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EXTRACT

FROM THE LAST WILL AND TESTAMENT

OF THE LATE

REV. JOHN BAMPTON

CANON OF SALISBURY

. . . I give and bequeath my Lands and Estates to the Chancellor,

Masters, and Scholars of the University of Oxford for ever, to have and

to hold all and singular the said Lands or Estates upon trust, and to

the intents and purposes hereinafter mentioned; that is to say, I will

and appoint that the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Oxford for

the time being shall take and receive all the rents, issues, and

profits thereof, and (after all taxes, reparations, and necessary

deductions made) that he pay all the remainder to the endowment of

eight Divinity Lecture Sermons, to be established for ever in the said

University and to be performed in the manner following:

I direct and appoint, that, upon the first Tuesday in Easter Term, a

Lecturer be yearly chosen by the Heads of Colleges only, and by no

others, in the room adjoining to the Printing-House, between the hours

of ten in the morning and two in the afternoon, to preach eight

Divinity Lecture Sermons, the year following, at St. Mary's in Oxford,

between the commencement of the last month in Lent Term, and the end of

the third week in Act Term.

Also I direct and appoint, that the eight Divinity Lecture Sermons

shall be preached upon either of the following Subjects--to confirm and

establish the Christian Faith, and to confute all heretics and

schismatics--upon the divine authority of the holy Scriptures--upon the

authority of the writings of the primitive Fathers, as to the faith and

practice of the primitive Church--upon the Divinity of our Lord and

Saviour testis Christ --upon the Divinity of the Holy Ghost--upon the

Articles of the Christian Faith, as comprehended in the Apostles' and

Nicene Creeds.

Also I direct, that thirty copies of the eight Divinity Lecture Sermons

shall be always printed, within two months after they are preached; and

one copy shall be given to the Chancellor of the University, and one

copy to the Head of every College, and one copy to the Mayor of the

city of Oxford, and one copy to be put into the Bodleian Library; and

the expense of printing them shall be paid out of the revenue of the

Land or Estates given for establishing the Divinity Lecture Sermons;

and the Preacher shall not be paid, nor be entitled to the revenue,

before they are printed.

Also I direct and appoint, that no person shall be qualified to preach

the Divinity Lecture Sermons, unless he hath taken the degree of Master

of Arts at least, in one of the two Universities of Oxford or

Cambridge; and that the same person shall never preach the Divinity

Lecture Sermons twice.'
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LECTURE I

Rom. i. 8: First, I thank my God through Jesus Christ for you all, that

your faith is spoken of throughout the whole world.'

The subject of these lectures is in one sense a well-worn theme. The

literature bearing upon the history of the Church in Rome during the

first century is enormous, and unfortunately in modem times the

prevailing note has been controversial. It has seemed as if it were

impossible even for those who have tried to write on the beginnings of

Roman Christianity in the impartial spirit of the scientific historian

to free themselves from bias and prejudice. This very fact, however,

only proves that this has been and is a subject of profound and indeed

of absorbing interest, and it is so from whatever point of view we

regard it, the political, no less than the. ecclesiastical and

religious. That interest indeed, so far from diminishing, has been

greatly stimulated and increased by the archaeological researches and

discoveries made in Rome and its immediate neighbourhood during the

past half-century. Year by year additions have been made to our

knowledge, and it is now generally admitted that the last word on many

most important and critical questions has not yet been spoken. Already

many assertions once confidently made have had to be modified or

abandoned, opinions put forward with authority are constantly being

revised, and a careful study of avail-able evidence has convinced me

that there are grounds for questioning seriously certain conclusions

now generally received, and at the same time for upholding the

historical character of some ancient traditions too hastily rejected.

The first point to grasp is the character of the spell exercised over

the minds of men by the very name of Rome during the period of the

early Caesars. Rome in the first century of our era occupied a position

of influence unique in the annals of history. It had become the

magnetic centre of the civilised world, and it was itself the most

cosmopolitan of cities that have ever existed. The Rome of Claudius and

of Nero was the seat of an absolute and centralised Government, whose

vast dominion stretched from the shores of the Atlantic to the borders

of Parthia, from Britain to the Libyan deserts, over diverse lands and

many races, all of them subdued after centuries of conflict and of

conquest by the Roman arms, but now forming a single empire under an

administrative system of unrivalled flexibility and strength, which

enforced obedience to law and the maintenance of peace without any

unnecessary infringement of local liberties or interference with

national religious cults. One of the most remarkable features of this

great Empire was the freedom of intercourse that was enjoyed, and the

safety and rapidity with which travelling could be undertaken. Never

until quite modern times has any such ease and security of

communication between place and place been possible. And this not

merely by those admirable military roads which were one of the chief

instruments for the maintenance of the Roman rule and for the binding

together of province with province and of the most distant frontiers

with the capital; the facilities for intercourse by water also were

abundant and were, except during the winter months, freely used. The

Roman Empire, as a glance at the map reveals, was--even at its

zenith--essentially a Mediterranean power. Its dominion consisted

mainly of the fringe of territory encircling that sea. In the midst

stood the capital. The greatest cities of the Empire were ports, and

Rome itself, the chief among them, was dependent upon sea-borne traffic

for its daily food.' [1]

At the beginning of the Christian era the population of the imperial

city has been estimated at not less than 1,300,000, of which more than

one half were slaves. The entire number of citizens owning private

property was very small--a few thousands only.' [2] Each of these

possessed vast numbers of slaves, [3] who were trained to perform every

kind of work, so that a considerable portion of the free inhabitants

found themselves without occupation or employment. In the time of

Julius Caesar [4] no fewer than 320,000 were supported by the state,

and though Augustus was able to reduce this multitude of paupers to

200,000, [5] the number afterwards rapidly increased. This huge

population was, as has been already said, one of the most cosmopolitan

that has ever been gathered together to form one community. This was

due in the first instance to the practice of selling prisoners of war,

and the inhabitants of captured cities, as slaves. The institution of

slavery therefore implied that in every wealthy household in Rome there

was a great mixture of races, and the custom of manumission on a large

scale was continually admitting batches of persons of foreign

extraction to many privileges of citizenship. Thus was formed the large

and important class of freedmen (liberti) containing men of culture and

ability, who not only filled posts of responsibility in their former

masters' households but not seldom became rich and rose to high

official positions in the state. Freedmen indeed and the descendants of

freedmen played no small part in the history of the times with which we

are dealing, and Christianity found among them many of its early

converts and most earnest workers. But the freedmen and the slaves by

no means comprised all the foreign population of Rome at this epoch.

The legionaries were recruited in all parts of the empire; the

Pretorian camp contained contingents drawn from distant frontier

tribes. Traders, travellers, adventurers of every kind thronged to

Rome--particularly from the East. So did the preachers and teachers of

many philosophies, cults, and modes of worship, Greek, Egyptian, and

Phrygian. The very language of ordinary everyday life in Rome had

become Greek, and the whole atmosphere of the great city was in no

small measure orientalised. [6]

Amongst this large alien element in the population the Jews formed one

of the most marked and important sections. Their position indeed was at

once singular and exclusive, for they had privileges accorded to none

others. The origin [7] of the Jewish colony at Rome may be traced back

to 63 B.C., when Pompeius after the capture of Jerusalem brought back a

large number of prisoners, who were sold as slaves. But the Jew, as a

slave, was always difficult to deal with, through his obstinate

adherence to his ancestral faith and peculiar customs, and so many of

these slaves were speedily manumitted [8] that they were able to form a

community apart on the far side of the Tiber. [9] Julius Caesar from

motives of expediency showed especial favour to the Jews, and his

policy was continued by Augustus and, except for brief intervals, by

his successors. The privileges thus conferred were very great, and

included liberty of worship, freedom from military service and from

certain taxes, the recognition of the Sabbath as a day of rest, the

right of living according to the customs of their forefathers, and full

jurisdiction over their own members. [10] Once in the reign of Tiberius

[11] the worshippers of Jahveh and of Isis fell under the heavy

displeasure of the emperor; some were punished, others expelled from

the city, and the consuls were ordered to enlist 4000 Jews for military

service in the malarious climate of Sardinia, 19 A.D. The determination

of Caligula to set up a statue of himself in the Temple of Jerusalem

aroused a storm of opposition, which would undoubtedly have brought a

fierce persecution upon the Jews but for the assassination of the

tyrant (41 A.D.), before his design was carried into effect. [12]

Claudius, however, on his accession at once renewed all the old

privileges, and took steps to allay the fanatical passions stirred up

by the action of his half-insane predecessor. From this time forward

the Jews were never compelled to take part in Caesar-worship. [13] To

them alone of all the peoples of the empire was this concession made.

This Jewish colony in Rome seems from the descriptions of contemporary

writers to have had the same characteristics as the Jewish colonies in

European cities throughout the Middle Ages, and indeed much as we see

them to-day. A large proportion of these Roman Jews were very poor,

living in rags and squalor, making a precarious livelihood as hawkers,

pedlars, and dealers in second-hand goods. Above these were then, as

now, the moneylenders, larger traders, and shopkeepers, and at the head

the wealthy financiers, and in the days of Tiberius and his successors

many members of the Herodian family made Rome their home and lived on

terms of close intimacy with the Imperial circle. [14] It is a curious

fact that the Jewish race, while hated and despised by the people of

Rome, should have been endowed with so many immunities by the Emperors,

and above all that its exclusive religion and ceremonial rites should

have possessed such an attraction as undoubtedly they did possess, and

should have drawn so many adherents from all classes. [15] The truth is

that the privileges, as I have said before, were granted from motives

of pure expediency. The Jewish race was numerous, it had settlements in

practically every important city in the empire, and it was financially

indispensable. The number of Jews in Rome in 5 B.C. has been estimated

at 10,000; in Egypt, 1,000,000; in Palestine, 700,000; in the whole

Roman Empire (out of a total population of fifty-four to sixty

millions) four to four and a half millions.

As 4000 adult males were actually sent to Sardinia in 19 A.D. it may

safely be said that a quarter of a century later, allowing for the

natural growth of population, for fresh batches of slaves receiving

manumission, and for immigration from outside, the total Jewish

settlement in Rome would not be less than 30,000 and might reach

50,000.

Everywhere the Jew however held aloof from his Gentile neighbours, and

his absolute refusal to mingle with them and to share their life could

only be met either by coercion or by favoured treatment. To the wise

statesmanship of the dictator Julius the latter course commended

itself, and the permanence of the policy he adopted is sufficient proof

of its prescience. The attractiveness of Judaism, as a religious cult,

is more difficult to explain. It had neither the mysticism nor the

sensuousness of the worship of Isis or of Cybele. Yet although the Jew

was hated and scorned, his religion became to a surprising degree the

mode in Rome, especially among ladies of the patrician houses. The

number of actual proselytes of Gentile origin was large, and still

larger the number of those whom St. Luke in the Acts styles

God-fearers' [16] (sebomenoi ton Theon), i.e. people who adopted the

Jewish monotheism, attended the synagogue [17] services, and observed

the Sabbath and certain portions of the ceremonial law. These

God-fearers,' in every place where Jewish communities were to be found,

formed a fringe round the Synagogue of bodies of men and women, who, in

this age of religious electicism, without altogether abandoning their

connexion with Paganism, had become semi-Jews.

In a city such as the Rome we have been describing it is not difficult

to see a seed-plot ready prepared for the planting of a new religion

like Christianity, oriental in its origin, an outgrowth of Judaism,

akin in so many points to the Mystery-Religions of Egypt and Asia Minor

then so much in vogue, and bearing, as it did, in its ethical teaching

so striking a resemblance to the moral code of the Stoics. That the

message of the Gospel of Jesus Christ in some primitive form reached

the banks of the Tiber very early there is, as I shall show later, good

reason to believe, but of the when or how we know nothing directly. The

converts at first would be almost certainly few in number and drawn

from the humbler class of Jews. [18] The new sect, if it were noticed

at all by the authorities, would be regarded with contemptuous

indifference as a variety of Judaism, and therefore sheltered by the

privileges which Judaism, as a religio licita, enjoyed. [19] The only

possible allusion in the first decade after the Crucifixion to the

existence in Rome of a knowledge of Christian teaching is contained in

a passage of Suetonius' Life of Caligula,' in which he tells of the

performance before the Emperor of a play in which a certain Laureolus,

who gives his name to the piece, is crucified upon the stage. Might

there not be here a cruel parody upon the central theme of Christian

preaching? Probably not, though such an exhibition is at any rate

thoroughly illustrative of the spirit of mockery with which the idea of

a crucified Saviour would be received. [20]

There is evidence, however, in the pages of the same historian,

Suetonius, that almost exactly a decade after the aforesaid production

of the Laureolus Christianity in Rome had already become a force

sufficiently potent to draw down upon it the fanatical antagonism of

the Jews. Tumults and disorders seem to have arisen in the Jewish

quarter of the city in 50 A.D. of such a threatening character as to

force the Government, in spite of its favourable inclination to the

Jews, to take strong action. This appears to me to be nothing more than

a fair interpretation of Suetonius' words--the Jews who were

continually rioting at the instigation of Chrestus he (Claudius)

expelled from Rome.' [21] To write Chrestus for Christus was quite

natural to a Latin historian, for Chrestus was a name in use at Rome as

extant inscriptions show, [22] and both Tertullian and Lactantius [23]

tell us that in their time the common pronunciation was "Chrestus' and

Chrestianos' for Christus' and Christianos.' The French word chr�tien'

is to this day a living proof that this mode of spelling still

survives. Dion Cassius [24] informs us that the edict of expulsion,

owing to the disturbance that it caused, was only partially carried

out, but that the synagogues were closed and the clubs licensed by

Caligula dissolved. Among the Jews that were expelled were no doubt the

chief leaders of the contending factions. Among these were Aquila and

Priscilla or Prisca, of whom we read in the Acts of the Apostles that

in consequence of Claudius' edict of banishment they had left Rome and

taken up their abode at Corinth, and were there brought into personal

contact with St. Paul, when in the summer of 51 A.D. he first visited

that city.

The intercourse which thus began was destined to be long-continued and

intimate, and it was through this intercourse (such at least is my firm

persuasion) that that eager desire to visit Rome, to which the Apostle

gives such strong expression in his Epistle to the Romans some five or

six years later, was first fanned into flame. Not without purpose did

St. Luke, who never wastes words, give such an elaborate description of

this husband and wife upon their first entry on the stage of his

history. Having departed from Athens' we read Acts, xviii. 1. Paul came

to Corinth and having met a certain Jew, by name Aquila, a Pontian [25]

by birth, who had lately come from Italy, and Priscilla his wife, in

consequence of the decree of Claudius that all the Jews should depart

from Rome, betook himself to them, and because they were of the same

trade he abode with them and wrought at his craft, for they were

tentmakers by trade.' Here undoubtedly St. Luke intended in the first

place to give the reason for the strong bond of sympathy which at once

sprang up between these two Asiatic Jews and fellow craftsmen. The

description of Aquila as a Jew does not mean that he was not a

Christian. Had he and his wife required to be converted and baptised,

it is almost impossible that so important a fact should not here have

been mentioned. Compare the notice about Apollos, Acts xviii. 24-27,

The Jews who were actually exiled by Claudius were no doubt the leaders

of the contending factions, Aquila and Prisca having been in 50 A.D. as

afterwards among the foremost of the Christian congregation. In the

eyes of the Roman authorities, as has already been pointed out,

Christianity was as yet simply a Jewish sect. The emphatic statement

that Aquila was a Jew applies, as the context shows, not to his

religion but to his race, and the separate mention of Priscilla without

that epithet may be taken to imply, firstly, that she was not Jewish

but Roman, and secondly that she was to play an independent role in the

furtherance of St. Paul's missionary work. Never indeed in the New

Testament is the one name mentioned without the other, and in four out

of the six places in which they occur the name of Prisca or Priscilla

stands first. [26] From this fact the deduction has been made, and in

my opinion rightly, that Prisca was of more honourable position by

birth than her husband, and that she possessed private means which she

freely used in furthering the cause of the Gospel. [27]

I have spoken, not without good reason, of this intercourse which began

in 51 A.D. at Corinth, as being long-continued and intimate. During the

whole of his eighteen months' sojourn in that city St. Paul lived under

their roof, and when he sailed from Cenchraea for Ephesus in the early

spring of 53 A.D. Aquila and Prisca accompanied him. At Ephesus they

took up their abode, Acts, xviii. 11 and 18, 19. and at once set about

active missionary work, while awaiting the Apostle's return some six

months later. During this interval it was by their instrumentality that

the eloquent and learned Apollos was instructed in the full Christian

faith, and probably it was by their advice that he entered upon, what

we know to have been, his fruitful ministry at Corinth. Acts, xviii.

24-27. Throughout the two years and a quarter Acts, xix. 10. that St.

Paul made Ephesus the centre of his labours, Aquila and Prisca resided

there. Probably their house was as before the Apostle's home; in any

case we know that it was a meeting-place in which the faithful gathered

for worship, for in his First Epistle to the Corinthians, I Cor. xvi.

19. which was written from Ephesus some time in the autumn of 55 A.D.,

St. Paul sends the salutations of Aquila and Priscilla and of the

Church that is in their house.' From these his close friends and

fellow-workers, with whom he was for some five or six years in constant

communication, St. Paul would therefore have ample opportunities for

learning much about the condition of the Church in Rome, and this not

only from Aquila and Prisca themselves but from other exiles and the

many travellers and traders from the capital whom he must have met at

their house, and who would bring with them the latest news as to the

state of things in the Imperial City. Among other things would come the

glad tidings of the accession of the young and popular Nero in the

place of Claudius, and of the happy prospects that his reign promised,

a promise that was justified so long as the boy emperor was content in

his public administration to place himself under the guidance of his

wise counsellors Seneca and Burrhus. [28] What is certain is that St.

Paul at the close of his two years' ministry at Ephesus began to look

ahead and to plan fresh schemes of missionary activity. His first task

was to journey through Macedonia to Corinth, where his presence was

called for and needed; his next to pay another visit after a long

absence to Jerusalem, but fter I have been there,' he said, I must see

Rome.' [29] His departure from Ephesus was more hurried than he

expected, for in the riots raised by Demetrius and his fellow-craftsmen

against the Christians and the Jews with whom as usual they were

confounded, [30] Paul seems to have narrowly escaped from the violence

of the angry throng, and to have succeeded in doing so only through the

self-sacrificing courage of Aquila and Prisca, [31] who risked their

own lives in order to save his.

It had been Paul's intention to remain at Ephesus till Pentecost, but

this serious tumult compelled [32] him to leave much earlier in the

year 56 A.D., and at the same time and for the same reasons his friends

Aquila and Prisca may have taken the opportunity to start on their

return journey to Rome, the edict of banishment having now been allowed

to lapse by the conciliatory policy of Nero's advisers. The friendly

Asiarchs, who warned Paul not to adventure himself into the theatre,

would indeed feel it their duty, as soon as the riot was appeased, for

the sake of the peace of the city to insist that both Paul and his

protectors Aquila and Prisca should quit Ephesus for a time. Paul

himself carried out his plan of journeying by way of Troas and Philippi

to Corinth, where he passed the three winter months of 56-57 A.D. The

project of a visit to Rome, so long cherished, so often hindered, now

began to assume a concrete shape in his mind, and the result was the

writing, almost certainly in the early spring of the year 57 A.D., of

the Epistle to the Romans. Now this great epistle stands in the

forefront of the Pauline writings chiefly as a theological treatise,

but apart from its theology it has other claims, as an historical

document of the highest evidential value, deserving from the Church

historian's point of view the closest and most attentive study.

In the first place then this Epistle bears upon its face the clearest

testimony to the existence in 57 A.D. of a distinguished and

well-established Christian Church in Rome, a Church already of some

standing and in which the Gentile element predominated. The mere fact

that the Apostle, at a time when many cares pressed heavily upon him,

[33] took the pains to write this elaborate and carefully reasoned

statement of his doctrinal teaching to a body of Christians that he had

never visited, is evidence to the very important place they occupied in

his thoughts. His words, I thank my God through Jesus Christ for you

all that your faith [34] is proclaimed in all the world,' may be

somewhat hyperbolic, but they mean at any rate that the Roman Church

was well known and highly spoken of in all the various Christian

communities with which St. Paul was acquainted. And the impression

these words convey is emphasised by the Apostle's later declaration

affirming even in stronger terms his personal assent to this widely

received estimate of the character of Roman Christianity, for no

language could be more explicit than this--I am persuaded, my brethren,

I myself also concerning you, that even of yourselves'--i.e. without

any extraneous help derived from such an epistle as I am sending to

you--you are full of goodness, filled with all knowledge, able also to

admonish one another.' [35] Such a declaration implies a conviction

based upon trustworthy evidence, otherwise his readers would be the

first to perceive that here was only high-flown language covering an

empty compliment. Such an utterance from a man and a writer like St.

Paul presupposes an already existing acquaintance with a considerable

number of Roman Christians, whose goodness, knowledge, and sound

judgment he has tested and learnt to appreciate. Indeed it is not too

much to say that Paul in writing this epistle is somewhat oppressed by

a sense that those whom he is addressing--for a reason, which will

appear presently--may possibly think that they have no special need

either of his instruction or of his admonition. His epistle is an

apologia for venturing to be so bold as to propose to pay a visit to

Rome, even though that visit should be no more than a brief pause in

the course of a journey farther west. [36] He evidently had in his mind

the fear that in Rome he had, as a preparatory step, to fight down

disparaging rumours concerning himself, his teaching, and his office,

and that he might be regarded as an intruder. If he had found it

necessary even in Corinth, a Church which he himself had planted, and

where even now he was writing, to defend strenuously his Apostolic

claims and doctrine, [37] how much more in Rome among Christians of old

standing, in whose conversion he had had no hand. So in the

Introductory Salutation St. Paul sets forth his credentials. He is no

mere ordinary apostle, a man commissioned by the Twelve or by some

particular Church to go forth to some limited field of missionary work.

His Apostleship differed from that of their own Junias and Andronicus,

[38] whom later he describes as apostles of note,' differed--perhaps it

is implied--even from that of so eminent a man as Barnabas, [39] in

that he [Paul] like the Twelve had been chosen out and set apart [40]

for the preaching of the Gospel by the Lord Jesus Christ

Himself--chosen and set apart for preaching the Gospel among all

nations and bringing them to the obedience of the faith. [41] And

though the Gospel has already been preached in Rome and with such

success that the faith of the Roman Christians is spoken of everywhere

in terms of praise, yet Rome too lies within the bounds of his

commission, and so he has many times planned, though hitherto always

hindered, to come to them that he might have some fruit amongst them

also. Indeed he calls God to witness that he had prayed continually

that he might be prospered on his way to visit them, that he might be

able to impart to them some spiritual gift for their confirmation.

