 | 27, 38 | 5 | 168 |
| 4-6 | 20 | X. 10 | 181 |
| 6 | 109 | XI. 9 | 164 |
| X. 4 | 17 | 23-27 | 152 |
| XII. 1-11 | 132 | 23-33 | 56 |
| XIV. | 246 | 25 | 204 |
| 6 | 71 | 32, 33 | 45 |
| XV. 8 | 27, 38 | XII. 7 | 165 |
| 9 | 26 | 10 | 166 |
| 30, 31 | 153 | 12 | 150 |
| 32 | 147 | 14 | 161, 163 |
| XVI. 1 | 157, 158, 159, 262, 263 | 18 | 162 |
| 3 | 132 | XIII. 1 | 161 |
| 3, 4 | 169 | 2, 10 | 162 |
| 5, 6 | 157 | | |
| 5-9 | 162 | GALATIANS | |
| 6 | 168 | I. 1 | 70 |
| 8, 9 | 147 | 1, 12, 17, 18, 19 | 65 |
| 9 | 153 | 1, 16 | 35 |
| 17, 18 | 160 | 2 | 79, 263 |
| 19 | 140, 147, 213 | 11-17 | 27 |
| 2 CORINTHIANS | | 16 | 34, 38, 51, 69 |
| I. 5 | 153 | 17 | 42 |
| 8 | 152 | 18 | 47, 53 |
| 8, 10 | 147 | 18-24 | 43, 44, 242 |
| 9, 15, 16, 23 | 162 | 19 | 46 |
| 14 | 164 | 21 | 99 |
| II. 1 | 161 | 21 | 54, 267 |
| 1, 13 | 162 | 21, 22 | 52 |
| 12, 13 | 164 | 21-23 | 109 |
| | | 22-24 | 55 |
| | | 22, 23 | 25 |

| CHAPTER | PAGE | CHAPTER | PAGE |
|---------------|-------------------------------|----------------------|----------|
| I. 23 | 26 | COLOSSIANS | |
| II. I | 44, 51, 52, 54, 141, 242, 265 | I. I, 6 | 221 |
| 1, 9 | 60 | 7 | 148 |
| 1-10 | 87 | II. I | 148 |
| 2, 6 | 90 | IV. 3, 18 | 217 |
| 2, 9 | 89 | 7, 10, 11 | 221 |
| 4 | 94 | 10 | 73, 108 |
| 5 | 262, 267 | 10-13, 14 | 138 |
| 6 | 93 | 11, 14 | 114 |
| 9 | 65, 91, 99 | 1 THESSALONIANS | |
| 9, 7 | 98, 177 | I. 6 | 122 |
| 10 | 63, 144, 158 | 7, 8 | 123 |
| 11, 12 | 107 | 9 | 120 |
| 12 | 99, 104 | II. 2 | 117 |
| 14-21 | 105 | 13 | 122 |
| III. 3, 4, 5 | 111 | 14 | 121, 122 |
| 19 | 17 | 17-19 | 123 |
| IV. 8, 13, 14 | 111 | 18 | 127 |
| 12-14 | 110 | III. I | 128 |
| 13 | 264 | I, 5 | 123 |
| 13, 14 | 77 | I, 2 | 125, 127 |
| 14 | 263, 267 | 6 | 131 |
| 15 | 40 | 11 | 127, 130 |
| 22-25 | 17 | IV. 10 | 123, 125 |
| V. 7 | 111 | 16, 17 | 18 |
| 11 | 263, 267 | 2 THESSALONIANS | |
| VI. 11 | 41 | I. 5-10 | 18 |
| EPHESIANS | | III. 17 | 41 |
| III. 1 | 217 | 1 TIMOTHY | |
| IV. 1 | 217 | I. 2 | 137 |
| V. 22-23 | 21 | 3 | 138, 225 |
| VI. 20 | 22, 217 | 20 | 229 |
| PHILIPPIANS | | III. 14 | 225 |
| I. 1 | 138, 221 | IV. 13 | 225 |
| 13 | 216, 217 | 2 TIMOTHY | |
| 12, 14, 15-18 | 220 | I. 8, 12, 15, 16 | 230 |
| 23 | 18 | 16 | 222 |
| 25 | 223, 254 | 18 | 225 |
| II. 24 | 223, 254 | II. 3, 9, 10, 11, 12 | 230 |
| III. 5 | 10 | III. 1, 5 | 137 |
| 6 | 26, 36, 37 | 8 | 17 |
| 21 | 18 | | |
| IV. 2, 3 | 115 | | |
| 10, 18, 22 | 221 | | |
| 16 | 120 | | |

| CHAPTER | PAGE | CHAPTER | TITUS | PAGE |
|---------------------|---------------|---------|--------------------|---------------|
| III. 15 | 10, 137 | I. 5 | | 141, 227 |
| IV. 6, 7, 8, 13, 21 | 231 | III. 12 | | 141, 228 |
| 10 | 138, 141, 230 | | PHILEMON | |
| 11 | 108, 138 | | Verse 1, 9, 10, 13 | 217 |
| 11, 16, 17, 21 | 230 | | 10 | 221 |
| 13, 20 | 226 | | 19 | 148 |
| 16 | 259 | | 22 | 223, 228, 254 |
| 19 | 140 | | | |
| 20, 21 | 227 | | | |