Immediately, however, adding lest he should offend their

susceptibilities by any assumption of superiority--that is that while I

am amongst you we may be jointly strengthened by the mutual faith of

you and me.' [42]

But if the note of apologia can be discerned here in the introductory

verses, it comes out much more strongly in what may be styled the body

of the epistle. The difficulties of interpretation theologically of the

Apostle's reasoning and arguments, in that grand series of chapters

which end with chapter xi., lie outside my province. Those

difficulties, admittedly very great, are caused in no small degree by

our ignorance of the circumstances, of the persons, parties, questions,

and situation generally with which St. Paul was dealing. We lack in

fact the historical background. It is my present object to try to trace

out from the materials, which the epistle itself supplies in definite

even though in parts but in faint outline, such features of that

background as are discernible through the mist of ages. Leaving on one

side for the present the extremely important autobiographical passage

in chapter xv., also the valuable testimony as to the composition of

the Roman Church furnished by the list of salutations in chapter xvi.,

which require special and separate treatment, we can, I think, make

certain well-grounded assertions concerning the three distinct groups

of persons whom St. Paul had in his thoughts as he wrote this epistle.

These three groups are (1) a body of Jewish Christians, (2) a larger

body of converted Gentiles, (3) the mass of unbelieving Jews. St. Paul

leaves in no doubt that the third group comprised the vast majority of

the Roman Jews, including practically the whole of official Israel. And

what is more, as yet these rabbis, elders, and rulers of the Synagogues

were not so much actively hostile to the preaching of Christianity as

simply deaf, contemptuously indifferent. Those of Group No. 1, the

Jewish Christians, were relatively small in number, but though small

they were divided into two very distinct sections or parties. One of

these sections consisted of Jews like Aquila and others mentioned in

the salutations, who were Paul's friends and fellow-workers; the other,

an extremely influential and energetic section of Judaeo-Christians,

Jews rather than Christians, who, like the Judaisers who are brought

before us in the Epistle to the Galatians and elsewhere, were bitterly

opposed to St. Paul, disputed his Apostolic authority, traduced and

misrepresented his teaching, and denounced him as a renegade from the

faith of his fathers. The Gentiles of the second group formed the chief

element in. the Roman Church. Of these no doubt a certain number had

been converted straight from heathendom, but the assumption which runs

through the epistle, that they were familiar with the Jewish Scriptures

in the Septuagint version, and with the Jewish ceremonial law, would

seem to point to their being largely drawn from the class of

Greek-speaking God-fearers,' which, as I have already stated, in all

the chief towns of the Empire, and conspicuously in Rome, formed a

fringe round the synagogue. If it be asked, what was the impelling

motive which led to the writing of this epistle, and which dictated the

order and character of the arguments, the answer surely is not far to

seek. St. Paul had made up his mind after many hesitations to visit

Rome, but from information that had come to him he was not altogether

happy about the reception he would meet. To the Christian community of

the imperial city as a whole he was a stranger, and as I have said, he

was aware that there was a Judaising faction there busy at their usual

task of stirring up enmity against him. His own words (Rom. iii. 8), as

we are slanderously reported and as some affirm that we say, let us do

evil that good may come,' are a proof that he had been informed that

his great doctrine of Justification by Faith had been seized upon by

these adversaries to represent him as an antinomian. He therefore felt

it to be incumbent upon him to answer at once and in advance these

Judaistic attacks by a full exposition of his teaching on the subject

of Justification by Faith, and at the same time he desired to make

clear what was his real attitude towards many disputed questions

concerning Judaism and the observance of the Mosaic Law, and the

relation between Jew and Gentile in the Church of Christ.

If this be granted then a flood of light is immediately thrown on the

interpretation and import of that central portion of this epistle,

which begins with the words (Rom. ii. 17)--but if thou bearest the name

. . . of Jew and possessest a law to rest upon'--up to the end of

chapter xi. It is unmistakably addressed to Jews. [43] Not to the

strict orthodox Jews of the Synagogues, who in their haughty aloofness

would not be likely either to see or to read the Apostle's arguments.

The Jews addressed were men who had indeed accepted Jesus as the Jewish

Messiah but who perhaps only the more obstinately for that very reason

clung to their Judaism, and hated the thought of losing any of those

exclusive religious privileges, as Israelites, which were their pride

and boast. The doors of the Christian Church, as they conceived it,

might be open to Gentiles, but only if they would consent to be

circumcised and to conform to the ordinances of the Mosaic Law.

But though in form he is addressing himself to Jews, Paul's thoughts

are all the time directed to his Gentile readers, and it is for their

sake and for their edification quite as much as for the persuasion of

his Jewish fellow-countrymen that he step by step leads up to the

establishment of the fundamental principles of the Gospel that he

preached. This is made quite clear by his own words (chap. xi. 13-14):

For it is to you the Gentiles that I am speaking. Nay, more, [44] in so

far as I am the Gentiles' Apostle I make-the-most-of [45] my ministry;

if by any means I may stir to jealousy my own flesh and might save

some.' [46]

The lengthy list of salutations to be found in the first twenty-three

verses of chapter xvi. is a passage of great and peculiar interest

historically, for it enables us to form some estimate, not

conjecturally but positively, concerning the social and racial

composition of the Roman Christian community at this time. It also

gives indirectly an indication of the close relations of intercourse

subsisting between the Churches of the chief cities of the

Mediterranean coast. The very fact of its historical importance has

however caused doubts to be raised by certain critics of the

hypercritical school whether the passage is really an integral part of

the Epistle to the Romans. Its Pauline authorship is not assailed, but

attempts have been made to show that the list where it stands has

(wholly or in part) been displaced and that it should be attached to

some hypothetical epistle addressed at some unknown time to another

Church, most probably to that of Ephesus. It must suffice here to say

that I accept without hesitation the whole of this sixteenth chapter as

an original and authentic portion of the Epistle to the Romans on the

following grounds. First, to quote the words of Professor Kirsopp Lake,

one of the most recent advocates of the Ephesian hypothesis, There is

no trace of any external evidence for doubting that this section has

always belonged to the epistle.' [47] This then is admitted, and it

counts heavily. Secondly, all the names, some of them rare and uncommon

names, contained in the list of salutations have been discovered in the

inscriptions found in the colurnbaria and cemeteries of Rome, of a date

contemporary or nearly contemporary with the date of the epistle: an

evidence in favour of authenticity, which, if not absolutely

conclusive, is at least remarkably convincing. [48] The arguments in

favour of the anti-Roman hypothesis are of a purely a priori character,

and there are only two of them, it seems to me, of weight sufficient to

deserve consideration. The first is the difficulty of imagining that

Paul could possibly have been acquainted with the names of so many

members of a Church he had never visited, and still more that he should

have been able in quite a large proportion of cases to add personal

details. With this argument I have already dealt in part. Besides the

information which he must have acquired from Aquila and Prisca during

those four years they spent together at Corinth and Ephesus, he would

be brought into contact at those two great centres of Mediterranean

traffic with a constant stream of travellers and traders from Rome.

Among these would be Christians, whose first thought would be to find

their way to the friendly house of their banished fellow-citizens.

Criticism here, as in many other instances, has gone astray from its

failure to recognise the great facilities for intercourse in Apostolic

times, especially between cities on the shores of the Mediterranean,

and the freedom with which those facilities were used. The travels of

Apollonius of Tyana as told by Philostratus are a good instance in

point, for Apollonius was a contemporary of St. Paul. The Apostle did

not draw up, we may be sure, this unusually long list of salutations

without an object. Diffident, as he seems to have been, of the welcome

he would receive upon his visit to Rome, may we not regard these

salutations as in some sense a tactful act of diplomacy? He wished to

remind those who are mentioned that he bore them in his remembrance and

affection, and at the same time to bespeak, as it were, their good

offices with their brethren for the time when he actually came amongst

them. [49] That Paul himself could not have made out such a list with

its many details without assistance is possibly true, but that

assistance was at his very side, as his words were being written down.

Very interesting, as a mark of the genuineness of this passage, is the

sudden interpolation, in the midst of the Pauline phrases, of a

salutation from another hand, I, Tertius, the scribe of this epistle,

salute you.' [50] Tertius was then a Roman Christian, and he had

doubtless been chosen by Paul on this occasion to act as his

amanuensis, for this very reason.

The second argument relied upon by the critics is at first sight more

plausible. Paul in writing his First Epistle to the Corinthians from

Ephesus sends salutations from Aquila and Prisca and the Church in

their house, adding according to one group of authorities the words

with whom also I am a guest.' [51] Nothing could be more natural, and

the inference seems to follow that when previously the Apostle was a

guest in their house at Corinth, there likewise that house was a

meeting-place for a Christian congregation. About a year and a quarter

after this Paul, writing from Corinth to the Romans, again sends

salutations to these same fellow-workers (Aquila and Prisca), and then

after a eulogistic reference to their having risked their lives to save

his, and thanking them not only in his own name but in that of all the

Churches of the Gentiles, he proceeds to salute the Church that is in

their house.' Now to the critics with whom I am dealing it appears very

improbable that if Aquila and Prisca had only returned to Rome so

recently there could have been already a Church in their house with the

existence of which St. Paul could have been sufficiently acquainted to

deem it worthy of a special salutation. It is pointed out, moreover,

that in his Second Epistle to Timothy (an epistle, by the by, not

accepted by these same critics as Paul's or contemporary) Paul sends

salutations from Rome to Prisca and Aquila apparently at Ephesus, and

the suggestion is put forward that during the decade which intervened

between the first and last of these salutations the home of this

husband and wife had always been at Ephesus. This being so, this

section of the sixteenth chapter of the Romans cannot belong to the

epistle in which we find it.

It might be thought a sufficient answer to this allegation that

external authority in its favour is confessedly nonexistent--to say

nothing of the fact that tradition with no uncertain voice connects the

names of Prisca and Aquila with definite localities in Rome. [52] But

quite apart from this there is no real difficulty in accepting the

usual interpretation of the salutation.

When the Apostle parted at Ephesus with the faithful companions and

fellow-workers who had been so long of such service to him, one may be

quite sure it would not be without full knowledge on both sides of

their future intentions and plans. On his reaching Corinth a whole

twelve-month at least must have passed, ample time for news to have

come, by some of those using the highway of traffic across the isthmus,

that Aquila and Prisca were again settled at Rome and carrying on their

work there on the same lines as at Corinth and Ephesus. There is

nothing whatever impossible in this, nothing certainly to afford the

slightest pretext for the rejection of a well-authenticated text.

Personally however I do not believe that there is any necessity for

entering upon the consideration of what I venture to call time-table

calculations.' There is nothing in St. Paul's words to warrant us in

assuming that this Church in the house' of Aquila and Prisca was new to

Roman Christianity. The banishment decreed by Claudius was according to

Dion Cassius most leniently carried out and would not involve the

confiscation of property. [53] It is one of those minute points that

are often so significant, that St. Paul speaks of the house at Ephesus

as that of Aquila and Prisca, of the house at Rome as that of Prisca

and Aquila. If Prisca were, as is commonly supposed, when they were

resident at Rome the more important person of the two spouses, and the

owner of property, then the unusual inversion of the names is

explicable. But at Ephesus where they were strangers the house would

naturally be described as that of Aquila and Prisca, the husband's name

standing first in order of precedence. [54]

Since Aquila and Prisca were expelled, it must have been, as I have

already said, because they were recognised leaders of that faction of

Chrestus' of which Suetonius speaks. May one not be justified then in

the assumption that the readiness of the exiles at Corinth and at

Ephesus to offer hospitality and a room for worship in their house was

but the continuation of their previous practice at their Roman home

before their banishment? But if the Church in their house was thus in

existence before 50 A.D., it is scarcely likely that the owners in

their enforced absence would forbid its use. It would but lessen their

sense of separation, if they were thus able to be of continued service

to their poorer Christian brethren in Rome. Such a supposition of

course involves certain assumptions about the state of the Church in

Rome in 50 A.D., but I hope to be able to show that it is a reasonable

assumption, and consistent alike with the positive and traditional data

that we possess. [55] The Epistle to the Romans is itself a proof that

Christianity was firmly established in the metropolis some time before

57 A.D.; there must therefore before that date have been houses where

the faithful met. Tradition mentions only two such places of

assembly--the house of Prisca and Aquila and the house of Pudens. The

localities are still supposed to be marked by the very ancient Churches

of St. Prisca and St. Pudenziana.

Granting then that this list of salutations is addressed to the Roman

community, let us glance very briefly at its general features. A study

of the names enables us to draw the conclusion that the Roman

Christians mainly belonged to the class of Greek-speaking freedmen and

slaves. [56] Certain of these are addressed by the Apostle as kinsmen

(sungeneis), and it is safe to assume that these were Jewish

fellow-countrymen. [57] It is possible that some others not so

designated may have been Jews, but the probability is the other way.

The evidence already adduced points clearly to a hostility to Paul

among the Judaeo-Christians at Rome, which would naturally exclude them

from receiving friendly greetings. Two names in this group deserve

special mention. Salute Andronicus and Junias my kinsmen and my

fellow-prisoners, who are men of mark among the apostles, who also were

in Christ before me' [58] is the remarkable language of the seventh

verse. When and where these two had been Paul's fellow-prisoners we

know not. Paul in his Second Epistle to the Corinthians--only a few

months before--had spoken of frequent imprisonments [59] of which we

know nothing. The very fact that he describes Andronicus and Junias as

men of mark among the apostles' makes it probable that he had

encountered them in his journeys, for the term apostle' at this early

period seems to have been applied generally to delegates sent out with

a commission by some Church for some special field of missionary work,

and to have carried with it as a necessary qualification the possession

of charismatic gifts. [60] But a still greater distinction is conferred

on these two by Paul's admission that they were in Christ before me,'

words which imply that their conversion dated back at least as far as

the days of St. Stephen's activity. Possibly they belonged to that

Synagogue of the Libertines' [61] in which Stephen argued, and

afterwards became, a little later, the first preachers of the Gospel at

Rome. Very interesting are the salutations to the households of

Aristobulus and Narcissus. These would all be freedmen or slaves.

Aristobulus may well have been that grandson of Herod the Great who is

described by Josephus [62] as making his permanent home at Rome. This

is borne out by the salutation to Herodion my kinsman' intervening

between those of the two households. The name suggests a member of the

family to which Aristobulus belonged. Narcissus can scarcely be any

other than the freedman and favourite of Claudius. He had been put to

death some three years before this epistle was written, but his slaves

and dependents, though they would after his execution be incorporated

in the Imperial household, might still retain the distinctive name of

Narcissiani. [63] It is possible that Aristobulus may have been dead in

57 A.D., and have bequeathed his slaves to the emperor. If so, both

these groups would form part of that vast body of freedmen and slaves

known as Caesar's Household, to which St. Paul refers writing from Rome

to the Philippians: all the Saints salute you, specially they of

Caesar's Household.'

How vast a number composed the imperial household may be gathered from

the statement of Lanciani (Ancient Rome in the Light of Recent

Discoveries,' p. 130) that in two columbaria of the servants and

freedmen of Augustus and Livia the remains of no fewer than 6000

persons have been found. The two groups of names in verses 14-15 seem

to indicate that they were members of two smaller households belonging

to private persons. [64] The expression all the Churches of Christ

salute you' (v. 16) is unique in the New Testament, and when taken in

connexion with the language of this epistle elsewhere upon the high

repute of the Roman Church may be held (to quote the words of Dr. Hort)

to signify that that Church was already an object of love and respect

to Jewish and Gentile Churches alike.' [65]

And now we come to a consideration of the all-important autobiographic

passage in the fifteenth chapter, [66] which contains, if rightly

interpreted, an explanation at once of St. Paul's attitude of deference

to the Roman Church and the widespread esteem in which, as he declares,

it was held by its sister Churches. This passage may be regarded as an

expansion of the earlier autobiographic section with which the epistle

opens. The object and the tone are the same, only here the Apostle

enters more into detail. After recounting how from Jerusalem and round

about even to Illyricum I have fully carried the Gospel of Christ, but

in doing so making it my pride-and-care [67] to preach not where Christ

was named lest I should build upon another man's foundation,' Paul

proceeds wherefore also I was hindered many times [68] from coming to

you. But now having no more place in these regions and having had these

many years a keen-longing [69] to come to you, whenever I journey to

Spain [I will come to you] [70] for I hope to see you, as I am

journeying through, and to be sent forward on my way thitherward by you

after I have first in some measure enjoyed-my-fill of your company.'

The meaning of this statement, though the language and sequence of

thought are somewhat involved, is nevertheless, so it seems to me, as

plain and direct as it is possible to be. St. Paul had been hindered

hitherto from visiting Rome, because he had made it a cardinal

principle of his missionary life not to trespass in fields opened out

by other men's labours, in Churches whose foundations others had laid.

May not this ordinance of limitation imposed by the Apostle on himself

afford the explanation of Acts xvi. 6-7, And they went through the

region of Phrygia and Galatia, having been forbidden of the Holy Ghost

to preach the word in Asia; and when they came over against Mysia, they

assayed to go into Bithynia; and the Spirit of Jesus suffered them

not'? If the South Galatian theory be accepted (I myself accept it

unreservedly), it is really remarkable how small a portion of what is

now known as Asia Minor was actually evangelised by St. Paul. [71] Even

now he does not propose to come to Rome with any intention of

undertaking a prolonged spell of missionary work, but merely to pay a

brief passing visit on his journey further west, in order to make the

acquaintance of the Roman Christians, of whom he had heard so much, and

to receive at their hands a friendly and encouraging send-off when he

leaves them for the scene of his new labours in Spain. It has often

been asked, why St. Paul, if he meant that another had preached at Rome

and been the founder of the Roman Church, did not mention his name? The

answer is a very simple one: he was not writing for the information of

students and critics of the twentieth century, but for the Roman

Christians, who knew the facts.

There had then been a founder of this great Church of world-wide fame

with whom Paul was well acquainted and into whose special sphere of

successful preaching he did not think it right to intrude. Who was he?

[72] All tradition answers with one voice the name of St. Peter. In the

next lecture I shall attempt to set forth the grounds on which this

tradition rests, and to show that its acceptance, so far from being

inconsistent with those fragments of early Christian history which have

been preserved to us in the Acts and in the Epistles, serves to

complete and bind them together and to explain much that is otherwise

inexplicable in the rapid spread of Christianity in the three decades

which followed the Great Day of Pentecost.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[1] See Sir W. Ramsay's Article in Hasting's Dict. vol. v. Roads and

Travel in N.T. Times'; his Seven Churches, p. 15, and elsewhere in his

writings. Friedlander, Sittengeschichte Roms, ii. 3; Sanday and

Headlam, Ep. to Rom. p. xxvi; Merivale, St. Paul at Rome, p. 5; Miss C.

Skeet, Travel in the First Century; Renan, Hibbert Lectures, 1850, The

Influence of the Institutions, Thought, and Culture of Rome on

Christianity and the Development of the Catholic Church,' Eng. tr., pp.

17-19.

[2] Cicero (De Officiis, ii. 21) speaks of the number as 2000 in 102

B.C.

[3] At the end of the Republic and under the Empire it was not a rare

thing to meet rich Romans possessing many thousands. Under Augustus a

simple freedman, C. Caecilius Isidorus, although he had lost a

considerable part of his fortune during the civil wars, still left at

his death 4116 slaves. Pliny, Historia Naturalis, xxxiii. 47.

[4] Suetonius, Caesar, 41; Dion Cassius, xliii. 21.

[5] Dion Cassius, lv, 10.

[6] Among the upper classes it had become the fashion to speak and

write Greek; for trade purposes and among the lowest classes of mixed

race a debased Greek was used, as the language most generally

understood. Juvenal, Sat. iii. 60 Non possum ferre, Quirites, Graecam

urbem'; ibid. 62 Jam pridem Syrus in Tiberim defluxit Orontes.' Also

73-80.

[7] Berliner, Abraham (Geschichte der Juden in Rom, one of the best

monographs on the subject), thinks that there must have been Jewish

settlers in Rome before 63 B.C., or else it is difficult to account for

Cicero, when pleading for Flaccus in 59 B.C., affecting to be

intimidated by the crowd of Jews thronging the Aurelian

steps--multitudinem Iudaeorum flagrantium nonnunquam in concionibus'

(Cic. pro Flacco xxviii.), and probably he was right. Cicero however

was no doubt greatly exaggerating his fear for his advocate's purpose.

See Sanday and Headlam, Ep. to Rom. p. xix.

[8] Philo, Leg. ad Caium, 568.

[9] The Transtiberine Ghetto,' which was first removed across the river

in 1556.

[10] Sch�rer, Hist. of the Jewish People in N.T. Times, 2nd Div., vol.

ii. pp. 234, 259, 264. Josephus (Ant. xiv.) gives a number of the

edicts conferring these privileges. See also Suet. Caesar, 42. The

action of Julius Caesar was the more remarkable as he took energetic

steps to repress all collegia which were unable to prove ancient

prescriptive rights and liberty of association generally. Consult also

Harnack, Expansion of Christianity, vol. i. pp. 5-10, 350-371; Fouard,

S. Pierre, c. xiv. Les Juifs de Rome'; Renan, Hibbert Lectures, Eng.

tr., pp. 45-55.

[11] Josephus (Ant. xviii. 5) tells us that the anger of Tiberius was

aroused by the complaint of Saturninus, a friend of the emperor, that

his wife Fulvia, who was a proselyte, had been induced to give money

for the service of the Temple at Jerusalem under false pretences.

Suetonius (Vit. Tib. 36) writes: Iudaeorum iuventutes per speciem

sacramenti in provincias gravioris caeli distribuit, reliquos gentis

eiusdem vel similia sectantes urbe summovit, sub poena perpetuae

servitutis nisi obtemperassent.' Tacitus (Ann. ii. 85) confirms the

account of Josephus about the sending of this body of Jews to Sardinia

and characteristically remarks si ob gravitatem caeli interiissent;

vile damnum.' The action of Tiberius was confined to the Jews of Rome.

[12] Much may be learnt about the position of the Jews in the Empire

and of Caligula's disposition towards them in Philo's Legatio ad Caium,

in which he gives an account of the reception by the emperor of a

deputation from the Jews of Alexandria headed by himself.

[13] Tacitus, Hist. v. 5 Non regibus haec adulatio, non Caesaribus

honor.'

[14] For the Herodian family at Rome see Josephus, Ant. xviii. 5, 6.

[15] Harnack, Expansion of Christianity, i. 7-11; Sch�rer, 2 Div. ii.

220-242; Allard, Hist. de Pers�c. c. i. sec. 1; Hardy, Studies in Roman

Hist. pp. 14-28; Workman, Persecutions in Early Church, pp. 108-115.

[16] These people, described in the Acts and elsewhere as sebomenoi (or

phoboumenoi) ton Theon or simply as sebomeeoi, were by Sch�rer, in the

1st ed. of his Geschichte d. J�dischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu

Christi, described as being the Proselytes of the Gate' of the Talmud.

He followed the commonly received opinion. He has however since then,

by a careful study of inscriptions, been led to change his opinion. In

his 4th ed. 1909 (iii. 173 ff.) he is able to show that the term

proselyte of the gate' was not used until a much later period than that

with which we are dealing, and that the real meaning is that given

above, heathen who had partially adopted Judaism, but without becoming

proselytes. See Kirsopp Lake, Early Epistles of St. Paul, pp. 37-39.

[17] The synagogues in Rome were each separately organised and

independent. The entire body of Jews of the capital were not allowed,

as at Alexandria, to form a state within a state, self-administered

with an Alabarch at their head. The names of seven synagogues have been

discovered in the inscriptions of the ancient Jewish cemeteries: (1)

Augousteseon, (2) Agrippesion, (3) Bolumni, (4) Kampesion, (5)

Sibouresion, (6) Aibreon, (7) Elaias. The first two were probably the

synagogues of the households of Augustus and Agrippa. The fourth and

fifth belong to Jewish settlements on the outskirts of the Campus

Martius and in the crowded Suburra. The third may have been built by

some one of the name of Volumnus, or have been associated with him in

some unknown way. The seventh, the synagogue of the Olive Tree, may

have suggested the simile of Rom. xi. 17-24. The sixth inscription does

not seem to have referred to any special synagogue but to have been a

generic term, a synagogue of the Hebrews (or Jews).' In addition to

settlements in the Suburra and near the Campus Martius, the discovery

of two ancient Jewish cemeteries on the Appian Way, one of them close

to the Porta Capena, bears evidence to yet another Jewish colony at

this point, not inconsiderable in numbers. The Transtiberine, however,

was always by far the largest of the Jewish quarters. See Sch�rer, 2

Div., ii. 247-249; Fouard, S. Pierre, pp. 316-322; Garrucci, Cimetero

degli antichi Ebrei in Roma, and Marucchi, Elements d'Arch�ologie

Chr�tienne, vol. ii. pp. 208-226, 259-274.

[18] For the chronology of these Lectures see Note A of the Appendix.

[19] Tertullian (Apol. xxi.) says that the Church until the time of

Nero's persecution grew up under the shadow of the synagogue: quasi sub

umbraculo religionis insignissimae certe licitae.'

[20] Suet. Calig. 57. See also for later notices of Laureolus, Jos.

Ant. xix. 18; Martial, Spect. 7; Tertullian, Valent. 14. In Mayor's

Juvenal, vol. ii. p. 40, the following note appears to Sat. viii. 167:

Laureolum Schol. In ipso mimo Laureolo figitur crux unde vera cruce

dignus est Lentulus, qui tanto detestabilior est quanto melius gestum

imitatus est scenicum. . . . Hic Lentulus nobilis fuit et suscepit

servi personam in agendo mimo.'

[21] Suet. Claudius, 25 Iudaeos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantes

Roma expulit.'

[22] CIL. vi. 10233. The following inscription, which I came across,

seemed to me specially interesting from the collocation of the names

Chrestus and Paula. P. �lius Chrestus et Cornelia Paula hoc scalare

adplicitum huic sepulchro quod emerunt a fisco agente Agathonico proc

[-uratore] Augustorum nostrorum quod habet scriptura infra scripta.

Gentiano et Basso cons. vii Kal. April.' Date, 211 A.D.

[23] Tert. Apol. 3: Sed ut cum perperam Chrestianos pronuntiatur a

vobis, nam nec nominis certa est notitia penes vos'; Lact. Inst. Divin.

iv. 17: Sed exponenda huius nominis [Christi] ratio est propter

ignorantium errorem, qui eum immutata litera Chrestum solent dicere.'

Compare the title Le Roy tr�s Chr�stien of the French Kings.

[24] Dion Cassius, lx. 6: tous te Ioudaious, pleonasantas authis

chalepos an aneu taraches hupo tou ochlou sphon tes poleos eirchthenai,

ouk exelase men, to de de patrio nomo bio chromenous, ekeleuse me

sunathroizesthai. tas te hetaireias epanachtheisas hupo tou Gaiou

dieluse.

[25] I.e. a native of the Roman Province of Pontus.

[26] For further details about Prisca and Aquila see Appendix, Note B.

It is noteworthy that St. Paul according to the authority of the best

authenticated readings always calls the wife Prisca, while St. Luke

names her Priscilla. Both writers, except in one case, I Cor. xvi. 19,

place the name of the wife first. St. Luke is wont to use the

diminutive forms of names, which were usual in conversation, i.e.

Priscilla, Silas, Sopatros; St. Paul the forms Prisca, Silvanus,

Sosipatros. See Ramsay, St. Paul the Traveller, pp. 267-8.

[27] Plumptre, Biblical Studies, p. 417; Hort, Romans and Philippians,

pp. 12-14; Ramsay, St. Paul the Traveller, pp. 253 f., 267 f.; Zahn,

Intr. to N.T. i. 263, etc. etc.

[28] For the good government of the Empire during the first five years

of Nero's reign, known in history as the quinquennium of Nero, see

Henderson's Life and Principate of the Emperor Nero.

[29] Acts, xix, 21.

[30] Acts, xix. 33-4.

[31] Rom. xvi. 34: Aspasasthe Priskan kai Akulan tous sunergous mou en

Christo Iesou, hoitines huper tes psuches mou ton heauton trachelon

hupethekan. Comp. 2 Cor. i. 8. The group of MSS. D, E, F, G, add par

hois kai psenizomaa, pointing to the tradition in the Western Church

that St. Paul lived at Ephesus in the house of Aquila and Prisca.

[32] Acts, xix. 31.

[33] 2 Cor. ii. 4, 5, 13; iv. 8-11; xi. 27-28; xii. 10, 20-21; Acts,

xx. 19-25.

[34] 2 Rom. i. 8: he pistis humon = your profession of Christianity.

[35] Rom. xv. 14: Pepeismai de, adelphoi mou, kai autos ego peri humon,

hoti kai autoi mestoi este agathosunes, pepleromenoi pases gnoseos,

dunamenoi kai allelous nouthetein. Notice the emphatic position of kai

autos ego. Compare xvi. 19: he gar humon hupakoe eis pantas aphiketo.

[36] Rom. xv. 24.

[37] 2 Cor. x. 12-18; xii. 11-13; and elsewhere.

[38] Rom. xvi. 7.

[39] There are grounds, as will appear in the sequel, for believing

that Barnabas had already visited Rome.

[40] Rom. i. 1: kletos apostolos, aphorismenos eis euangelion theou.

[41] Rom. i. 5: di hou [Iesou Christou tou kuriou hemon] elabomen

charin kai apostolen eis hupakoen pisteos en pasin tois ethnesin.

[42] Rom. i. 12: touto de estin sunparaklethenai en humin dia tes en

allelois pisteos humon te kai emou. See Zahn, Int. to N.T. pp. 355-8,

369. Kirsopp Lake, Early Epist. of St. Paul, pp. 378-9.

[43] Rom. ii. 17-29; iii. 1, 2; iv. 1. That this body of

Judaeo-Christians were still active in Rome, and doing their utmost at

a later time to counteract St. Paul's influence and oppose his

teaching, see Phil. i. 15, 16; iii. 1-6. It was to these same Jews that

chap. xiv. 1-23 appears to have been addressed. The extreme

particularity about meats and rigid asceticism were characteristic of

the party of the circumcision. See Zahn, Int. to N.T. pp. 366-7.

[44] So Sanday and Headlam give the force of the men oun in this verse.

Commentary on Romans, p. 324.

[45] Lit. glorify.

[46] On St. Paul's attitude towards Jewish Christianity and Judaism see

the extremely interesting section of Harnack's Neue Untersuchungen sur

Apostelgeschichte, 1911 (Eng. tr. by Rev. J. R. Wilkinson in Crown

Theol. Lib.), pp. 28-47. Of the evidence supplied by that section of

the Epistle to the Romans from which these words are taken, Harnack

writes: Der Grosse Abschnitt--c. 9-11--ist aus der Feder eines Juden

geflossen der mit allen Fasern seiner Seele an seinem Volke h�ngt' (p.

31). And again concerning the simile of the olive-tree in c. xi.: Man

beachte wohl, das (gl�ubige) Israel kata sarka ist and bleibt "der g�te

�lbaum" (gegen�ber dem wilden �lbaum der Heiden); jeder Israelit ist

ein "naturlicher Zweig" dieses guten �lbaums, wenn er auch unter

Umst�nden abgehauen werden muss, and er d.h. das gl�ubige Israel kata

sarka ist die Wurzel an deren Safte and Fettigkeit die eingepropften

wilden Sch�sslinge teilnehmen und die sie tr�gt' (p. 32). See also the

quotation from Herzog in note. I have already pointed out the

possibility that the name of one of the Roman synagogues The Olive

Tree' may have suggested this simile to St. Paul.

[47] Kirsopp Lake, The Early Epistles of St. Paul, their motive and

origin, p. 325 ff.

[48] Sanday and Headlam, Ep. to Romans, pp. xciii-xcv; Lightfoot, Ep.

to Philippians, see dissertation on Caesar's Household, pp. 169-176.

[49] Zahn (Int. to N.T. i. 388) says: Who does not see that all these

personal references are due to Paul's desire to make the Church feel

that it is not such a stranger to him as it seems, and at the same time

are indications of an effort on his part to bring himself into closer

touch with the Church where as yet he was really a stranger?'

[50] Rom. xvi. 22.In the first-century Cemetery of Priscilla close to

the mausoleum of the noble family of the Acilii there may be seen

to-day a Greek inscription in red (a proof of its very early date):

TERTIADELPhE

EUPsUChIOUDIC

AThANATOC

The Tertius here mentioned is probably not St. Paul's amanuensis, but

there is no reason why he should not be. It is interesting that a

well-authenticated tradition places the tombs of Aquila and Prisca in

the vicinity of this inscription. Horace Marucchi, El�ments

d'Arch�ologie Chr�tienne, ii. 419. See also i. 104.

[51] par hois kai xenizomai. D, F, lat, goth, Bede.

[52] The Church of St. Prisca and the Cemetery of Priscilla. See

Appendix, Special Note B.

[53] Relegatio, not deportatio. Dion Cassius, lx. 6.

[54] See Zahn, Int. to N.T. p. 390, for a useful comment on the

movements of Aquila and Prisca.

[55] See Marucchi, El�ments d'Arch�ologie Chr�tienne, iii. p. 180 ff

and 364 ff.

[56] They would consist of people of every nationality, but among those

converted to Christianity probably a large proportion were Orientals by

race.

[57] Compare Rom. ix. 3: euchomen gar anathema einai autos ego apo tou

christou huper ton adelphon mou, ton sungenon mou kata sarka, hoitines

eisin Israelitai.

[58] aspasasthe Andronikon kai Iounian tous sungeneis mou kai

sunaichmalotous mou, hoitines eisin episemoi en tois apostolois, ohi

kai pro emou gegonan en Christo. It is possible that Iounian might be

feminine = Junia, but it is generally taken as masculine, Junias an

abbreviation for Junianus.

[59] 2 Cor. xi. 23: en phulakais perissoteros.

[60] See Harnack, Expansion of Christianity, i. 398-412; Lightfoot,

Epistle to Galatians, p. 93; Kirsopp Lake, Early Epistles of St. Paul,

pp. 108-110. Comp. 2 Cor. viii. 23: apostoloi ekklesion.

[61] Acts, vi. 9. Andronicus and Junias may, of course, have been among

the strangers of Rome, Jews and Proselytes,' who were converted on the

Great Day of Pentecost.

[62] Josephus, Ant. xx. 1. 2; Bell. Iud. ii. 11. 6.

[63] Lightfoot, Epistle to Philippians, Dissertation on Caesar's

Household, p. 169; Sanday and Headlam, Romans, pp. 405-6.

[64] Lanciani (p. 132) says that in certain columbaria on the Esquiline

at least 370 members of the household of Statilius Taurus are buried.

[65] Sanday and Headlam, Romans, pp. 128-9; Hort, Romans and Ephesians,

i. 52.

[66] Rom. xv. 14-29.

[67] v. 20 philotimoumenon = (lit.) priding myself, or endeavouring

earnestly.

[68] dio kai enekoptomen ta polla tou elthein pros humas. ta polla

seems to be the equivalent of the pollakis of i. 13 = the many times to

which I have already referred: ou thelo de humus agnoein, adelphoi,

hoti pollakis proethemen elthein pros humas kai ekoluthen achri tou

deuro.'

[69] epipothian.

[70] These words are omitted in the best MSS., but are necessary to

complete the sense.

[71] Bigg, Comment on 1 Peter, pp. 73-4.

[72] Professor Kirsopp Lake in his Early Epistles of St. Paul, pp.

378-9, writes: St. Paul clearly implies that the Roman Church was

another man's foundation, and that he had hitherto refused to preach in

such places where others had made a beginning: this was the reason why

he had never yet been to Rome. "Wherefore" he says "I was greatly

hindered from coming to you." That "you" implies that the Church was

someone else's foundation and the "wherefore" explains that this was

his reason for not coming. He then goes on to explain why he now

proposes to depart from his principle: there is now "no place left for

him in these districts," i.e. from Jerusalem to Illyricum. Thus with a

proper exegesis the meaning of this passage is that the Church of Rome

was founded by some one else, and the question will always remain, why

not St. Peter?' A remarkable admission on the part of this writer.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

LECTURE II

Romans, x. 14: How shall they call on Him, in whom they have not

believed? And how shall they believe in Him whom they have not heard?

And how shall they hear without a preacher?'

The narrative of St. Luke in that earlier part of the Acts of the

Apostles which leads up and is introductory to the main theme of the

work is obviously fragmentary. The object of the writer however stands

out clearly. He intended to give such an account, step by step, of the

beginnings of Christianity, as was necessary for a full understanding

of the life-work and missionary labours of St. Paul up to the time of

his captivity at Rome. Every episode appears to have been carefully

selected with a definite and precise purpose, and if the story, as told

by him, seems at times to be tantalisingly brief and scanty, even

disjointed, we must remember that those for whom it was written had

access to oral sources of information from persons who had witnessed or

taken part in the events described, which would place each episode in

its proper setting and give to it its rightful significance. This we

cannot do now, but if we bear in mind that not only the facts recorded

by Luke but even his silences are suggestive, we may, I think, by the

help of evidence gathered in from various sources, from contemporary or

nearly contemporary writings, from the accumulated results of

archaeological research, and from well-authenticated tradition, be able

to show that the spread of Christianity during the period covered by

the Acts was not by any means confined to the sphere of Paul's

activity, nor intended to be so confined, but that one most important

field was reserved for the Apostle who fills the foreground of the

Lucan narrative up to the year 42 A.D. and then, except for a single

brief appearance, is seen no more.

It is, of course, evident from what I have said that I am assuming that

St. Luke the physician, the travelling companion of St. Paul, was the

author of the Acts of the Apostles. I do so without feeling that such

an assumption at the present time requires defence. In these lectures

it is my aim, as far as possible, to avoid the mere collecting or

comparing of other men's opinions, or the balancing of the authority of

one set of scholars against another. It is the results of personal

investigation into the history of the Church in Rome in the first

century that I am now specially desirous of bringing before you, not a

recapitulation of what has recently been written about that history. My

own experience has taught me that the only way to arrive at conclusions

in historical questions satisfying to the historical conscience is to

study the original authorities for oneself with an independent mind,

using indeed all the light and all the suggestions that modern critical

scholarship can throw upon the many problems and difficulties that have

to be solved, but never accepting any of the so-called results of

criticism' without testing for oneself with the greatest care and at

first hand the grounds on which they are supposed to rest.

The case for the Lucan authorship of the Third Gospel and of the Acts I

consider however to have been so thoroughly established by the

remarkable series of works published by Sir William M. Ramsay [73] and

Dr. Adolf Harnack [74] upon the subject, as to have been placed, if not

beyond the reach of controversy--for alas ! the spirit of controversy

is not quickly laid--on a solid bedrock of reasoned and exhaustive

argument against which the waves of controversy will beat in vain. And

not merely have they proved the unity of authorship. They have shown

that we have in St. Luke a cultured writer possessed of literary power

and historical grasp and well acquainted with the details of Roman

provincial administration and of the distinct characteristics,

geographical and political, of different localities, who in a

considerable part of his work speaks as an eyewitness, and who

elsewhere uses first-hand evidence, if at times with a certain freedom,

yet always with honesty and intelligence. My own conviction that the

book of the Acts must have been written during St. Paul's first

captivity at Rome and completed before his release has long been firmly

held, but this conviction has been strengthened and deepened by the

extraordinarily powerful way in which Dr. Harnack [75] has quite

recently set forth in serried array the reasons which have slowly

driven him to abandon his earlier prepossessions on this question, and

forced him (in spite of the knowledge that he was--to use his own

words--creating a revolution within the domain of criticism' [76] ) to

fix on grounds alike of external and of internal evidence the end of

St. Paul's imprisonment as the date when the Acts, in the form we now

possess the book, was finished.

It is needless to say that the acceptance of such a conclusion has a

very important bearing on the subject of these lectures. For, if St.

Luke wrote the Acts at Rome, the work must have been written in the

first instance for the Roman Christians, but if so the question

naturally arises, why should there be a total omission in the book of

any reference to the founding of the Church in Rome or to the names of

those who first preached the Gospel in that city? This is one of those

silences of St. Luke, of which I have spoken already as being

suggestive. A comparison of the last verses of the Third Gospel and of

the Acts may help us to an answer. [77] Had the Gospel stood alone all

commentators and critics would have asserted unanimously that the

Evangelist believed the Ascension of our Lord to have taken place on

the evening of the day of the Resurrection. [78] But from the opening

passage of the Acts we learn that they would have been wrong, and that

St. Luke in the conclusion of his Gospel deliberately foreshortened the

events of six weeks in this way, because he intended to take up the

thread of the story and fill in the details later. The. similar

foreshortening of the events of two years, which we find in Acts

xxviii. 30-1, suggests that St. Luke in writing this otherwise

strangely puzzling and abrupt ending to his narrative had already

planned in his mind a third book, which should supplement the Acts as

the Acts had supplemented the Gospel, and that this book would have

begun by taking up the account of Peter's life-work, so sharply broken

off at his release from prison, and that a brief sketch would have been

given of the history of the Church in Rome previous to St. Paul's two

years'ministry during his captivity.

With this preface let us now turn to those introductory chapters of the

Acts in which St. Luke sketches for us the steps by which Christianity

emerged from the condition of a strictly Jewish sect to that of a

universal religion intended for all mankind. It will be seen that the

enlargement of view, which is so clearly traced, was very gradual; that

it came from below rather than from above; from the subordinates, to

some extent from the rank and file, rather than from the acknowledged

leaders. On the Great Day of Pentecost when St. Luke so carefully

enumerates the various nationalities from which the great crowd of

pilgrims was drawn, it should be noted that St. Peter addresses them as

Men of Israel,' and his whole discourse is that of a man concerned only

with proving to an assembly of Jews that Jesus of Nazareth was the

promised Messiah of their sacred Scriptures. The passage is in fact a

striking testimony both to the wide extent of the Jewish Diaspora and

to the fact of the intense love and reverence for the Holy City and for

the injunctions of the Mosaic Law, which brought together such a throng

of worshippers from far-distant regions, including people speaking many

different tongues, to this feast at Jerusalem. In the list of those

forming St. Peter's audience we find the names of six different peoples

and the inhabitants of nine different districts, and it is implied that

Jews from these various places had come up specially for the

occasion--with one exception. The phrase the sojourning Romans, Jews as

well as proselytes' seems capable of only one interpretation, that St.

Luke is here referring to a body of Roman Jews and converts to Judaism,

who were temporarily residing in Jerusalem, and whom it may be

permitted with considerable probability to identify with the Synagogue

of the Libertines' [79] mentioned in Acts vi. 9. Among this body may

have been numbered the Roman Christians Junias and Andronicus, who were

some quarter of a century later saluted by St. Paul in his Epistle to

the Romans as men of mark among the Apostles and who were in Christ

before me.'

In his record of the period that follows St. Luke makes it quite clear

that the first organised Christian community was at Jerusalem, not in

Galilee. [80] After the day of Pentecost when certain of the multitude

exclaimed Are not all these that speak Galilaeans?'--there is not a

word in the Acts to indicate that the early Church had any connexion

with Galilee. The Twelve, whose authority, as being derived directly

from the Lord, no one called in question, made Jerusalem their

headquarters from this time forward, and from this centre carried on

their mission work. But that mission work was limited to. Jews. The

Twelve, moreover, we are expressly told, visited the Temple regularly

[81] and they seem to have conformed in every way to the regulations of

the Mosaic Law, and to have differed from the Jews amongst whom they

lived only in that they taught that the crucified Jesus, to whose

Resurrection from the Dead they bore personal testimony, had by His

Resurrection proved Himself to be the Messiah. [82] Among the Twelve

St. Peter on every occasion takes the lead and is the spokesman of the

rest, and occupies a position of undisputed pre-eminence. [83] In all

that they did during these years, which immediately followed their

Lord's departure from them, it is scarcely possible that these personal

disciples should not have been acting in strict accordance with their

Master's last commands. Eventually they were to go forth upon a wider

mission to the nations, but for awhile--an ancient tradition of

considerable weight says definitely for twelve years [84] --they were

to abide at Jerusalem, and restrict themselves to proclaiming in its

simplest form the message of the Gospel to the Palestinian Jews,

meanwhile resting in the promise that in the future whenever fresh

calls should be made upon them they should receive illumination and

guidance from the Holy Spirit. [85]

Not until the sixth chapter of the Acts do we find any indication of a

widening of view. But here reading between the lines of the brief

narrative one cannot but feel something more than a suspicion that the

movement of which the appointment of the Seven was the outcome, and at

the head of which St. Stephen placed himself, was not one with which

the Twelve were at the time in entire sympathy. The work to which St.

Stephen specially addressed himself was the preaching of the Gospel to

the members of those Synagogues which were set apart for the use of the

Hellenistic settlers and sojourners in Jerusalem, i.e. for Jews of

foreign origin, speaking a foreign tongue, and trained amidst Gentile

associations. Those mentioned seem to belong in order of importance to

the chief Jewish Colonies of the Dispersion. The first place, be it

noted, is assigned to the Libertines or Roman freedmen, men conspicuous

probably alike for their wealth and their close connexion with the

Imperial City. Then come the Alexandrians, members of a Jewish

settlement of ancient date and high culture, in numbers exceeding

probably the entire population of Palestine. [86] And after them the

Cyrenians, [87] second only to the Alexandrians in number, and like

them thoroughly Hellenised. Lastly, mention is made of those of Cilicia

and Asia--traders no doubt connected by ties of family and business

with those characteristically Graeco-Asiatic cities, Tarsus and

Ephesus. Among such a body of Hellenists' the message of the Gospel

would naturally be interpreted in a larger and more universal sense

than in those stricter Hebrew' circles to which as yet the Twelve had

chiefly directed their appeal.

What we do know is that St. Stephen's ardour and activity and the

special character of his teaching speedily aroused the intense enmity

of the Jewish rulers. He was seized, brought before the Sanhedrim, and

without proper trial or condemnation in a sudden outburst of fanatic

fury stoned to death. It was the signal for a persecution which

scattered far and wide those who had attached them-selves to him and

the doctrines that he taught. [88]

But fierce though the persecution was, St. Luke expressly tells us, it

did not touch the Twelve. They were all,' we read scattered abroad,

except the Apostles.' [89] Apparently at this time the accusers of

Stephen did not regard the Twelve, and the Judaeo-Christians who held

with them, as men speaking against this Holy Place and trying to change

the customs that Moses hath delivered unto us.' As yet they (the

original Apostles) seem not to have offended the susceptibilities of

the High-Priestly caste by any neglect in their outward observance of

the rites and ceremonies of the Jewish law. But tliis scattering abroad

of the friends and disciples of Stephen was to be, under God's

providence, gradually productive of great results. It led directly to

the conversion of Saul the persecutor. It brought Philip, one of the

Seven, to Samaria, where many were converted by his preaching. Such

indeed was his success that for the first time the Apostles broke

through their rule of confining themselves to Jerusalem and its

neighbourhood, and Peter and John, the two leaders, were sent to take

official charge of the new field of missionary operations. And there at

Samaria (mark the emphasis Luke lays upon the incident) Peter was

confronted with the man who, under the name of Simon Magus, was

according to tradition to exercise a large, perhaps a decisive,

influence upon his action at a critical point in his career. [90]

Nor was this all. After an interval, probably of some three years, [91]

we find that persecution has for the time entirely ceased, and that

already the Christian Church is peacefully and firmly established

throughout the whole of Judaea, Galilee and Samaria, [92] and Peter

engaged on a tour of visitation in all parts. [93] Finally he reaches

Joppa and there takes up his abode for some time in the house, we are

told, of one Simon a tanner. Now this very fact, that the Apostle chose

to reside with a man whose trade in the eyes of strict orthodox Judaism

was unclean, points to the advance he had already made in casting

himself loose from the fetters of Jewish prejudice. The vision which

sent him to Cornelius was probably the reflection of the doubts and

questionings which had been previously filling his thoughts and an

answer to his prayers. [94] It was a preparation for that which was to

follow, for his visit to the Roman centurion was not merely to teach

him that the law which forbade intercourse between Jew and Gentile was

henceforth done away, but to open his eyes to the startling and

all-important fact that it was the revealed will of God that

uncircumcised Gentiles should be admitted to the full privileges of

Christianity. The question how far such Gentiles would have to conform

to the Jewish law was indeed not yet settled, nor was it to be settled

without much prolonged and even embittered controversy in the years

that were to come. The collocation by St. Luke in juxtaposition of the

defence of St. Peter [95] to the brethren at Jerusalem for his action

in regard to Cornelius, and of the news reaching those same brethren

that certain men from Cyprus and Cyrene, on their own initiative,

without sanction or authority from the Mother Church, were preaching to

the Greeks at Antioch and had converted a large number of them to the

faith, [96] was clearly intentional. St. Peter's apologia was

apparently somewhat grudgingly accepted, for there is little of

spontaneous enthusiasm about the words--and when they had heard these

things they held their peace and glorified God, saying "Then also--ara

ge kai--to the Gentiles hath God granted repentance unto life."'

On receiving information, therefore, about what was occurring at

Antioch, it was only natural that those at the head of the Church in

Jerusalem should determine to send to the Syrian capital one of their

own body with instructions to inquire personally into the truth of the

reports that had reached them, and to establish official control over a

movement which seemed at first sight to be revolutionary, and which was

in fact a long step in advance towards a totally new conception of the

mission of Christianity in the world.

Joseph, surnamed Barnabas, whom they selected as their emissary, was a

man singularly well qualified for dealing wisely and sympathetically

with the new situation. He had been intimately associated from the very

first with the Jerusalem Church. [97] He was at once a Levite and a

Cypriote Hellenist, and the surname which was given to him by the

Apostles themselves tells us that he was a man endowed with prophetic

gifts for the exposition and interpretation of Scripture. [98] And he

was to remain for some years, probably to the end of his life, a

mediator and reconciler between the opposing schools of thought and

ideals of Christianity associated later with the names of St. James and

St. Paul. It is noteworthy how large a part Barnabas, who had now gone

to Antioch as the representative of the Church at Jerusalem, took in

preparing the way for him who was to be pre-eminently the Apostle of

the Gentiles. The two men may possibly have first become friends in

their youth, when Saul of Tarsus was studying at the feet of Gamaliel.

In any case when Saul, three years after his memorable conversion, came

up to Jerusalem to make the acquaintance of Peter, he found, perhaps

not unnaturally, that the brethren looked askance at the erstwhile

persecutor, until Barnabas took him by the hand and, as it were, stood

voucher for his good faith. [99] His reception, however, on this

occasion appears to have been so far discouraging that Saul withdrew

for a considerable time to his native place Tarsus. Thither Barnabas

after a brief sojourn at Antioch now went to seek in his retirement the

man whom he knew to be specially well fitted to act as his colleague at

this juncture. His judgment and prevision were more than justified. For

a whole year, we read in the Acts, Barnabas and Saul taught with such

success that the assemblies of the faithful, whether of Jewish or

Gentile origin, met together harmoniously and in such numbers [100]

that even in this vast city, [101] of mixed population, professing

every known variety of religion, the new sect became sufficiently large

and well known to attract public attention. The scoffing nick-name,

Christiani, was now for the first time given to the disciples of Jesus

by the pagan Antiocheans--a term of shame and reproach, which soon was

to become a title of glory.

While at Antioch under the leadership of Barnabas the preaching of the

Gospel was thus making rapid progress, events were taking place in

Judaea of critical importance for the future of the Church. The peace

which the Christians in Palestine enjoyed in the period preceding the

conversion of Cornelius had been due, not to any increase of good-will

on the part of the Jewish rulers, but to the fact that thesewere too

much occupied at that time with their own serious troubles. The order

given by the Emperor Caligula to place his statue in the Holy of Holies

had filled the whole nation with horror and made them resolve rather to

be massacred than allow such a profanation of the Temple. [102] The

assassination of Caligula alone averted a general revolt. According to

Josephus, Herod Agrippa, who was then in Rome, played a very important

part in securing the peaceful accession of Claudius, who rewarded him

for his services by bestowing upon him, in addition to Galilee, Peraea

and the territory beyond the Jordan with which he had been invested by

Caligula, also Judaea, Samaria and Abilene, making his kingdom thus

equal in extent to that of his grandfather Herod the Great. [103]

Claudius became emperor, January 24, 41 A.D., and towards the end of

that year King Agrippa went to Palestine with the intention of using

every means to ingratiate himself with his new subjects. He was

especially desirous of impressing them with his careful observance of

the Mosaic law and his zeal for the national religion, being to some

extent suspect through his long residence in Rome and alien descent.

[104] Accordingly having gone to Jerusalem to keep the first Passover

after his accession, he resolved to give a signal mark of his fervour

as a defender of the faith, by the summary execution of James the son

of Zebedee. Possibly he was the only one of the Christian leaders on

whom for the moment he could lay hands. But finding his action had

pleased the Jews, he proceeded to arrest Peter also, and, as the days

of unleavened bread had already begun, he placed the Apostle in prison

under the strictest guard with the intention of bringing him forth

before the people as soon as the Passover was over. [105] The story of

his escape as told by St. Luke, which ends so abruptly, has every

internal mark of having been derived directly from the maid-servant

Rhoda, whose name is otherwise so unnecessarily mentioned. We learn

from this graphic narrative that the house in Jerusalem where the

disciples were accustomed to hold their gatherings for prayer was that

of Mary, the mother of John Mark, and the aunt of Barnabas. It was to

this house that the Apostle naturally turned his steps, as soon as he

found himself outside the prison gates, but with no intention of

remaining in so well known a spot. As he entered the room with a

movement of his hand he at once checked their cries of astonishment,

briefly told his tale, probably almost in the rapid words recorded,

asked his hearers to repeat it to James and the brethren, and then

immediately, while it was still dark, he went out to betake himself to

a more secure hiding-place. And as the Apostle disappears into the

obscurity of the night, so does he, so far as his active career is

concerned, disappear henceforth from the pages of St. Luke's history.

There are difficulties in this brief account of the Herodian

persecution of the spring of 42 A.D. There is no hint that the Twelve

were at Jerusalem at this critical time. St. Peter himself does not

seem to have been there when St. James was beheaded. His parting words

point to two conclusions: (1) that the other James, the Lord's Brother,

was already the recognised head of the Jerusalem community; and (2)

that the speaker had no expectation of being able to tell his tale to

James and the brethren' in person. The explanation however lies to our

hand, if we accept the ancient and well-attested tradition of which I

have already spoken, that the Lord Jesus had bidden his Apostles to

make Jerusalem the centre of their missionary activity for twelve

years, after which they were to disperse and go forth to preach to the

nations. Already before Herod Agrippa struck his blow the Twelve had

begun to set out each one to his allotted sphere of evangelisation, the

care of the Mother Church being confided to James, the Lord's Brother,

assisted by a body of presbyters, of whom he was one, but over whom he

presided with something of monarchical authority. It would be an

anachronism to give him the Gentile title of Bishop, but in this

earliest constitution of the Jerusalem Church we have the model which

other Churches were to follow and out of which episcopacy grew.

But even if this be granted, it throws no light on the after-life of

St. Peter.

For his after-life we have again to fall back mainly upon tradition, a

tradition already referred to by me at the close of my first lecture,

which makes St. Peter to have been the founder of the Church in Rome.

St. Paul in his Epistle to the Romans, as I have shown, speaks of that

Church as already in 57 A.D. long established and of world-wide repute,

into which as being built on another man's foundation he had not

thought it right to intrude. [106] The question then arises, what

grounds are there for believing that the man to whom he refers was St.

Peter?

Now there are traditions and traditions. First let it be premised that

we are not dealing here with a tradition handed down orally by

illiterate people. Not that oral tradition is to be neglected or

despised. There is abundant evidence to show with what accuracy

historical traditions including long lists of names have been handed

down from generation to generation even among tribes unacquainted with

writing. After describing the pre-Hispanic civilisation in Peru, a

recent writer remarks: It is not surprising, in spite of the fact that

no form of writing was known, that the people capable of such political

organisation had pre-served in traditional form much of their early

history. Feats of memory, which seem almost miraculous to civilised

races, who have become dependent on written records, have been

chronicled of several peoples below the Peruvians in the scale of

culture. The nobility among the Polynesians received regular

instruction in their past history, and the chiefs could repeat long

genealogies, which had been faith-fully handed down from generation to

generation. Even among African races traditional records are not

unknown, and in one case a list of even one hundred chiefs, together

with historical details, has been recently obtained from a tribe in the

heart of the Southern Belgian Congo.' [107] In the first century,

however, in Rome and in all the chief centres of population, where the

early Christian Churches were established, writing was familiarly

employed by all classes. At one time it was assumed, with an assurance

that had absolutely no basis, that the events of early Christian

history could only have been known through oral transmission, that it

was most unlikely that anything was committed to writing at the time,

and the idea that the separate Churches kept any records of the

appointment of their officers, or any statements concerning the various

vicissitudes of their fortunes, was dismissed as untenable. There is a

very strong body of opinion,' said Sir W. Ramsay [108] about nine years

ago, that the earliest Christians wrote little or nothing. It is

supposed that partly they were either unable to write or at least

unused to the familiar employment of writing for the purposes of

ordinary life. Put aside that prejudice, and the whole body of opinion,

which maintains that the Christians at first did not set down anything

in writing about the life and death of Christ, strongly and widely

accepted as it is, dominating as a fundamental premise much of the

discussion of this whole subject in recent times, is devoid of any

support. . . . One of the initial presumptions, plausible in appearance

and almost universally assumed and conceded, is that there was no early

registration of the great events in the beginning of Christian history.

This presumption we must set aside as a mere prejudice, contrary to the

whole spirit and character of that age and entirely improbable.' Such a

presumption has in fact been proved by recent discoveries to be in all

probability quite erroneous, and indeed there are strong grounds for

making an assumption of a precisely opposite character, i.e. that the

chief Christian Churches did keep more or less regular archives, which,

like the bulk of ancient records, perished through fire or other

accidents, [109] through the ruthless sacking of the city by barbarian

conquerors, and in the case of these Christian archives by systematic

destruction at the hands of the imperial authorities, more especially

during the persecution of Diocletian. But though the documents

themselves disappeared, [110] the memory of their contents would remain

to be worked up afresh into new narratives tinged with the opinions,

beliefs and modes of thought of the time at which they were written,

and in such a setting as the pious fancy of the compilers thought to be

edifying, and in harmony with their subject. What criteria then, it may

be asked, have we for judging whether these later Acts and Passions of

Saints and Martyrs contain in the midst of apocryphal accretion a real

core of sound and trustworthy historical fact? A tradition before it

can be accepted as embodying authentic history should, I think, satisfy

the following conditions: (1) It must be concerned with an event or

series of events that had a great number of witnesses, and of witnesses

who would have a strong motive to record or bear in memory what they

had seen. (2) The beginning of the tradition should appear at a time

not too remote from the facts it records, at a time, that is to say, in

which it should not be possible for the notices handed down by

contemporaries to be obscured. (3) Shortly after that time to which the

beginning of the tradition goes back there should appear in the

community to which it relates a firm and general persuasion of its

truth. (4) This persuasion should spread gradually until everywhere the

facts are accepted as true without any doubts being raised even by

those who, had they not been plainly true, would have desired to reject

them.

Let us now apply these criteria to the Petrine tradition at Rome. That

Peter visited Rome between the years 62 A.D. and 65 A.D. and that he

was put to death there by crucifixion is admitted by everyone who

studies the evidence in a fair and reasonable spirit. [111] This is not

a tradition, it may rather be described as a fact vouched for by

contemporary or nearly contemporary evidence. On this point no

statement could be stronger than that of Professor Lanciani: I write

about the monuments of Rome from a strictly archaeological point of

view, avoiding questions which pertain or are supposed to pertain to

religious controversy. For the archaeologist, the presence and

execution of SS. Peter and Paul in Rome are facts established beyond a

shadow of doubt by purely monumental evidence.' It is now generally

conceded that the first epistle bearing the name of Peter was written

from Rome. The Apocalypse of St. John' and the Sibylline Oracles' show

that Babylon was a common synonym for Rome in the second half of the

first century. [112] The language of Clement of Rome [113] in his

Epistle to the Corinthians leaves no doubt--for it is the witness of a

contemporary--that Peter was martyred at Rome. But leaving ancient

examples let us come to the athletes who were very near to our own

times, let us take the illustrious examples of our own generation.

. . . Peter who through unjust jealousy endured not one or two but many

sufferings and so having borne witness--marturesas--departed to the

place of glory that was his due.' The statement in the apocalyptic

Ascension of Isaiah' [114] --also the work of a contemporary--that a

lawless king, the slayer of his mother, will persecute the plant which

the Twelve Apostles of the Beloved have planted. Of the Twelve one will

be delivered into his hands' can scarcely refer to another event than

the death of Peter at the time of the Neronian persecution. A

comparison of St. John xxi. 18, 19 with St. John xiii. 36, 37 and with

2 Peter i. 14 is evidence as to the manner of that death. The question

of the authorship of the Fourth Gospel or of 2 Peter is immaterial, for

the writers, whoever they were, belong to the first century, and the

testimony to the received belief of the Christian Church which they

give is authentic.

But a solitary brief visit to Rome after St. Paul had previously spent

in that city two years of fruitful work does not account for the

position assigned by tradition to St. Peter in relation to the Roman

Church. Though the two names are on several occasions coupled together,

as joint founders of the Roman Church, in all the earliest notices in

which the two are named together the name of Peter stands first. Thus

Ignatius in his Epistle to the Romans written about 109 A.D. says: I do

not command you like Peter and Paul; they were Apostles; I am a

condemned criminal.' [115] Dionysius of Corinth 171 A.D. writing to

Soter bishop of Rome [116] a speaks of the plantation by Peter and Paul

that took place among the Romans and Corinthians.' Irenaeus a few years

later is filled with respect for the most great and ancient and

universally known Church established at Rome by the two most glorious

Apostles Peter and Paul, and also the faith declared to men, which

comes down to our own time through the succession of her bishops. For

unto this Church, on account of its more powerful lead, every Church,

meaning the faithful who are from everywhere, must needs resort; since

in it that tradition which is from the Apostles has been preserved by

those who are from everywhere. The Blessed Apostles, having founded and

established the Church, entrusted the office of the episcopate to

Linus. Paul speaks of this Linus in his epistles to Timothy, Anencletus

succeeded him, and after Anencletus, in the third place from the

Apostles, Clement received the episcopate.' Now Irenaeus, who was a

disciple of Polycarp, and acquainted with others who had known St.

John, and who in 177 A.D. became bishop of Lyons, had spent some years

in Rome. This passage was written, as he tells us, in the time of

Eleutherus, probably about 180 A.D. [117]

Eusebius of Caesarea has left us two lists of the Roman bishops, one in

his Ecclesiastical History,' the other in his Chronicle.' The first is

the list of Irenaeus, the beginning of which has just been quoted. The

second is derived from the lost Chronicle' of Hippolytus, bishop of

Portus, written about half a century later. In the Chronicle' St.

Peter's episcopate at Rome is stated to have lasted twenty-five years.

[118] In the Ecclesiastical History' we read--under the reign of

Claudius by the benign and gracious providence of God, Peter that great

and powerful apostle, who by his courage took the lead of all the rest,

was conducted to Rome.' In other passages his martyrdom with that of

Paul is represented as taking place after Nero's persecution. [119] The

interval between these two dates would roughly be about twenty-five

years. Now it is evident that these figures, derived as they are from

men like Irenaeus and Hippolytus, who had access to the archives and

traditions in Rome itself, cannot be dismissed as pure fiction. They

must have a basis of fact behind them. Eusebius tells us that after the

martyrdom of Paul and Peter Linus was the first that received the

episcopate at Rome.' Now the date of this martyrdom was according to

the received tradition the fourteenth year of Nero or 67 A.D.; if then

we deduct twenty-five years, we arrive at 42 A.D., which is precisely

the date given for St. Peter's first visit to Rome by St. Jerome in his

work De Viris Illustribus.' Remembering that Jerome was a translator of

the Eusebian Chronicle his words may be taken to embody a close

acquaintance with Eusebius' works, including his lost Records of

Ancient Martyrdoms,' and with the sources that he used. Jerome writes

as follows: Simon Peter, prince of the Apostles, after an episcopate of

the Church at Antioch and preaching to the dispersion of those of the

circumcision, who had believed in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and

Bithynia, in the second year of Claudius goes to Rome to oppose Simon

Magus, and there for twenty-five years he held the sacerdotal chair

until the last year of Nero, that is the fourteenth.' [120] Now here

amidst a certain confusion, which will be dealt with presently, a

definite date is given for Peter's first arrival at Rome, and, be it

noted, it is the date of his escape from Herod Agrippa's persecution

and his disappearance from the narrative of the Acts.

This evidence of Jerome, it will be thus seen, rests upon that of

Eusebius, and that of the earlier authorities which that historian

consulted. It has been said that one of the conditions of the soundness

of an historical tradition was the wideness and unanimity of its

reception. Now probably never was any tradition accepted so

universally, and without a single dissentient voice, as that which

associates the foundation and organisation of the Church of Rome with

the name of St. Peter and which speaks of his active connexion with

that Church as extending over a period of some twenty-five years.

It is needless to multiply references. In Egypt and in Africa, in the

East and in the West, no other place ever disputed with Rome the honour

of being the see of St. Peter; no other place ever claimed that he died

there or that it possessed his tomb. Most significant of all is the

consensus of the Oriental, non-Greek-speaking, Churches. A close

examination of Armenian and Syrian MSS., [121] and in the case of the

latter both of Nestorian and Jacobite authorities, through several

centuries, has failed to discover a single writer who did not accept

the Roman Petrine tradition.

No less striking is the local evidence (still existing) for a

considerable residence of St. Peter in Rome. There is no doubt,' is the

judgment of Lanciani, once more to quote his well-known work Pagan and

Christian Rome' (p. 212), that the likenesses of St. Peter and St. Paul

have been carefully preserved in Rome ever since their lifetime, they

are familiar to every one, even to school-children. These portraits

have come down to us by scores. They are painted in the cubiculi of the

Catacombs, engraved in gold leaf in the so-called vetri cemeteriali,

cast in bronze, hammered in silver or copper, and designed in mosaic.

The type never varies. St. Peter's face is full and strong with short

curly hair and beard, while St. Paul appears more wiry and thin,

slightly bald with a long pointed beard. The antiquity and the

genuineness of both types cannot be doubted.' Other noticeable facts

are: (l) the appearance of the name of Peter, both in Greek and Latin,

among the inscriptions of the most ancient Christian cemeteries,

especially in the first-century catacomb of Priscilla. [122] The

appearance of this unusual name on these early Christian tombs can most

easily be explained by the supposition that either those who bore it or

their parents had been baptised by Peter. In any case it may be taken

that his memory was held in especial reverence by them. Again, on a

large number of early Christian sarcophagi now in the Lateran Museum

the imprisonment of Peter by Herod Agrippa and his release by the angel

is represented. The French historian of the Persecutions of the first

two Centuries,' Paul Allard, [123] was the first to point out that the

frequency with which this subject was chosen might be accounted for by

the existence of a traditional belief in a close connexion between this

event and the first visit of St. Peter to Rome. Orazio Marucchi, the

learned and accomplished pupil and successor of De Rossi, in his latest

volume upon recent researches in the catacombs, commenting upon this

suggestion of Allard, adds that this scene is often united to others,

in which Moses and Peter appear as the representative founders of the

Jewish and Christian Churches with particular reference to the Church

in Rome. [124] In some representations may be seen the Lord handing to

Peter a volume on which is written Lex Domini, or beneath which is the

legend Dominus Legem Dat. [125] More remarkable still are those in

which Moses, with the well-known traits of St. Peter, strikes the rock

out of which flow the waters of cleansing through baptism in the name

of Jesus Christ. [126] Taken together all these authentic records of

the impressions that had been left upon the minds of the primitive

Roman Church of a close personal connexion between that Church and the

Apostle Peter cannot be disregarded. They are existent to-day to tell

their own tale.

Once more the number of legends and the quantity of apocryphal

literature that grew up around the Petrine tradition are witnesses not

merely to the hold that it had upon popular regard but to its

historical reality. Many of these legends, much of this literature may

in the main be evidently fictitious, but even in those which are most

clearly works of imagination, there is almost always a kernel of truth

overlaid with invention. [127] It is perfectly well known that most of

these documents have behind them other documents, which are now lost,

but out of which those we now possess have grown by gradual accretions

and interpolations. [128] But it is not impossible even now for sound

and scholarly criticism to arrive with fair certainty in many cases at

the ultimate basis of fact on which the edifice of fiction rests. One

of these apocryphal documents we have in a very early form--the

Ebionite Preaching of Peter'--which was produced in the first decade of

the second century; as a proof of its early date it may be mentioned

that it was used by Heracleon in Hadrian's time. [129] The work bears

on the face of it testimony to the fact that Peter did labour and

preach at Rome, for it was written at a time when some of those who

actually saw and heard him may have been still alive, and there must

have been numbers whose fathers were grown-up men even in the time of

Claudius. The traditions connected with the cemetery ad Nymphas' where

Peter baptised, with the primitive chair now in St. Peter's Basilica,

with the very ancient churches of St. Pudenziana, St. Prisca and St.

Clement, with the Quo Vadis? story, whatever their real historical

value or lack of value, undoubtedly stretch back long before the fifth

and sixth centuries, when pilgrims flocked to Rome with their

itineraries' in their hands, and they spring from a general and

deep-rooted belief in a long and active ministry of the Apostle in the

See that had become identified with his name. [130]

Returning then once more to the undisputedly historical ground of St.

Paul's Epistle to the Romans, we find that in 57 A.D. there was in Rome

a Christian community not of yesterday, but of many years' standing: an

important community, whose faith and whose high repute were well known

in all churches of the Empire with which the writer was acquainted.

Further that St. Paul himself for some years past had been longing to

visit this Rdman community, but had been hindered from doing so by the

restriction he had imposed upon himself of not building on another

man's foundation. If again the question be repeated--Who was this man?

with greater emphasis than before the same answer must be returned--It

cannot be any other than St. Peter.

But having arrived so far, we are confronted with certain difficulties

that arise in making this earlier ministry of St. Peter at Rome fit in

with the New Testament records relating to the same period. These

difficulties will be dealt with in the next lecture. To-day I shall

confine myself to pointing out that the circumstances which led to St.

Peter's mission to Rome very soon after his escape from prison in the

second year of Claudius were strictly analogous to those described in

the earlier part of the present lecture, which led first to the mission

of Peter accompanied by John to Samaria, and then to that of Barnabas

to Antioch.

The dispersion of the Hellenist disciples of St. Stephen, after the

persecution in which their brilliant leader died a martyr's death, was

the direct cause of the evangelisation first of Samaria and then some

years later of Syrian Antioch. Philip, like Stephen one of the Seven,

preached in Samaria meeting with great success, and there encountered a

certain man, Simon by name, who gave himself out to be some great one,

and who had by his sorceries astonished and drawn to him great numbers

of the people. On the news of this state of affairs being brought to

the Apostles at Jerusalem, Peter and John were despatched in the name

of the Twelve, to deal with the situation authoritatively. The result

for a time, according to the Acts, was the triumph of St. Peter, Simon

himself being baptised and seeking to be endowed by the Apostle with a

portion of his wonder-working spiritual gifts. And as with Samaria so

it was with Syrian Antioch. Men of Cyprus and Cyrene, who had been

obliged to fly from Jerusalem upon the tribulation that arose about

Stephen,' after preaching in their own native regions found their way

to Antioch, and preaching in that city of mixed nationalities, not only

to Jews but also to the Greeks, converted many. This news again, that a

Church was arising in the Syrian capital with a considerable Gentile

element in its midst, when it reached the Twelve at Jerusalem, led to

immediate action being taken. Barnabas was sent to exercise

super-vision over the new movement, and to see that a precedent of

far-reaching consequences should not be established with-out the

knowledge and sanction of those in authority.

Events at Rome probably followed on precisely the same lines. Just as

the men of Cyprus and Cyrene in the face of persecution made their way

back to their own homes carrying with them the message of the Gospel,

so would it be with some of the sojourners of Rome' belonging to the

Synagogue of the Libertines. They would return to the capital inspired

by the spirit and example of St. Stephen to form there the first

nucleus of a Christian community. As I have already suggested, St.

Paul's salutation to Andronicus and Junias seems to point to these two

men as the leaders of this first missionary band. Among those converted

would be, as at Antioch, both Jews and Gentiles.

Some time may well have elapsed before any news of these first small

beginnings of Christianity in Rome reached Jerusalem. Possibly St.

Peter's intercourse with Cornelius the centurion and his relatives and

friends at Caesarea first made him acquainted with the fact that the

Gospel had obtained a foothold in the capital, for the body of troops

to which Cornelius belonged--the Cohors Italica--consisted of

volunteers from Italy. [131] From this source too he may in due course

have learnt that Simon Magus was in Rome, and that there as in Samaria

previously he was proclaiming himself to be the Great Power of God' and

was leading many astray by his magical arts.

This information in any case, whether derived from Cornelius or from

Roman Christians, who came up for the feasts, would reach the Apostles

about the time when their twelve years' residence in Jerusalem was

drawing to a close, and when, according to tradition, they divided

among themselves separate spheres of missionary work abroad. To St.

Peter, as the recognised leader, it may well have been that the charge

of the Christian Church in the Imperial capital should have been

assigned as the post of honour. If so, it will be seen that the

persecution of Herod Agrippa only hastened on a journey already

planned. After his imprisonment and escape St. Peter's first object

would be to place himself out of the reach of the persecutor and to set

about his voyage as quickly as possible. If so, his arrival at Rome

would be in the early summer of 42 A.D., the date given by St. Jerome.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[73] The Church in the Roman Empire before A.D. 170, 3rd ed. 1894; St.

Paul the Traveller and Roman Citizen, 7th ed. 1903; A Historical

Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians; The Cities of St.

Paul; Luke the Physician and other Studies in the History of Religion,

1908; The First Christian Century, 1911, etc. etc.

[74] Lukas, der Arzt, der Verfasser des dritten Evangeliums und der

Apostelgeschichte, 1906; Spr�che and Reden Jesu. Die zweite Quelle des

Matth�us and Lukas, 1907; Die Apostelgeschichte, 1908; Neue

Untersuchungen zur Apostelgeschichte, etc., 1911. All these volumes

have been translated into English and published as vols. xx. xxiii.

xxvii. and xxxiii. of the Crown Theological Library.

[75] Neue Untersuchungen zur Apostelgeschichte, pp. 63-81. In this

volume Dr. Harnack completes his defence of the date 62 A.D. for the

Acts in favour of which he had already argued in his Apostelgeschichte,

5 Excurs, 217-221. How strong was the case he made out even in this

earlier and more tentative argument may be judged by the following

extract from Neue Untersuchungen, p. 64: Nicht auffallend aber konnte

es nur sein, dass andere sich durch die starken Argumente f�r die fr�he

Abfassung der lukanischen Schriften als vollkommen �berzeugt erkl�rten.

Nicht nur Delbr�ck hielt mir sofort vor, ich h�tte mich in einer von

mir selbst sicher entschiedenen Frage mit unn�tiger Zur�ckhaltung

ausgedr�ckt, sondern auch Maurenbrecher erkannte in meinen

Beweisf�hrungen die L�sung des chronologischen Problems. In seinem Werk

"Von Nazareth nach Golgatha" (1909) S. 22-30, gibt er die wichtigsten

der von mir geltend gemachten Beobachtungen f�r eine fr�he

Abfassungszeit der Acta zutreffend und eindrucksvoll wieder and

beschliesst seine Darlegung also: "Die Annahme (eines sp�teren

Ursprungs and geschichtlichen Wertlosigkeit der Lukasschriften) ist

neuerdings immermehr gefallen and schliesslich durch eine gr�ndliche

Untersuchung von Prof. Harnack in allen Teilen g�nzlich widerlegt and

beseitigt worden. Viel mehr hat sich nach jeder Richtung hin, wenn auch

nicht die unbedingte Glaubw�rdigkeit, so doch das hohe Alter der

Apostelgeschichte ergeben. Und wenn Prof. H. selbst nur z�gernd und

erst nur in letzten Moment seiner Arbeit die Konsequenz seiner

Ergebnisse auch f�r die Datierung zog, so muss man doch sagen, dass nur

in jener von ihm vorgeschlagenen Weise so wohl der Schlusssatz der Acta

wie die ganze Tenor des Buchs verst�ndlich wird, und dass daher schon

um dieses �usseren Zeugnisses willen die Datierung auf d. J. 62 als

bewiesen und nicht nur als m�glich zu gelten hat."'

[76] Eine Revolution innerhaib der Kritik, p. 65.

[77] St. Luke, xxiv. 50-53; Acts, xxviii. 29-31.

[78] Codex Bezae D and the first hand of the Sinaitic Codex '?1 omit

kai anephereto eis ton ouranon. The difficulty which these words raised

was probably the reason for their omission.

[79] An inscription at Pompeii contains the words Synagoga

Libertinorum,' Lanciani, Pagan and Christian Rome, p. 310.

[80] A striking testimony to the authenticity of the Johannine account

of our Lord's ministry. Had our Lord's mission been confined to Galilee

up to the last week of His life, as the Synoptic narratives appear to

suggest, it is almost inconceivable that the home of the Christian

Church should from the very first have been at Jerusalem.

[81] St. Luke, xxiv. 52, 53; Acts, ii. 46; iii. 1; v. 12, 25, 42.

[82] Acts, ii. 32-36; iii. 14, 15, 20, 21, 26; iv. 10, 33; v. 30-32,

42.

[83] St. John is singled out on several occasions by name, as being

second only to St. Peter in influence and authority; see Acts, iii. 1;

iv. 13; viii. 14. Compare Gal. i. 18; ii. 9; also St. John, xiii.

23-27; xviii. 15; xx. 3-10; xxi. 20-24. Again the history of the Acts

confirms the account given in the Fourth Gospel.

[84] Compare St. Luke, xxiv. 44-49; St. John, xiv. 26; xvi. 13.

[85] Harnack (Const. and Law of the Church, p. 31) describes this as a

very old and well-attested tradition.' Apollonius is stated by St.

Jerome (De viris illust.) to have learnt it from the ancients' and it

is found in Clem. Alex. Strom. vi. 5.

[86] Philo, In Flaccum and Leg. ad Caium. Philo describes the Jews at

this time as occupying entirely two out of the five districts of

Alexandria, and says that in Egypt their numbers amounted to 1,000,000.

See also Josephus, cont. Apion. ii. 4; B.J. xii. 3. 2.

[87] Josephus, xiv. 7, Life, 76, B.J. vii. last chapter. In the revolt

of the Jews in the time of Trajan (116-117) the number of Jews who

perished in the district of Cyrene is given as 22,000, no doubt an

exaggeration but pointing to a very large Jewish population.

[88] Acts, vi. 8, vii. 54-60, viii. 1-3.

[89] pantes de diesparesan kata tas choras tes Ioudaias kai Samareias

plen ton apostolon.

[90] Acts, viii. 5-24.

[91] Comp. Acts ix. 26-31 with Gal. i. 18.

[92] kath' holes tes Ioudaias kai Galileias kai Samareias. ix. 31.

[93] egeneto de Petron dierchomenon dia panton. ix. 32. Comp. xv. 41

and xviii. 23.

[94] We are here in presence of one of those strange psychical

communications of which we have been learning so much in recent years.

They are far more common than most of us dream of, and come we know not

how or whence. In the trance into which Peter, exposed on the housetop

to the full heat of the mid-day sun and faint for lack of food, fell,

just in proportion to the deadening of the ordinary senses would be the

sensitiveness of those faculties which lie below the threshold of

wake-a-day consciousness. First the spirit of the Centurion in his

anxious search after truth is moved to seek out Peter, as his guide and

teacher; then the spirit of Peter, while still unconsciously conscious

of the approach of the messengers who were on their way to seek him,

receives the intimation, which is the response to his own prayers. Men

like Peter and John and Paul were in a manner far beyond the normal,

what we should now call sensitives'; their spiritual faculties attuned

to constant and intimate intercourse with that Divine Spirit who, their

Master had promised, should in their hours of doubt and darkness be

their guide and helper towards light and truth.

[95] Acts, xi. 1-18.

[96] Acts, xi. 19-27. These men were of those Hellenist Christians who

had been driven from Jerusalem by the persecution which followed the

death of Stephen. The exiles, St. Luke tells, preached the word in

Phoenicia, Cyprus and Antioch (and no doubt in many other places), but

at first to the Jews only. Then, after an interval probably of five or

six years, certain of them, who had meanwhile settled in Cyprus and

Cyrene, came to Antioch, and, finding that the Greeks were willing to

listen to their preaching, began with success a work of evangelisation

among them.

[97] His aunt Mary resided in Jerusalem, and her house appears to have

been used as a place of assembly (Acts, xii. 12); indeed there is a

tradition that the upper room of the Last Supper was in this house.

Bamabas himself seems to have had property in Jerusalem or its

neighbourhood. Acts, iv. 37.

[98] Bar-nabas = son of exhortation; Nabi = a prophet. The Greek form

huios parakleseos may be illustrated by Acts xiii. 15, where Barnabas

and Paul are asked by the rulers of the Synagogue if they have any

logos parakleseos to address to the congregation. Compare also

parakletos =Comforter, Advocate, Helper, St. John, xiv. 16, 26. In

accordance with his surname we find that on his arrival at Antioch

Barnabas parakalei pantas. In Acts xiii. 1 Barnabas is classed as a

prophet and teacher.'

[99] Acts, ix. 25-27; Gal. i. 18-21.

[100] Acts, xi. 26. This seems to be the force of the words

sunachthenai en te ekklesia.

[101] The population of Antioch at this time was probably about half a

million. Ottfried M�ller (Antiquitates Antiochenae) has collected all

that can be learnt from ancient sources about Antioch.

[102] Josephus (Ant. xviii. 8) and Philo (Leg. ad Caium) tell the whole

story in detail, and also the fruitless efforts made by Agrippa to

induce the Emperor to abandon his intention.

[103] Jos. Ant. xix. 4, 5; B.J. ii. 11. H. Lehmann, Claudius und seine

Zeit (Leipzig, 1877), 118-121, 161-164. Milman, Hist. of the Jews, ii.

126-158.

[104] Jos. Ant. xix. 6. Jost (Geschichte des Judenthums, i. 420 ff.)

quotes many anecdotes from the Talmud of Agrippa's eagerness to give

proof of his orthodoxy and piety. See also Fouard, S. Pierre, pp.

207-212.

[105] St. Luke, xii. 1-18.

[106] Supra, pp. 28-9.

[107] Joyce, South American Archaeology, 1912, p. 76.

[108] Ramsay, The Letters to the Seven Churches, 1904, pp. 4, 5.

[109] In sixteen years three great fires destroyed much of Rome and an

enormous quantity of documents, i.e. in 64, 69 and 80 A.D. There was a

most destructive fire in the reign of Commodus 191 A.D. Think of the

meaning of the following facts: Rome was taken and sacked by Alaric,

410 A.D.; by Genseric, 455 A.D.; by Ricimer, 472 A.D. ; by Vitiges, 537

A.D.; by Totila, 546 A.D. In 846 A.D. the Saracens plundered Rome. See

Lanciani, Ancient Rome in the Light of Recent Discoveries, pp. 147-9;

also The Destruction of Ancient Rome, p. 131.

[110] Horace Marucchi, El�ments d'Arch�ologie Chr�tienne, vol. i. xiv.

writes thus: Malheureusement les Actes [des Martyrs] authentiques ont

presque tous disparu. . . . L'Eglise romaine non poss�de aucun. Les

actes de ces martyrs ont d� �tre d�truits pendant la grande pers�cution

de Diocl�tien; il est certain qu'� cette �poque on a br�l� les Archives

de de 1'Eglise romaine; on a d'ailleurs agi de m�me en Afrique, ainsi

que nous 1'apprend S. Augustin.' Of the principal contemporary

historians of the period dealt with in these lectures--Fabius Rusticus,

Cluvius Rufus, and Pliny the Elder--not a single line has survived. A.

Peter (Hist. Rom. frag. pp. 291-324) gives a list of thirty-five

historical writers upon the period from Caligula to Hadrian (37-138)

all of whose writings have perished. Of the works of Tacitus only a

portion have come down to us, and the Histories in a single MS.

[111] Lanciani, Pagan and Christian Rome, p. 125.

[112] In that portion of the fifth book of the Sibylline Oracles which

was probably written 71-74 A.D. the flight of Nero from Rome is thus

described; v. 143 pheuxetai ek Babulonos anax phoberos kai anaides.

[113] Clement Rom. 1 Cor. v.

[114] See Clemen, Die Himmelfahrt des Isaia, ein �ltestes Zeugnis f�r

das r�mische Martyrium des Petrus' in Zeitsch. f�r Wissensch.

Theologie, 1896. The discovery among the papiri of Lord Amhurst of the

Greek text of the Ascension makes the reference clear. kai (t)on dodeka

(heis) tais chersin autou p(arad)othesetai. Grenfell, The Amhurst

Papiri. Ascensio Isaiah, etc., 1900.

[115] Ep. S. Ignatii ad Romanos, c. iv: ouch hos Petros kai Paulos

diatassomai humin; ekeinoi apostoloi, ego katakritos.

[116] Quoted by Eus. Hist. Eccl. ii. 25: tauta kai humeis dia tes

tosautes nouthesias ten apo Petrou kai Paulou phuteian genetheisan

Rhomaion te kai Korinthion sunekerasate. A comparison with the passage

from the Ascension of Isaiah, from which a quotation has already been

made, is most interesting. ho basileus houtos (Nero the matricide) ten

phuteian hen phuteusousin hoi apostoloi tou agapetou dioxei kai ton

dodeka heis tais chersin autou paradothesetai.

[117] Irenaeus, Adv. Haereses, iii. 3; Eus. Hist. Eccl. v. 6.

[118] Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. v. 6, see also iv. 22. Hippolytus'

Chronicle was written during the first quarter of the third century and

was undoubtedly used by Eusebius. For an account of this learned and

essentially Roman writer see Lightfoot's Apostolic Fathers, part i.

vol. ii. pp. 317-477. The original Greek of Eusebius' Chronicle or

Chronography is lost, but it survives in three translations, a Latin

version by Jerome, a Syriac and an Armenian. The Hieronymian and Syriac

versions give twenty-five years as the length of Peter's episcopate. On

the other hand the Armenian has twenty years, but Duchesne (Liber

Pontificalis, p. v) says: Ann. XX dans le texte arm�nien, �videmment

fautif.' The Armenian version has in fact many divergences from the

Hieronymian, but Lightfoot, who has discussed the matter very

thoroughly (Apost. Fathers, part i. vol. i. pp. 212-246), comes to the

conclusion that these divergences are due probably to the errors and

caprice of transcribers' (p. 245). Duchesne, Mommsen, and others hold

the Latin Chronography, known as the Liber Generationis, to be a

translation from the Greek of Hippolytus' Chronicle dating from about

234 A.D.

[119] Eus. Hist. Eccl. ii. 14--the whole of this passage will be

considered later. For the death: Hist. Eccl. ii. 25, iii. 1, 4.

[120] Jerome, De Viris Illust. i. Jerome must have had access to the

Chronography of Julius Africanus, the Chronicle of Hippolytus, the

Memorials of Hegesippus, and other lost works.

[121] P. Martin, S. Pierre, sa venue et son martyre � Rome,' Rev. des

Questions historiques, xiii. 5, xv. 5, xviii. 202. This writer gives an

array of quotations from Armenian and Syrian (Jacobite and Nestorian)

authors from the fifth to the thirteenth centuries.

[122] The oldest parts of the Catacomb of Priscilla are regarded by De

Rossi, Marucchi, Lanciani and the best authorities as dating from the

middle of the first century. The most ancient inscriptions are in red

and many in the Greek language. Among them is one containing only the

single word . Another on the left side of the main gallery thus:-- a

third:-- In this catacomb is the mausoleum of the Acilii Glabriones,

the family of the consul M. Acilius Glabrio, put to death by Domitian

in 95 A.D. His own tomb has been destroyed. According to the Liber

Pontificalis Pope Leo IV, in the ninth century, removed from this

catacomb the bodies of Aquila and Priscilla, with others, into the city

to protect them from profanation at the hands of the Saracen invaders.

Marucchi, Arch�ologie Ch�dtienne, vol. ii. pp. 586 ff; Le Memorie degli

Apostoli Pietro e Paolo in Roma, p, 119, pp. 160-164. On p. 162 may be

seen a copy of the beautiful medallion containing the heads of SS.

Peter and Paul found by Boldetti in the first-century catacomb of

Domitilla and now in the Museo Sacro delta Biblioteca Vaticana.

[123] Allard, Hist. des Pers�cutions, vol. i. p. 15.

[124] Roma Sotterranea Christiana (nuova serie) Tom. I.: Monumenti del

Cemitero di Domitilla sulla Via Ardeatina descritti da Orazio Marucchi,

1911, p. 9.

[125] Marucchi, Le Memorie degli Apostoli Pietro e Paolo in Roma, pp.

180-182.

[126] G. B. de Rossi, Bullettino di Archeologia Christiana, 1868, p. 1

ff.; 1874, p. 174; 1877, p. 77 ff. In the Vatican museum this scene is

depicted on two glasses. Behind the figure striking the Rock is written

the word Petrus.' There is no doubt a reminiscence here of St. Paul's

words, 1 Cor. x. 4: epinon gar ek pneumatikes akolouthouses petras; he

de petra en ho Christos, and of the declaration of Christ: Su ei Petros

kai epi taute te petra oikodomeso mou ten ekklesian, St. Matt. xvi. 18.

[127] Les Actes des Martyrs. Suppl�ment aux Acta sincera de Dom

Ruinart,' par Edmond Le Blant. M�moires de l'Institut Nat. de France,

tom. xxx. part 2, p. 81: Les gentils, aux temps de Diocl�tien, avaient

recherch�, pour les an�antir, les livres, les �crits religieux des

fid�les. Cette destruction, qui nous est attest�e par des

proc�s-verbaux contemporains, fut rigoureusement poursuivi, et

l'Eglise, apr�s la tourmente, dut pourvoir � la r�fection de ses

archives d�vast�es. Ce fut souvent � l';aide de souvenirs de traditions

orales, que l'on dut r�constituer alors nombre d'Acta et de Passiones

et souvent . . . ces r�dactions nouvelles furent accommod�es, pour le

d�tail, � la mode du temps o� elles �taient faites'; p. 81: Ces

interpolations, � mon avis, ne doivent donc ni d�concerter ni r�buter

la critique. Sous la couche des inventions, les traits originaux

existent, et un grand nombre d'entre eux apparaissent come � fleur de

sol. Il les faut d�gager patiemment,' p. 87.

[128] G. B. de Rossi in an Archaeological Conference held at Rome,

December 11, 1881, said: Che nella formazione degli Atti dei martiri

devono esser distinti e considerati molti periodi successivi; it primo

della relazione contemporanea dei testimoni oculari; il secondo delle

interpolazioni fatte al testo originale fino dal seculo incerca quarto

e forse prima: poi vengono le amplificazioni e parafrasi composte dai

retort nei secoli quinto e sesto: finalmente le abbreviazioni delle

prolisse parafrasi ad use delle Lectiones liturgicae, e le nuove forme

di stile date alle vecchie leggende dal seculo decimo in poi per opera

di scrittori diversi, i cui nome in parte conosciamo; i quali vollero

togliere ogni oscurit� e rossezza al dettato e vestirlo di nuove fogge

di lingua. In tutte queste trasformazioni naturalmente si venne assai

alterando l'indole genuina dei documenti; furono aggiunti prolissi

discorsi, circostanze meravigliose, leggende strane, ma generalmente

rimase sempre il fondo e la sostanza del primitivo discorso.'

Bullettino di Arch. Chr. serie IV. 1882, p. 162.

[129] Clem. Alex. Strom. vi. 5. 6. 15; Origen, tom. xiii., comment on

St. John, c. 17. It is from Origen we learn that the kerugma was known

to Heracleon. Clement regards the work as genuine, but Origen doubted.

[130] Carlo Macchi, La Critica Storica e l'origine della Chiesa Romana,

1903, p. 93: Non tutte le memorie di S. Pietro in Roma hanno per se

stesse il medesimo valore. Altre sono d'indubitata autenticit�; altre

sono d'autenticit� probabile, altre per se stesse neppur di probabile.

Ma quando anche si prescinda dai monumenti per se stessi autorevoli,

l'unione di tante memorie in Roma e nella sola Roma � un fatto che non

pu� spiegarsi, se non si ammetta quel che abbiamo gi� dimostrato con

argotnenti, i quali crediamo the non possano venir dispregiati da una

critica veramente sincera.'

[131] Cohors Italica. Vid. Gruter, Inscr. p. 434: Cohors militum

Italicorum voluntaria, quae est in Syria.'

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

LECTURE III

Rev. xvii. 18--The great city, which reigneth over the Kings of the

earth.

In my previous lectures I have attempted to show from the internal

evidence of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans that there existed at Rome

in 57 A.D. a Christian Church of high repute and many years' standing,

and that this Church had been founded and built up by a man into the

sphere of whose labours he [St. Paul] had been careful not to intrude.

Moreover though St. Paul does not mention the name of the man,

circumstantial evidence has been brought forward making a very strong

prima facie case in favour of the ancient tradition that he was none

other than St. Peter.

To-day I propose to consider how far that tradition in the form in

which it has been handed down to us by Eusebius and Jerome [132] is

consistent with the facts of the early Apostolic history contained in

the Acts and the Pauline Epistles and fits in with the chronological

framework of that history.

Eusebius [133] tells us, on the authority of Justin Martyr (a passage

of whose Apology' [134] he quotes at length), that a certain Simon of

the village of Gitton in Samaria, whom nearly all the Samaritans

worshipped, confessing him to be the Supreme God, came to Rome in the

reign of Claudius Caesar and having there performed many magic rites

was regarded as a god. After further describing, this time on the

authority of Irenaeus, the character of this man's teaching, as being

the fountain-head of all heresy, Eusebius proceeds to say that when in

Judaea Simon was convicted of his wickedness by the Apostle Peter, and

later journeying from the east to the west arrived at Rome and was

there successful in bringing many to believe in his pretensions. Not

for long, however,' adds the historian, did his success continue; for

on his steps in this same reign of Claudius, the all-good and most

beneficent providence of God conducts the mighty and great one of the

Apostles, Peter, on account of his virtue the leader of all the rest,

to Rome against so great a corruption of life, who like some noble

warrior of God armed with divine weapons, brought the precious

merchandise of the light that had been made manifest from the east to

those in the west, preaching the true light and the word that is the

salvation of souls, the proclamation of the Kingdom of God.' [135]

It is not necessary here to enter into any detailed examination of the

theories of Christian Baur [136] and his disciples of the T�bingen

School or of the arguments of Richard Lipsius [137] in their attempt to

prove that the Roman Petrine legend was without foundation and that

Simon Magus never had any real existence, but was a lay figure

concealing the personality of St. Paul; for later research has shown

that their conception of the course of early Christian History is

fundamentally false and it is becoming generally discredited. These

distinguished scholars indeed, while brushing aside the

pseudo-Clementine literature with one hand, as pure romance invented by

Essene-Ebionite writers of the third and fourth centuries, at the same

time laid hold with the other hand on those very fictions, on which the

Clementine romance is built up, in order to erect thereon a romance of

their own equally unsubstantial, and no less inconsistent with the

clear evidence of the earlier authorities that we possess. Dr. Hort as

long ago as 1884 in his Lectures on the Clementine Recognitions' (pp.

130-1) declared--all these impossible theories [of the T�bingen School]

have no other real basis than the assumption that Simon is only St.

Paul in disguise. The true relations of the Syrian and Roman stories

are much simpler, according to what seems to me the most natural

interpretation. Simon at Rome was familiar in the second century; of

Simon in conflict with Peter in Syria, we hear nothing till the third

century has well begun.'

Indeed with regard to this second century evidence, how is it possible

to set aside the statements of Justin Martyr and Irenaeus ? The

evidence of Justin is of great weight. He was himself born at Flavia

Neapolis in Samaria in 103 A.D., a place only a few miles distant from

the native place of Simon Magus. His account of Simon's earlier

activity and great success in the neighbourhood of his own home must be

regarded as first-hand evidence, and it is in exact agreement with the

other account of that earlier activity which we have in the eighth

chapter of the Acts, an account which it is more than probable that St.

Luke derived directly from that best of all witnesses, Philip the

Evangelist. I have already pointed out that the emphasis with which St.

Luke dwells upon this episode of the encounter between Peter and Simon

at Samaria suggests that he had in his mind that later encounter at

Rome, which would be fresh in the memories of the first readers of the

Acts. [138] Be this as it may, Justin was himself at Rome for some

years between 150 and 160 A.D., and wrote his Apology' to the Emperor

Antoninus Pius in that city. In writing a defence intended for the

Imperial eyes it may surely be taken for granted that Justin would not

twice over have ventured (for in a slightly different form in c. 56

[139] he repeats the statement from c. 26 already quoted) to declare

that the Magician Simon of Samaria visited Rome in the reign of

Claudius and that a statue was erected in his honour and that he was

worshipped as a god, unless it were well known that such had been the

case. Yet a third time in his Dialogue with Trypho' [140] Justin speaks

of the Simonians as an existing sect that took their name from the

arch-heretic. Two points have been pressed against the evidence of

Justin. The first that he states that Simon had been honoured with a

statue as a god in the river Tiber, (on an island) between the two

bridges, having the superscription in Latin Simoni Deo Sancto, which

is, To Simon the Holy God.' Now in this same island was found in the

sixteenth century an inscription to the Sabine God Semo Sancus, i.e.

Semoni Sanco Deo Fidio. It is of course quite possible that Justin saw

this inscription, and being a Samaritan ignorant of Latin mythology

mistook this for an inscription referring to Simon Magus. It was a

natural mistake. That Justin was right in saying that a statue was

erected to Simon and worshipped is sustained, as will be seen, by other

evidence. The other point is that while Justin states that Simon was in

Rome in the reign of Claudius he makes no mention of his encounter with

St. Peter. The only argument here is that most treacherous and

worthless of all arguments--the argumentum ex silentio. Justin was not

writing for our instruction, but was offering a defence of Christianity

to a Roman Emperor. If anyone has thought that the omission of Peter's

name here was an argument against his presence in Rome in the reign of

Claudius, let him read the summaries of Justin's pleading in the latest

edition of the Apologia' by Mr. A. W. F. Blunt (Camb. Univ. Press,

1911), and he will see that neither in the twenty-sixth nor in the

fifty-sixth chapter was there any place for a reference to Peter.

The evidence of Irenaeus, who was in Rome some ten or fifteen years

after Justin, is equally striking. Irenaeus writes at some length about

Simon. He describes the rudimentary gnosticism of his teaching, and,

like Justin, he mentions the tradition that an image was erected by

Claudius Caesar to his honour in the figure of Jupiter, which the

people worshipped, and he speaks of him as the father of all heretics.

[141] Even these testimonies to the still living fame of Simon, as a

religious leader whose lofty pretensions and skilful charlatanry had

made a deep impression at Rome and elsewhere, do not stand alone. The

discovery in the middle of the last century of a MS. at Mount Athos

containing a Iarge part of the Philosophumena' or Refutation of all

Heresies' by Hippolytus, the learned bishop of Portus, has thrown much

fresh light upon Simon and his teaching. [142] Hippolytus, who is

described as a disciple of Irenaeus, [143] spent at least twenty years

of his life at or pear Rome and also travelled widely. He devotes a

long section of his sixth book, which was probably written about 225

A.D., to an account of the heresy of which Simon was the author. Of the

man himself he writes thus [144] : This Simon deceiving many by his

sorceries in Samaria was reproved by the Apostles and was laid under a

curse, as it has been written in the Acts. But he afterwards abjured

the faith and attempted [these practices]. And journeying as far as

Rome he fell in with the Apostle, and to him, deceiving many by his

sorceries, Peter offered repeated opposition.' Here then is another

absolutely clear statement that Simon went to Rome and there

encountered St. Peter.

Frankly then the contention that Simon is merely Paul in disguise, Paul

the heretic in the eyes of all good Jews, whom the orthodox Peter is

represented as triumphantly pursuing from place to place, has not a

shred of early evidence behind it, and must be given up. Indeed

Professor Kirsopp Lake in his recent work on the early epistles of St.

Paul does not express himself a whit too strongly, when he says The

figure of a Judaizing St. Peter is a figment of the T�bingen critics

with no basis in history.' [145] So far indeed from Peter and Paul

being bitterly opposed, there is every ground for believing that they

worked at Rome during their latter years in the closest harmony. The

First Epistle of Peter is saturated with Pauline thoughts and language,

and its amanuensis was Silvanus, the companion of Paul on his second

missionary journey. St. Paul twice mentions Mark, the disciple and

interpreter of Peter, as being with him during his first imprisonment,

and writing to Timothy immediately before his death shows anxiety to

have him at his side, because he is profitable to me in the ministry.'

[146] Whatever misunderstandings concerning their attitude towards

Judaism or divergences in practice there may have been between the two

great Apostles in early days, it is evident that they have been greatly

exaggerated. It was rather on questions of expediency than of principle

that they differed, and the experience of years spent in earnest work

had long before the end drawn them together into the friendliest

co-operation.

The appearance of Simon Magus at Rome followed by Simon Peter, so far

from being an extraordinary or even an unusual event, is one in

complete accord with all that we know from non-Christian sources of the

way in which during the reigns of Claudius and of Nero religious

teachers, preachers, and wonder-workers from the East found their way

to Rome. Oriental cults, especially the worship of Cybele and of Isis,

were all the vogue. Judaism had great attractions for the Roman upper

classes. Priests, magicians, soothsayers, astrologers crowded the

capital and found a ready welcome. Claudius, we are told, was so struck

by the progress of foreign superstitions' that he thought it an act of

sound political conservatism to re-establish the haruspices. [147]

Harnack makes the statement in his Expansion of Christianity' that the

majority of the Christians with whose travels we are acquainted made

[Rome] their goal,' and he admits that there are no real grounds for

doubting that Simon Magus did so. [148] Of prominent Christians who

were in Rome in the time of St. Peter's and St. Paul's ministry,

Timothy, Apollos, Silas, Titus, Epaphras, Aristarchus, Mark and Luke

are mentioned in the salutations of extant epistles, and in all

probability the names of John and of Barnabas should be added to the

list. The travels and experiences of Apollonius of Tyana are most

instructive (even when full allowance has been made for the element of

romance introduced by his biographer Philostratus), for he was an exact

contemporary of the Apostles, and a kind of second Simon Magus. His

vast journeys, which extended from the Ganges to the Pillars of

Hercules, are a proof of the facilities with which such wonder-working

teachers of philosophy and religion made their way from place to place,

and the honour and respect with which they were generally received.

Apollonius was in Rome in 65 and 66 A.D. [149]

Of St. Peter's first Roman visit and preaching early tradition has

handed down few details; a series, however, of witnesses affirm that

Mark accompanied the Apostle to Rome and there wrote his Gospel. Both

Irenaeus and John the Presbyter, as reported by Papias, speak of Mark

as Peter's interpreter,' [150] as do later writers. That Peter should

have chosen John Mark to go with him is quite what one might expect

from the narrative of the Acts, for Peter was clearly on terms of the

closest intimacy with Mary, the mother of Mark and the aunt of

Barnabas, whose house was a centre of reunion for the Christians of

Jerusalem. There is no reason for thinking that this was the first time

that Mark had acted as the Apostle's companion and interpreter ; his

services would be profitable to the ministry' in Palestine, scarcely

less than in Rome, and the suggestion that he was a catechist to whom

the instruction of the Apostle's Greek-speaking converts in the

elements of the Gospel story was entrusted, is both plausible and

probable. [151] His surname, Marcus, may be taken as indicating that

his family had some Roman connexion; he may have been, like Paul and

Silas, a Roman citizen. Eusebius relates that as a consequence of

Peter's preaching the power of Simon was soon extinguished and

destroyed together with the man,' but that the Apostle's hearers were

not content with listening but once to the unwritten doctrine of the

Divine Message, but they persisted in supplicating Mark, who was

Peter's companion and whose Gospel is extant, that he should leave them

also in writing a memorial of the doctrine that had been orally

delivered. Nor did they cease their entreaties until they had prevailed

with the man, and in this way that writing which is called the Gospel

according to Mark is due to them. And they say that when the Apostle

through the revelation of the Spirit knew what was done he was pleased

with the zeal of the men and gave authority for the writing to be read

publicly in the churches.' [152] This, says Eusebius, is the account

given by Clement [of Alexandria] in the sixth book of his Hypotyposeis'

and that it is also corroborated by Papias the bishop of Hierapolis. In

other parts of his work Eusebius actually gives the quotations to which

he here refers, from which it appears that he has really combined more

than one passage of Clement in his statement. [153] The evidence of

John, as recorded by Papias [154] --that Mark being the interpreter of

Peter wrote whatsoever he remembered with great accuracy, but not in

the order in which the things were said or done by the Lord '--is

interesting, for it seems to point to the Gospel in its present form

having been compiled from a set of separate lections intended for

public exposition and for catechetical instruction. Harnack has come to

the conclusion that internal indications place no impediment in the way

of assigning Mark at the latest to the sixth decade of the first

century.' [155] But it is fairly certain that Mark was not at Rome

during the sixth decade, and there can therefore be no objection to

accepting the voice of tradition, which makes the Gospel to have been

written for the use of St. Peter's Roman converts about the year 45

A.D.

The evidence of St. Jerome, as to the form of the Petrine tradition,

which was current in the Rome of Pope Damasus during the latter part of

the fourth century, now demands our most careful attention, for it is

of great importance. His words (to which I have already referred) are:

Simon Peter . . . prince of the Apostles, after an episcopacy of the

Antiochean Church, and after preaching to the dispersion of those of

the circumcision, who had believed in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia

and Bithynia, in the second year of Claudius journeys to Rome to combat

Simon Magus, and there for twenty-five years he occupied the sacerdotal

chair, until the last year of Nero, that is the fourteenth.' [156] The

biographical notice of St. Peter, which appears in the edition of the

Liber Pontificalis' published about 530 A.D., is, as the Abb� Duchesne

states, [157] borrowed from St. Jerome, and this notice has remained as

what may be justly styled the standard Roman tradition ever since. I

have said that this represents the form of that tradition as it

obtained at Rome in the pontificate of Damasus (366-384). Damasus has

been well named the first Christian archaeologist. Some of his many

beautifully engraved inscriptions, embodying often the results of

personal research and investigation, above the tombs of the martyrs in

the catacombs and in the churches of Rome are still extant. [158]

Tradition connects the name of this Pope, coupled with that of Jerome,

with the compilation of the original Liber Pontificalis,' as the forged

letters prefixed to the work testify. Indeed so long and to such an

extent did this tradition survive that in the thirteenth century and

later we find the work designated as the Chronica Damasi' or Damasus de

Gestis Pontificum.' [159] In any case Damasus did make the early

history of the Roman Church his special study, and Jerome was his

secretary at the time of his death in 384. Nor was this all. Jerome

spent some time in his earlier life at Rome, as a student, and he has

himself left on record, [160] how at that time he visited the

sepulchres of the Apostles and martyrs in the catacombs, and it must be

borne in mind that in those days there were in existence very many

tombs and inscriptions of the highest historical interest, which have

long since been destroyed, and that others were then accessible, which

have not yet been unearthed. Lastly in assaying the value of Jerome's

evidence, as to the received Petrine tradition in the pontificate of

Damasus, it is a matter of no small interest to know that he must have

met at Rome in 382-84 and been the companion at the Papal Court of

Furius Dionysius Filocalus. [161] This man was the artist who engraved

the Damasene inscriptions, so noted for the peculiar beauty and special

character of their calligraphy. He was the illuminator and probably the

editor of the Liberian or Filocalian Catalogue of the Roman Bishops,

which was compiled and edited in 354 A.D. and which was the basis of

the later Liber Pontificalis.' [162] With this Liberian catalogue it is

impossible that Jerome should have been unacquainted, and the

differences between its form of the Petrine tradition and that given by

Jerome are of interest and will demand our consideration. What is,

however, important now to note is that Jerome, the later writer, in

differing from the Liberian notice of St. Peter must have done so

intentionally.

The quotation given above from the De Viris Illustribus' closely

follows the lines of the passage from the Chronicle of Eusebius about

St. Peter, which in the Hieronymian version is thus rendered--Peter the

Apostle . . . when he had first founded the Antiochean Church, sets out

to Rome, where as bishop (episcopus) of the same city he continues for

twenty-five years preaching the Gospel. After Peter Linus first held

the Roman Church for eleven years.' [163] The notice in the De Viris

Illustribus' adds the detail, which appears later in the Liber

Pontificalis,' that it was in the second year of Claudius that Peter

arrived in Rome, and as Peter's death is asserted to have taken place

in the last year of Nero, the interval gives exactly the twenty-five

years of the so-called episcopacy, or, as in this case it would be

better rendered, overseership of the Roman Church. The Abb� Duchesne in

his monumental work on the Liber Pontificalis,' while stating that it

is only after the time of Xystus I (117-126) that there is sufficient

uniformity in the catalogues to inspire confidence in the figures given

for the duration of the earlier episcopates, writes: As far as regards

St. Peter the figure of his twenty-five years is as well attested as

the figures of the years of his successors after Xystus I. I have then

believed myself able to note it, but without indicating from what date

one ought to count it, for there are on this point grave incertitudes.'

[164] With these grave incertitudes let me now deal very briefly. The

Eusebian History and Chronicle give lists of the Roman bishops, and the

Chronicle the lengths of their term-years, while the Liberian or

Filocalian Catalogue gives a list of bishops and their term-years, but

(as I have already said) with considerable divergences. Both are based

on earlier authorities--the Eusebian on the lists of Hegesippus and

Irenaeus, i.e. on documents belonging to the second half of the second

century; the Liberian on a chronicler, most probably Hippolytus, about

fifty years later. Now both the Eusebian Chronicle and the Liberian

Catalogue give twenty-five years as the term of St. Peter's episcopacy,

but they differ as to the dates of its beginning and its end. We have

already seen that the Eusebian date-limits are from 42 A.D. to 67 A.D.;

the Liberian, however, are from 30 A.D. to 55 A.D. The Liberian

chronicler states that after the Lord's Ascension the most blessed

Peter received the office of a bishop (episcopatum).' [165] He further

states that Linus succeeded him at Rome in 56 A.D. At first sight it

may appear that these two sets of dates are hopelessly inconsistent.

[166] That this is not necessarily the case, I will now endeavour to

show.

First, let me point out that the Liberian Chronicler's account of the

whole of the early history of the Roman episcopate is full of blunders;

his errors are not confined to his statement about St. Peter. By him

Clement is reckoned as the second bishop instead of the third, and

Anencletus or Cletus is represented as two persons [167] instead of

one. In the case of St. Peter the Chronicler apparently regards the

Ascension as being the date of the assumption of a general episcopate

by the Apostle, who after that date became undoubtedly the acknowledged

leader of the Twelve. Moreover St. Luke emphatically mentions

sojourners from Rome, Jews and proselytes as being present at the feast

of Pentecost when by Peter's preaching 3000 converts were made. But

what about the other date, 56 A.D.? It will be my aim now to show that

this date also may be one of real historical significance in the

life-work of St. Peter.

The Hieronymian-Eusebian version of the Petrine tradition is indeed, as

it stands, scarcely less in conflict with the Lukan history than is the

Liberian. Jerome's statement that before Peter went to Rome in 42 A.D.

he had been bishop of the Church at Antioch and had preached to the

Jewish Diaspora in various provinces of Asia Minor is obviously

irreconcilable with the narrative in the Acts. The explanation however

of all these difficulties seems to me to lie in the hypothesis of a

sojourn of Peter at Rome about midway between the sojourn in the early

part of Claudius and the final sojourn towards the close of Nero's

reign, which ended with his martyrdom. I propose therefore to examine

the possibilities of such an hypothesis, and to see whether any

evidence, circumstantial or otherwise, exists to give it support.

The sequence of events as given in the Acts has been frequently

misunderstood. In the eleventh chapter, verses 19-20, St. Luke tells us

of the rapid spread of the Christian faith at Antioch through the

efforts of evangelists from Cyprus and Cyrene, men who had once been

among the Hellenist disciples of Stephen at Jerusalem, and further that

in this company of the new converts were many Greeks as well as Jews.

He then proceeds to state that when news of this was brought to the

Apostles in Jerusalem, they resolved to send, in their name and as

their representative, Barnabas, as being at once a prominent member of

the Church at Jerusalem and a Cypriote by nationality, to take charge

of this important new movement and to assume its leader-ship. Barnabas

was successful in his mission and having brought Saul from Tarsus to

help him in his task, by the joint efforts of these two men of special

gifts and earnest zeal the growth of the Church made such conspicuous

progress as to attract public notice and to gain for the new sect in

the mouth of the multitude that scoffing but distinctive nickname of

Christiani which was to be in the coming centuries a title of honour

the profession of which would bring to thousands of martyrs terrible

sufferings and death.

Between verse 26 and verse 27, however, a certain interval elapsed. The

phrase now in these days'--as in the opening verse of the sixth

chapter--is one of those loose chronological expressions common to the

Lukan writings, implying an uncertain interval of time. In this case

the statement that certain prophets came down from Jerusalem unto

Antioch' may be taken to have suggested the insertion at this point of

the episode with which Chapter xii. opens: Now about that time Herod

the King put forth his hands to afflict certain of the Church.' The

departure of the prophets for Antioch was in fact one of the results of

the persecution of Herod, and as the story of the persecution was

essential to the writer's purpose he has interpolated it here in the

midst of his Antiochean narrative, which is resumed at verse 25 of this

same twelfth chapter. One of these prophets, whose name Agabus is

given, is stated to have predicted the coming of a great famine over

all the world, and such was the belief inspired by his utterance that

the Christian community of Antioch determined to collect a contribution

for the relief of the brethren that dwelt in Judaea. Now the famine,

which was, in accordance with Agabus' prophecy, of wide extent

throughout the Eastern portion of the Roman world, [168] seems to have

begun in Judaea in the year 45 A.D. and to have reached its height in

the following year. According to Josephus [169] the famine took place

when Tiberius Alexander was procurator in Judaea, and his term of

office did not begin before the latter part of 45 A.D. As this same

historian gives a circumstantial account of the relief brought

personally to Jerusalem by Queen Helena, mother of Izates, King of

Adiabene in 45 A.D., and of her remaining there some considerable time

distributing corn that she imported from Egypt and figs from Cyprus, it

is evident that the dearth lasted for at least two years. The

probability is that the prophecy of Agabus was delivered some time in

44 A.D. and that with the first reports of a failure of the crops being

imminent the fund in aid at Antioch was started. The raising of a

sufficient sum by weekly collections would take some time, and it is

not likely that the delegates Barnabas and Saul left Antioch until the

spring of 46 A.D. was sufficiently advanced for a voyage to one of the

Palestinian ports to be possible. The Feast of Pentecost would have

been a very fitting time for the arrival of men bringing alms to supply

the needs of those suffering from the loss of the harvest.

At this point let us carry our thoughts back to St. Peter, whom we left

at Rome with Mark, as his companion and interpreter. There exists no

record to tell us what was the duration of this his first sojourn in

that city. At this critical stage however of the development of the

Christian Church the advice and guidance of so trusted a leader must

have been frequently needed both at Jerusalem and at Antioch, The

longest stay that St. Paul ever made in one place was at Ephesus, where

he remained for three years, and three years may be safely regarded as

the extreme limit of St. Peter's absence in these opening years of the

reign of Claudius. [170] In any case the news of the famine would be

sure to hasten his departure, and if, as I myself strongly hold, the

second visit of Paul to Jerusalem in company with Barnabas, described

in the second chapter of the Epistle to the Galatians, [171] be

identical with their mission from Antioch as the bearers of the relief

fund, then in the spring of 46 A.D. they would find both Peter and Mark

on their arrival already at Jerusalem. The only other member of the

Twelve present in the Holy City at this juncture seems to have been St.

John, and no more suitable opportunity could have been afforded for a

private discussion of the situation raised by the admission into the

Antiochean Church, without any Jewish restrictions, of a large number

of Gentile converts, and of an understanding being arrived at upon the

vital issues that were in question. The five principal representatives

of what may be styled the old, the moderate and the new schools of

Christian thought and opinion were now brought together by the

discharge of a common charitable duty, and the result was an agreement

on general principles and a working arrangement as to missionary

spheres, which approved itself, if not to the Judaistic extremists, to

the recognised leaders Peter, John and James no less than to Paul and

Barnabas, as satisfactory.

The measure of Peter's satisfaction may be gathered from the fact that

John Mark accompanied the two delegates on their return to Antioch,

probably in the spring of 47, and that some months later, but before

the period for sailing was over, Barnabas and Saul set out on their

missionary journey to Cyprus, taking Mark with them. Their work in

Cyprus, for they went through the whole island, would occupy them till

the spring, when they crossed to Perga in Pamphylia where Mark left

them and returned to Jerusalem. Many reasons have been suggested as the

cause of this abandonment at this time. It may have been due in part to

dissatisfaction with Paul's methods of teaching, more probably to a

feeling that now the Cyprian mission was over it was his duty to return

once more to the side of his old leader in that new sphere of work with

Antioch as its centre which Peter had probably been, to Mark's

knowledge, for some time planning. [172]

No tradition from early Christian times is stronger or more persistent

than that which asserts that before Peter entered upon his Roman

episcopate,' he for seven years filled a similar office at Antioch.

[173] Now if the so-called Roman episcopate be taken to date strictly

from the second year of Claudius, it is quite clear that Peter did not

spend seven years at Antioch previously. So it has come to pass that

even those who have been willing to accept the Roman visit of 42 A.D.

as historical have dismissed the Antiochean tradition as baseless

fable. But in my opinion no tradition of this character can have come

into existence and held its ground as this did without there being a

genuine substratum of truth in it. The real difficulty is the

chronological one. Can this be overcome? I believe it may be. If Peter

sojourned at Rome a second time in the years 54-56 A.D., and I hope to

show grounds for believing that he may have done so, then there is no

reason why the seven years that preceded this (47-54 A.D.) should not

have been years during which Peter made Antioch the centre of his

missionary work, a starting-point for journeys to Mesopotamia in the

east or even to Cappadocia and Pontus in the north, an abode from which

visits to the feasts at Jerusalem could be easily undertaken. It is

certain that he was in Antioch at the same time as Paul and Barnabas

after the return of the latter from their first missionary journey in

the autumn of 49 A.D. [174] The account, which Paul gives in the second

chapter of his Epistle to the Galatians, of the dispute he had with

Peter concerning the question of eating with the Gentiles, would indeed

lead one to think that the Apostle's stay at that time had been one of

some duration. As St. Luke from the thirteenth chapter of the Acts and

onward confines his narrative entirely to the missionary life of St.

Paul, it is with gratitude that we welcome these flashes of light from

the autobiographical portions of the Pauline epistles, which from time

to time suddenly illumine the darkness of these early decades of the

first century, through which we are pain-fully striving to grope our

way, and, however evanescent, prove to us at any rate that for the

moment we are walking upon the right track. There is probably no

epistle which is so rich in passages of this kind as St. Paul's First

Epistle to the Corinthians. It is generally agreed that this epistle

was written at Ephesus towards the end of St. Paul's stay of three

years in that city. Now the recent discovery of an inscription at

Delphi [175] practically fixes the date of Gallio's proconsulship in

Achaia as 52 A.D., and with it the chronology of this part of St.

Paul's life. The date of the First Epistle to the Corinthians can

therefore be given with something approaching to certainty. It was

written towards the end of the year 55 A.D. Now one of the chief

objects of this epistle was to reprove the Corinthians for their

divisions and party spirit. There was a party there which called itself

by the name of Cephas. Again there is a direct reference to the fact

that Cephas was accompanied in his missionary journeys by his wife.

[176] What other explanation can be given of such statements than the

obvious one, that Peter had been paying a visit of such duration to

Corinth as to have created a following who boasted themselves

distinctively, as being the disciples of one whom they looked upon as a

super-eminent Apostle.' [177] Further a chance reference is made to

Barnabas, as working for his maintenance, [178] a reference which would

be meaningless unless the Corinthians were acquainted with Barnabas

personally and had seen him so working. That Peter was really regarded

in the second century as a founder of the Corinthian Church conjointly

with Paul is proved by the quotation, preserved by Eusebius, from a

letter of Dionysius, bishop of Corinth, to Soter, bishop of Rome, who

speaks of the plantation of Peter and Paul at Rome and at Corinth. For

they both together here in Corinth planted us and taught alike; and

both together in Italy taught alike, and then were martyred about the

same time.' [179]

These almost casual references preserved in the First Epistle to the

Corinthians relating to an event of much significance in the history of

an important Church, to which an eminent bishop of that Church bears

witness as a recognised and established tradition about a century

later, bring before us in a startling way how widespread were the

activities of Peter and other members of the Apostolic band in those

years when the narrative of the Acts is dumb as to their very

existence, and therefore how little right we have to express ourselves

dogmatically and without reservation upon questions of first-century

Christian history, of which our knowledge is so utterly fragmentary, or

to reject unceremoniously traditions which, if carefully sifted, will

generally be found to contain some precious bits of authentic

historical fact. The particular episode of Petrine history with which I

am now dealing affords an excellent illustration of these remarks.

Granted then that the natural interpretation of certain passages of the

First Epistle to the Corinthians implies that both Peter and Barnabas

were in Corinth and working there in the autumn of 54 A.D., it may well

be asked is it not strange that these two Apostolic men of all others

should have thus gone apparently out of their way to visit a Church so

recently founded by the efforts of St. Paul, and which should have been

regarded as in his special charge ? The reply is that not by a single

word does St. Paul make any complaint on the subject. What then is the

explanation ? It is, I believe, that Peter on hearing of the death of

Claudius on October 13, 54 A.D., had thought the time opportune for

revisiting his Roman converts and had asked Barnabas to accompany him.

They had stopped at Corinth simply as a convenient halting-place, being

the half-way house between Syria and Italy. And now let us turn to

tradition. There are many traditions which associate Barnabas with Rome

and Italy. The forms in which they have come down to us are, like most

of the fifth and sixth century Acts, Passions and Travels, full of

chronological errors and contain many impossibilities and

contradictions due to the later inventions and interpolations of

hagiographers careless or ignorant of history and anxious only to

glorify the memory of the particular saint or martyr in whom for local

or other reasons they are interested. But as the learned French writer,

Edmond le Blant, [180] who is a specialist on this subject, well says

These interpolations, in my opinion, ought not either to disconcert or

to repel criticism. Under a layer of invention the original traits

exist, and a great number of them appear on the very surface. One must

extricate them patiently.' The earliest reference to Barnabas [181] is

that found in the Clementine Recognitions.' [182] This work, an

Ebionite romance of a much later age than Clement the supposed writer,

is prefaced by an account of Clement's early life at Rome. The author

says that Clement was converted by the preaching of Barnabas, who

afterwards introduced him to St. Peter. The object of the author of the

Recognitions' is to magnify the authority and orthodox teaching of

Peter, so that the introduction here of Barnabas, who is never

mentioned again, is purely gratuitous, and indeed inexplicable in such

a narrative unless the fact recorded were one based on a received and

ancient tradition too well known to be ignored. The mention of

Barnabas' preaching has nothing to do with the story. The insertion

thus of this incident without cause in an Ebionite document of Eastern

origin strongly speaks for its authenticity. The traditions represent

Barnabas as having preceded Peter [183] as a preacher at Rome, and it

is quite possible that he may now have left Corinth some weeks or

months before Peter followed him, and that one of the first-fruits of

his ministry in the Imperial City was the conversion of the man who was

to occupy so important a place in the history of the Church in Rome

during the latter half of the first century. [184]

If certain passages of St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians have

suggested that St. Peter visited Corinth in 54 A.D., certain other

passages of the Epistle to the Romans, sent by St. Paul from Corinth to

its destination in the early spring of 57 A.D., suggest no less

strongly that he [Paul] had been recently hindered from going to Rome

by the presence in that Church of one who was its founder. And here I

would venture to say that we may rest assured that the principle not to

build on another man's foundation' [185] was an Apostolic and not

merely a Pauline rule of action. That Peter went to Corinth with any

intention of interfering with Paul's great work in that town, or of

placing himself before the Corinthians as a rival and superior to the

Apostle of the Gentiles, is inconceivable. But just as Paul proposed in

Peter's absence to pay a passing visit to Rome on his way to Spain in

order that he might be refreshed by personal intercourse with those of

whose faith in Christ he had heard so much, and that he might in his

turn be able to impart to them some spiritual gift, [186] so would

Peter be anxious to break his voyage to Rome at the Isthmus of Corinth,

so as to make acquaintance during a brief sojourn with a Christian

community in whose first conversion and establishment as a Church his

own Roman disciples, Aquila and Prisca, had played so considerable a

part.

Now St. Paul in his Epistle to the Romans twice emphatically declares

that though he had for some time longed to visit Rome, he had been many

times hindered, and the cause is plainly stated, i.e. that it was his

settled practice not to trespass in another man's sphere of work. As I

do not wish to go over old ground, I shall assume that the other man'

here referred to is St. Peter. But this being granted, the more often I

read over these autobiographical passages from this epistle the more

thoroughly am I convinced that the writer is not here simply alluding

to so distant an event as the preaching of that Apostle in the Imperial

City in the early days of Claudius, but to Peter being actually present

at Rome in person at the times when otherwise he, Paul, might have been

able to carry out his wished-for visit. For such a friendly visit of

short duration need not, as I have already said, any more than the

contemplated visit on the way to Spain, have been regarded as a

building upon another man's foundation.' The often-times' of c. i. 13

and the many times' of c. xv. 22 are practically confined within

somewhat narrow limits. Paul after what he must have learned from

Aquila and Prisca would scarcely have thought of adventuring himself in

Rome before the death of Claudius. At that date be was in Ephesus, a

city that was in direct and constant communication with the capital,

and during the next two years he might have found several opportunities

for undertaking a voyage to Rome: one, for instance, when from Ephesus

he paid that second visit to Corinth of which there is no record in the

Acts, but which is mentioned in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians.

[187] Another, and a most tempting one, when his tried friends and

fellow helpers, Aquila and Prisca, returned home after the tumult. Yet

a third when after leaving Ephesus he went to Macedonia and then

apparently followed the Via Egnatia to Illyricum before making that

third sojourn in Corinth, when he wrote the Epistle to the Romans. If

he were hindered from doing so, it was because precisely during this

period Peter was himself in Rome.

I now turn to the evidence of the Liberian or Filocalian Catalogue of

354 A.D., which has been traced back by those who speak with the

highest authority upon the subject to the lost Chronicle of Hippolytus,

written about 234 or 235 A.D. [188] The Liberian Catalogue makes

several palpable blunders in the early part of its list of the Roman

bishops, as I have already said, but the most curious is that which

makes the twenty-five years of St. Peter's episcopate to begin in 30

A.D. and to end in 55 A.D. Now this last date can scarcely be intended

as that of St. Peter's martyrdom, for the Chronicler goes on to say

that he suffered with St. Paul on June 29 in the reign of Nero, showing

clearly his acquaintance with the common tradition. But the fact that

the names of the Consuls (in a corrupted form) for the year 55 are

correctly given is a piece of strong circumstantial evidence that this

date was one of special importance in the early history of the Roman

Church. [189] The assertion that Linus at this time succeeded Peter as

bishop supplies, I believe, a clue by which to arrive at a solution of

the difficulty. Later writers and the Liber Pontificalis' itself

mention both Linus and Anencletus as having been ordained by Peter as

bishops and as having exercised the duties of that office in his name

during his lifetime, [190] and there is likewise a tradition that

Clement also was ordained bishop by Peter in his lifetime. This is a

quite possible representation of what really took place. The date 55

A.D. occupied a permanent place in the records of the Roman Church

because at this date Peter personally gave to that Church its local

organisation by appointing out of the general body of presbyters an

inner presbyteral council entrusted with special pastoral duties of

administration and overseership, the members of which bore the name of

episcopi, which as St. Peter himself in his first epistle tells us was

virtually the equivalent of pastores. Not until after the death of St.

Peter however did this administrative episcopal body deem it necessary

to select one of their number to succeed him as presiding episcopus and

chief pastor of the Church.

There is one event which should, I think, be connected with this visit

of St. Peter in 55 A.D., of considerable interest. It has generally

been assumed that the mass of the early Christians belonged to the

lowest classes and that many of them were slaves. This is no doubt to a

certain extent true, but not by any means altogether so. Aquila and

Prisca may have belonged to the freedman' class, but they were

well-to-do people, and it is probable that Prisca was Roman by birth

and a person of some position. Again after dismissing all that is

worthless and utterly fictitious in the account given of Clement's

family and their adventures in the so-called Clementine literature,

that literature bears evidence that long after his death Clement was

given a place apart among the men of the sub-apostolic age not merely

because he was a disciple of St. Peter or the author of a well-known

epistle, but because he was connected by ties of relationship with the

Imperial house. It seems unlikely that Ebionite writers in Eastern

lands should have gone out of their way to lay stress on this

relationship, unless it had some foundation in fact. To this matter I

shall return later.

The case of Julia Pomponia Graecina, the wife of Aulus Plautius, the

conqueror of Britain, is exceedingly interesting. It is best told in

the words of Tacitus--Pomponia Graecina, a distinguished lady, wife of

the Plautius who returned from Britain with an ovation, was accused of

some foreign superstition and handed over to her husband's judicial

decision. Following ancient precedent, he heard his wife's cause in the

presence of kinsfolk, involving, as it did, her legal status and

character, and he reported that she was innocent. This Pomponia lived a

long life of unbroken melancholy. After the murder of Julia, Drusus'

daughter, by Messalina's intrigues, for forty years she wore only the

attire of a mourner, with a heart ever sorrowful. For this, during

Claudius' reign, she escaped unpunished, and it was afterwards counted

a glory to her.' [191] It had been long surmised that the foreign

superstition' of which this lady was accused was the profession of

Christianity. At that time Christianity was still regarded by the Roman

authorities as a mere sect of Judaism, and Judaism being a religio

licita Pomponia would be entitled to acquittal. Possibly public rumour

was already beginning to accuse the Christians, as distinguished from

the Jews, of indulging in impure and impious orgies, but if this were

the ground of the accusation, it would not be difficult to refute it.

The discovery by the famous archaeologist Giovanni Battista De Rossi in

1867, in the very ancient crypts of Lucina in the catacomb of

Callistus, of a Christian sepulchral inscription bearing the name, only

slightly injured, of a Pomponius Graecinus is a piece of testimony of

considerable weight. He may well have been a great-nephew of the

Pomponia Graecina of Tacitus, for De Rossi dates the inscription as

belonging to the second half of the second century. The conjecture then

that Pomponia Graecina, who was not only a friend but a relative of

Julia and of the Claudian family, was a Christian convert is rendered

very probable. It is worthy of note that the death of Julia, when

Pomponia's mourning began, was in 43 A.D. during St. Peter's first

visit to Rome, and that her trial before the family tribunal occurred

in 57 A.D. or about a year (according to the hypothesis I have been

endeavouring to sustain) after the second visit of the Apostle. It may

well have been her intercourse with him that led to this public notice

being taken of her addiction to a foreign superstition.'
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conflicting statements, as far as regards the position of Clement in

the Roman succession--a tradition, the Irenaean--a fiction, the

Clementine--and a blunder, the Liberian or perhaps the Hippolytean.

Under these circumstances we cannot hesitate for a moment in our

verdict. Whether the value of the tradition be great or small, it alone

deserves to be considered. The sequence therefore which commends itself

for acceptance is Linus, Anencletus or Cletus, Clemens, Euarestus'

(Apost. Fathers, part i. vol. i. p. 66).

[168] Sir W. M. Ramsay writes (St. Paul the Traveller, pp. 48-49): The

famine appears to me to be singularly well attested considering the

scantiness of evidence for this period. Suetonius alludes to assiduae

sterilitates causing famine prices under Claudius, while Dion Cassius

and Tacitus speak of two famines in Rome, and famine in Rome implied

dearth in the great corn-growing countries of the Mediterranean;

Eusebius mentions famine in Greece and an inscription perhaps refers to

famine in Asia Minor.'

[169] As to the famine in Judaea Josephus is full and explicit (Ant.

iii. 15. 3; xx. 2. 5 and 5. 2). The story of Queen Helena's munificence

is told also by Eusebius (Hist. Eccl. ii. 12). Ramsay in a note on the

date of the famine says that Tiberius Alexander's entry into office

cannot be fixed with absolute certainty: July 45 A.D. is the earliest

admissible date and 46 A.D. is far more probable' (St. Paul the

Traveller, p. 68). In the article on Chronology' in Hastings's

Dictionary of the Bible, Mr. C. H. Turner gives 46 A.D. as the date of

the visit of the Antiochean delegates.

[170] Both the Latin (Hieronymian) and Syriac translation of Eusebius'

Chronicle make Peter to have gone to Rome in the second year of

Claudius and to Antioch two years later (ed. Schoene, p. 211). This two

years may represent the time actually spent in Rome according to

tradition.

[171] Gal. ii. 1-10. For an eminently fair and thorough examination of

the arguments for identifying the Galatian visit after fourteen years'

with (1) the visit of Paul and Barnabas described in Acts xi and (2)

with the visit to the Council described in Acts xv, see Professor

Kirsopp Lake, The Early Epistles of St. Paul, pp. 274-293. Professor

Lake after stating the case for the identification with (1) says To my

mind it is extremely strong' (p. 281). Again after weighing the

objections against (1) and (2) he concludes my own view is that the

objections [against] placing Gal. ii. at the time of the famine are

much less serious, but I recognise that they are real, and prevent one

from claiming the right to feel quite certain on the subject' (p. 293).

It will be seen that, in the circumstances under which I suppose the

interview to have taken place, the case for the identification is much

strengthened.

[172] It is a curious fact that Barnabas and Paul made no attempt to

preach in Pamphylia either on the outward or the return journey, nor is

there any evidence to show that Paul ever revisited that country. The

idea suggests itself that Pamphylia may already have become another

man's sphere.' Possibly Peter himself may have paused on his voyage

back from Rome to preach to the Jewish Diaspora scattered along the

Southern coast of Asia Minor. If so, Mark's refusal to proceed to

Pamphylia would be explained on this ground.

[173] The Liber Pontificalis, both in its original form as restored by

Duchesne and in its later recension, gives seven years as the length of

the Petrine episcopate at Antioch. Duchesne, Liber Pontificalis, i. 51,

118; also St. Gregory, Ep. vii. 40.

[174] Certain, that is, if the second visit of Paul to Jerusalem be

identical with that in Galatians ii, which I am now assuming. It cannot

fail to strike anyone how much more fittingly the dispute between Peter

and Paul falls into its place with this assumption, than if it be

regarded as occurring after the Council of Jerusalem. Indeed the

difficulty of regarding this meeting as happening at this later time

just after the Apostolic decree had been drawn up is so overwhelmingly

great that some authorities, i.e. Harnack, Zahn, and Turner (Hastings's

Dict.) have felt compelled to suggest that the order of events has been

inverted by St. Paul. See Kirsopp Lake, Early Epistles of St. Paul, p.

294 ff.

[175] See Revue d'Histoire et de la Litt�rature Religieuses, Mars-Avril

1911: E. Ch. Babut, p. 139 ff., describes the discovery by M. Ed.

Bourget of four fragments of a letter of Claudius to the city of

Delphi. In the inscription, part of which is obliterated or wanting,

the twenty-sixth salutation of Claudius is mentioned and Gallio is

Proconsul. M. Babut shows that the date must lie between narrow limits.

Claudius had his twenty-seventh salutation on August 1, 52 A.D., and

the twenty-sixth salutation probably not before April or May of that

year. Also consult Adolf Deissmann's St. Paul (Eng. tr. 1912), where a

facsimile of the inscription is given and the Proconsulate of Gallio

forms the subject of a special Appendix, p. 235 ff.

[176] 1 Cor. i. 12; iii. 22; ix. 5.

[177] 2 Cor. xii. 11: husteresa ton huperlian apostolon.

[178] 1 Cor. ix. 6.

[179] Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. ii. 25: tauta kai humeis dia tes tosautes

nouthesias ten apo Petrou kai Paulou phuteian genetheisan Rhomaion

tekai Korinthion sunekerasate. Kai gar ampho kai eis ten hemeteran

Korinthon phuteusantes hemas, homoios edidaxan; homoios de kai eis ten

Italian homose didaxantes, emarturesan kata ton auton kairon. See also

Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. iv. 23 and Kirsopp Lake, Early Epistles of St.

Paul, p. 112.

[180] Les Actes des Martyrs. Supplement aux Acta Sincera de Dom

Ruinart' (part 2, p. 87).

[181] The traditions about Barnabas have been collected and fully

treated by Braunsberger. Der Apostel Barnabas. Sein Leben and der ihm

beigelegte Brief. Mainz, 1876. See also Harnack in the Theologische

Literaturzeitung, 1876, No. 19, 487 ff. and Lipsius, Die Apokryphen

Apostelgeschichten und Apostellegenden, 2er Band, 2e H�lfte, 270 ff.

The chief document relating to Barnabas' work first at Rome then at

Milan is entitled Datiana historia Ecclesiae Mediolanensis ed. Biraghi,

Milan 1848. Braunsberger's conclusion is that the preaching of Barnabas

in North Italy was zwar nicht sicher, aber sehr wahrscheinlich' (p.

83).

[182] Hort in his lectures on the Clementine Recognitions shows that

this pseud-epigraphic writing, and the Clementine Homilies, which

closely resemble it, are two separate Ebionite versions of a much

earlier work known as the Circuits of Peter--Periodoi Petror. See also

Salmon's article in Smith and Wace's Dict. of Christian Biography. The

date of these versions is about the end of the third century, of the

Periodoi about a century earlier. Both had their origin in the East.

[183] In the Datiana historia the Barnabas story as told by the author,

after relating Barnabas' work with Paul at Antioch and the choice made

of him and Paul as Apostles to the Gentiles in the fourteenth year

after Christ's Passion, and his first missionary journey, and second

visit to Cyprus after his separation from Paul, proceeds to state that

thereon--in the first year of Claudius, eight years after Christ's

ascension--he takes ship with some of his disciples for Rome--velut

totius orbis dominam visere cupiens,' where he, as the first Apostle,

proclaims the Word of God and among others converts Clement, afterwards

the third successor of Peter in the Roman episcopate (Lipsius, ii. 2,

p. 311). Here it is obvious that the chronology contradicts itself. It

ought to be the first year of Claudius Nero, i.e. 55 A.D. If the eight

years be counted from Barnabas' appointment as an Apostle of the

Gentiles, 47 A.D., we arrive at the same date.

[184] A prima-facie case is made out for the authenticity of the

tradition of Barnabas' preaching in Rome and North Italy from the fact

that it was so greatly in the interest of the upholders of the Petrine

origin of the Roman Church to suppress it; as Harnack points out, its

existence musste dem r�mischen Bischofe h�chst unbequem werden: denn

sie drohte die einzigartige Bedeutung des Petrus f�r das Abendland and

die einzigartige Stellung Roms im Abendlande zu gef�rhrden.'--Literatur

Zeitung, 1876. No. 19, 488.

[185] Rom. xv. 20.

[186] Rom. i. 10-12, xv. 23, 24.

[187] 2 Cor. xii. 24 and xiii. 1.

[188] See pp. 49, n. 2, 71, supra.

[189] Petrus, ann. xxv. mens. uno, d. viiii. Fuit temporibus Tiberii

Caesaris et Gai et Tiberi Claudi et Neronis, a cons. Minuci [vinicii]

et Longini [A.D. 30] usque Nerine at Vero [Nerone et Vetere A.D. 55].

Passus autem cum Paulo die iii. Kal. Iulias, cons. ss, imperante

Nerone. Linus, ann. xii. m. iiii, dies xii. Fuit temporibus Neronis, a

consulatu Saturnini et Scipionis [A.D. 56] usque Capitone et Rufo [A.D.

67] (Light-foot, Apost. Fathers, I. i. p. 253).

[190] Hic [Petrus] ordinavit duos episcopos, Linum et Cletum, qui

praesentaliter omne ministerium sacerdotale in urbe Roma populo vel

supervenientium exhiberent; beatus autem Petrus ad orationem et

praedicationem, populum erudiens, vacabat. . . . Hic beatum Clementem

episcopum conservavit, eique cathedram vel ecclesiam omnem disponendam

commisit.--Duchesne, Liber Pontificalis, i. 118. See evidence of

Epiphanius derived from Hegesippus, Lawlor, Eusebiana, p. 9.

[191] Pomponia Graecina, insignis femina, Plautio qui ovans se de

Britanniis rettulit nupta ac superstitionis externae rea,

mariti�iudicio permissa; isque prisco instituto, propinquis coram, de

capite famaque coniugis cognovit et insontem nuntiavit. Longa huic

Pomponiae aetas et continua tristis fuit; nam post Iuliam Drusi filiam

dolo Messalinae interfectam per quadraginta annos non cultu nisi

lugubri, non animo nisi maesto egit; idque illi imperitante Claudio

impune, mox ad gloriam vertit.--Tacitus, Ann. xiii. 32.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

LECTURE IV

Acts xxviii. 15--Whom when Paul saw, he thanked God and took courage.

The hope expressed by St. Paul in his Epistle to the Romans that he

might, after accomplishing his mission of alms-bearing to Jerusalem, be

able shortly to pay a passing visit to the Roman Christians on his way

to Spain, [192] was not to be realised in the way that he proposed. The

journey to Jerusalem was overshadowed from the first by dark

forebodings, [193] and it proved disastrous for a lengthened period to

all his plans of active missionary work. It lies outside the scope of

these lectures to relate in detail all that happened to St. Paul

between his arrival at Jerusalem to keep the Pentecost feast of 57 A.D.

and the early spring of 60 A.D. [194] when at length he entered Rome as

a prisoner. It is, however, necessary for a right understanding of the

character of St. Paul's captivity in the Imperial Capital to consider

with some care what St. Luke has to tell us about his treatment by the

Roman authorities during his earlier captivity in Caesarea. There are

few passages in ancient historical literatures more clearly the work

not merely of a contemporary writer but of an observant eye-witness

than is the narrative contained in the last seven chapters of the Acts.

These chapters abound in first-hand material for the history of the

time, and incidentally are valuable for the side-lights that they throw

upon many features of the Roman provincial administration and legal

procedure, and upon the state of Judaea in the years 57 to 59 A.D.

St. Paul here appears in an historical setting, the truth-fulness of

which we can estimate by a comparison with the narrative of the period

of Felix and Festus contained in Josephus' writings, and in the less

detailed but more pungent references of Tacitus. It was the period when

the great revolt was preparing. Probably there was no provincial post

that was more difficult and less desirable than that of Procurator of

Judaea. The celebrated character-sketch of Felix given by Tacitus,

[195] in the practice of all kinds of lust and cruelty he exercised the

power of a king with the temper of a slave,' no less than the fierce

accusations brought against this Procurator by Josephus of cruelty,

rapacity, and treachery, [196] are tinted with prejudice and

exaggeration. The judgment of Mr. Henderson, the historian of Nero's

Principate, is very different. [197] Alike in Jerusalem and in the

country generally Felix found a widespread turmoil and insecurity

alikeof person and of property. Bands of robbers were roaming up and

down, sweeping in adherents from every class of malcontent debtor and

malefactor. The sect of the Zealots, founded years before by one Judas

of Galilee, were hardly distinguishable from the Sicarii, those robbers

and murderers whose evil deeds load the page of Josephus, and both

plagued the unhappy land, as they disturbed the unfortunate Governor's

peace. Felix acted vigorously. Robber bands were dispersed yet always

reappeared. Daily assassinations in Jerusalem defied the Roman

garrison. The mob was always the credulous prey of any fanatic. One Jew

from Egypt gathered thousands together on the Mount of Olives promising

them that the walls of the city shall fall at his bidding as those of

Jericho before Joshua's trumpets, and his adherents' excited belief,

stimulated by their lust and hope of rapine and of plunder, was only

chilled by Felix' appearance at the head of Roman troops. The mob was

scattered, but the leader escaped. . . . Wherever Felix appears in the

history of these troubled years, we find him struggling with disorder,

and crushing, so far as he could with the small force at his disposal,

both brigandage in the country and rioting in the city. Difficult cases

he duly refers to Nero. Pending decision he will keep the peace firmly.

There is no good evidence to warrant the accusations of cruelty and

lust so lightly brought against him.' How accurately the Lukan

narrative pictures this state of things.' [198] The strong Roman

garrison in Fort Antonia keeping watch and ward over the faction-torn

city at the time of the Feast. The swoop of the tribune Lysias to

rescue Paul from the hands of the raging and howling crowd in the

Temple Courts. His mistake in thinking that his prisoner was the

Egyptian.' The scene on the stairs and within the fort. The growing

respect of the officer as he notes that the man whom he had taken to be

a leader of banditti can speak Greek, then that he is, though a Jew by

race, not merely an inhabitant but a citizen of a famous Greek

university city, and lastly, most important of all, that he inherits

from his father the privileges of Roman citizenship. His own naive

remark with a great sum obtained I this citizenship' only enhancing the

superior position of the man who can reply but I was Roman born.' [199]

The scene in the Sanhedrin is quite explicable when we read in

Josephus, about this time King Agrippa gave the High-Priesthood to

Ishmael, the son of Fabi. And now arose discussions between the high

priests and the leading men of the multitude of Jerusalem . . . and

when they met together, they cast reproachful words and threw stones at

one another.' [200] If Ananias were High Priest de facto, while Ishmael

was High Priest de jure, the exclamation of Paul, I wist not that he

was High Priest,' was not unjustifiable. [201] Again the request of the

chief priest to Lysias that Paul should again appear before the

Council, and the plot that was made whereby forty assassins were bound

together by an oath to waylay and murder him, is quite in accordance

with the evidence of Josephus, when he tells us that precisely at this

period robbers went up with the greatest security to the festivals and

having their weapons concealed [under their garments] and mingling

themselves with the multitude, they slew both their own enemies and

those whom other men wanted them to kill for money.' [202]

The reticences of St. Luke upon many points on which we should like to

have fuller information are quite as remarkable as his accuracy. We

would gladly know more about the causes which secured for St. Paul such

favoured and even indulgent treatment for four or five years at the

hands of the succession of Roman officials with whom he was brought in

contact. [203] How was it, one asks, that he was able during the whole

of this time to find sufficient means to meet the heavy expenses that

must have been thrown upon him? Had Paul been a mere penniless Jewish

preacher of a new superstition, an ordinary commonplace enthusiast of

no position or resources, it is practically certain that he would not

have received so much attention from Procurators like Felix and Festus,

or such courtesy as was shown by the tribune Claudius Lysias and the

Centurion Julius. At Fort Antonia he was allowed to receive visitors

and to bid a centurion conduct his nephew to the presence of his

superior officer. Does this visit of his nephew signify that some

change had taken place in Paul's relations with his family, that that

family was one of distinction and wealth, and that money had come to

Paul possibly on the death of his father? We do not know. We can only

conjecture, but the fact remains that in dealing with him the Roman

authorities treated him as if he were a person of some consequence.

The first mark of this was exhibited in the extraordinary precautions

taken to ensure Paul's safe convoy to Caesarea. Four hundred and

seventy troops--legionaries, horsemen, and light-armed

auxiliaries--were sent to make a swift night march to Antipatris, and

then the horsemen continued the journey apparently without a halt to

Caesarea. The next was when Felix, after declining to condemn Paul,

when the High Priest in person with a deputation of the Sanhedrin

brought their threefold accusation against the Apostle by the mouth of

a trained advocate, not only deferred the trial indefinitely on the

pretext that he must wait until Claudius Lysias also could appear and

give evidence, but he ordered that Paul, while kept in charge, should

be treated with indulgence, and leave was given to any of his friends

to minister unto him. [204] The reason given by St. Luke why Felix thus

deferred the trial and treated Paul well was that he had more accurate

knowledge concerning the Way,' [205] i.e. the Christian religion,

implying more accurate knowledge than to be deceived by the prejudiced

ex parte statements of the Jewish accusers. The explanation lies in the

verse which follows: and after certain days Felix came with Drusilla

his wife, who was a Jewess, and heard him [Paul] concerning the faith

in Christ.' And during the long interval of two years that he kept him

in captivity, hoping,' says St. Luke, that money would be given him of

Paul, he sent for him the oftener and had communion with him.' [206]

Now these statements point to two things: first, that Felix knew about

Paul and Christianity from Drusilla, and, secondly, that from what

Drusilla told him he was sufficiently interested in the man and his

teaching to have repeated private interviews with him, and further that

he believed him to be possessed of sufficient means to offer him a

bribe to secure his release. No Roman governor, more especially a man

of the type of Felix, would have such consideration as all this implies

for a commonplace prisoner. At this time of political unrest and

ferment in Judaea the Procurator's relations with the Jewish leaders

were sufficiently strained without his extending his protection to a

man against whom they displayed such fierce animosity. It would not

have been difficult for him to condemn Paul as a disturber of the

peace, and it was his interest to do so. At the same time he clearly

was afraid to release him, lest he should provoke one of those

outbursts of Jewish fanaticism which actually took place in Caesarea

itself after St. Paul had been confined in the barracks attached to

Herod's palace for two years. The stern way in which in this year 59

A.D. the Governor dealt with the Jewish rioters led to a deputation of

the principal Jewish inhabitants of Caesarea going to Rome to accuse

him for his misdeeds and harshness before Nero himself, and finally to

Felix' recall to Rome to answer the charges brought against him. [207]

It is perhaps no wonder that in such a crisis of his life the accused

man, who only narrowly escaped condemnation by the powerful influence

of friends at court, should have desired,' as St. Luke tells us, to

gain favour with the Jews by leaving Paul bound.' [208] There is a

curious Western reading here, which possibly records an ancient

authentic tradition that Felix left Paul in confinement because of

Drusilla.' [209] As Drusilla was the sister of Agrippa II, who had an

official residence in Jerusalem and in whose hands was the appointment

of the High Priest, she may well have counselled her husband, for her

brother's sake even more than for his own, not to irritate Jewish

fanaticism by any act that might fan it in its present state of fever

heat to yet further deeds of violence.

Festus on his arrival was confronted by a difficult and critical

situation. But he was a firm and just magistrate and was determined

that the prisoner should despite the clamours of the Jews have a fair

trial in his presence. The principal charge brought against Paul was

the crime of majestas--the inciting of the Jewish communities through

the world to treason against Caesar. The other accusations--the being a

ringleader of the sect of the Nazarenes and a profaner of the

Temple--on the other hand were, in the scornful words of the Procurator

to King Agrippa, only certain questions of their own superstition.'

[210] These charges, St. Luke tells us, they failed to prove, and the

Apostle no doubt hoped that the Governor would pronounce judgment in

his favour. But Festus, aware of the excited state of Jewish feeling,

was naturally anxious not at the very outset of his official term to

get himself into disfavour with these embittered representatives of the

dominant faction at Jerusalem, and he asked Paul whether he would be

willing to go up to that city, there to be judged by him. But the

Apostle was determined not thus to place himself in the midst of

enemies thirsting for his life and utterly unscrupulous about the means

employed; he was sick, too, of delay, and he no longer hesitated. To

the Jews I have done no wrong, as thou well knowest,' he replied to the

Governor (I am somewhat paraphrasing the actual words as recorded), and

if I have committed any offence against Caesar, I, as a Roman citizen,

should be tried not at Jerusalem but before Caesar's judgment seat. As

you do not acquit me of treason, I claim my right of appeal--ad

Caesarem appello.' [211] On this the Procurator, after a conference

with his assessors [212] (consiliarii) on the legal aspects of the

case, quashed all further proceedings in Judaea, Thou hast appealed to

Caesar, to Caesar shalt thou go.'

I have dwelt at some length on the circumstances which brought about

Paul's visit to Rome, in order to make it clear that the charge against

him was political, not religious, the offence one of majestas, not of

preaching new doctrines subversive of the Jewish law. And it is

noteworthy that even in regard to the political charge both Festus and

King Agrippa were agreed that Paul had done nothing worthy of death or

of bonds. He had however appealed to Caesar, and so he obtained, not

indeed his liberty, but an escape from an irksome confinement in the

midst of his deadly foes, and a prospect of at length making

acquaintance with that Church in Rome which he had so many years been

longing to visit. Whatever the risks, he would gladly face them, for

his deep faith assured him that he was going to Rome as God's appointed

instrument to do good work in Christ's Name amidst the thronging

population of that great world-centre of Imperial rule. Those words

that came to him, as on that first night of his incarceration in Fort

Antonia he beheld in mystic vision the Lord Jesus standing at his

side--Be of good cheer, for as thou hast testified concerning me at

Jerusalem, so must thou bear witness even at Rome' [213] --had, we may

well believe, been his comfort and stay during the whole of those two

weary years spent to all appearance so uselessly in the guard-rooms of

Herod's palace at Caesarea. Now, at last, the opportunity had come of

bearing witness in the presence of Caesar him-self: an opportunity

embraced with his whole heart and soul, even though the witness should

be that witness which is crowned with the martyr's death.

The Apostle left Caesarea some time during the month of August, 59

A.D., only after many hardships and life-anddeath perils to be

shipwrecked in November on the coast of Malta. Compelled with his

companions in misfortune to winter on the island, it was not until the

end of February 60 A.D. that Paul landed at Puteoli, a centre of the

corn traffic with Alexandria and the chief commercial sea-port of Italy

and Rome. [214] In this busy and prosperous place thronged with seamen

and traders of many nations the Apostle found a body of Christians who

gave a right brotherly welcome to him and his companions, Luke and

Aristarchus, and entertained them seven days. Of the origin of this

Christian community the Acts tells us nothing, but its presence here

will occasion no surprise to those who have followed the arguments of

the previous lectures. It is but one proof more of the early

evangelisation of Rome and other towns in Italy.

From Puteoli the company of prisoners with their military guard

journeyed along the Appian Way to Rome. But the news of the approach of

the Apostle had already reached the Christians of the capital, and two

separate deputations came to greet him, one as far as Appii Forum, one

of the regular halting places on this route, the other to Tres Tabernae

still nearer Rome. [215] Probably among these delegates were a number

of those whose names are so affectionately mentioned in the Epistle to

the Romans, Ampliatus, Urbanus, Stachys and the rest, and surely Aquila

and Prisca, his old and tried friends. St. Luke mentions no names, but

his one brief statement of the effect of this meeting upon the way-worn

and much burdened Apostle is worth a whole volume. In the midst of a

strange and foreign land, a prisoner in bonds, Paul was feeling

perhaps, as was natural, somewhat lonely and depressed, but at the

sight of his friends his spirit revived. How expressive are the words

whom when Paul