INDEX OF LITERATURE CITED¹

- Baedeker, *Griechenland*.
 Bethge, *Die Paulinischen Reden der Apostelgeschichte*.
 Blass, *Acta Apostolorum*.
 Bousset, *Theologische Rundschau, erstes Heft*.
 Chase, *Expositor*, 1893.
 Cicero, *Pro A. Lic. Archia*.
 Clemen, *Die Chronologie der Paulinischen Briefe*.
 Clement of Rome, *I Corinthians*.
 Conybeare and Howson, *The Life and Letters of St. Paul*.
 Eusebius, *Church History*.
 Farrar, *The Life and Work of St. Paul*.
 Gfrörer *Das Jahrhundert des Heils*.
 Graetz, *History of the Jews*.
 Harnack, *Die Chronologie der altchristlichen Literatur*.
 Holsten, *Das Evangelium des Paulus*.
 Holtzmann, H. J., *Einleitung in das N. T.*
 Holtzmann, O., *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*.
 Hort, *Judaistic Christianity*.
 Josephus, *Against Apion; Antiquities; Jewish War*.
 Jülicher, *Einleitung in das N. T.*
 Lewin, *The Life and Epistles of St. Paul*.
 Lightfoot, *St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians*.
 Lipsius, *Hand-Commentar; Briefe an die Galater, Römer, Philipper*.
 Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*.
 McGiffert, *The Apostolic Age*.
 Meyer, *Handbuch über die Apostelgeschichte*.
 Mommsen, *Römisches Staatsrecht*.
 Pfeleiderer, *Das Urchristenthum*.
 Plumptre, *St. Paul in Asia Minor and at the Syrian Antioch*.
 Ptolemy, *Geography*, Porta's edition.
 Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen; The Church in the Roman Empire; The Expositor*, 1892, 1896, 1897.
 Rénan, *St. Paul*.
 Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*.
 Sieffert, *Handbuch über den Brief an die Galater*.
 Smith, *The Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul*.
 Spitta, *Zur Geschichte und Literatur des Urchristenthums*.
 Sterrett, *Papers of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens*.
 Strabo, Müller's edition.
 Strack, *Einleitung in den Talmud*.
 Suetonius, *Claudius*.
 Tacitus, *Annals; History*.
 Volkmar, *Paulus*.
 Weber, *Die Lehren des Talmuds*.
 Weiss, *Einleitung in das N. T.*
 Weizsäcker, *Das apostolische Zeitalter*.
 Wendt, *Meyer's Handbuch über die Apostelgeschichte*.
 Winer, *Real-Wörterbuch*.
 Wood, *Discoveries at Ephesus*.
 Zahn, *Einleitung in das N. T.*
 Zöckler, *Studien und Kritiken*, 1895.

¹ I regret that the work of Dr. Cone, *Paul: the Man, the Missionary, and the Teacher*, and the work of Dr. Abbott, *The Life and Letters of St. Paul the Apostle*, did not appear in time to be used in the preparation of this volume.

The Student's Life of Jesus

BY

GEORGE H. GILBERT, Ph.D., D.D.

*Iowa Professor of New Testament Literature and Interpretation in
Chicago Theological Seminary*

Cloth. \$1.25 net

"Admirable in arrangement, concise in form, with abundant indexing, this modest work speaks most eloquently to every one who would study the history of Jesus seriously, by the truly critical and scientific method."

— *The Christian Advocate.*

"It will assuredly become the *vade mecum* for the class for whom it is particularly written." — *The Evangelist.*

"Written by one who is a profound believer in the supernatural, and whose belief does not in the least prevent his application of sound criticism and practical common sense to the consideration of such questions as the miraculous birth, and the interpretation of such events as the temptation."

— *The Outlook.*

"Acuteness, candor, and conspicuous fidelity to its purpose are the notable characteristics of this volume. . . . Its claim to be scientific in method is fully justified. It is thoroughly modern in spirit and manner, . . . with a clearness, completeness, and judicial calmness which all scholars must admire. The work is admirably adapted to its end, the use of students. . . . Any ordinarily intelligent layman will like it, and it will be a useful book in the Sunday-school library, although it is not in the ordinary narrative form." — *Congregationalist.*

"A work peculiarly suited to the needs of students."

— *The Chautauquan.*

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
66 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK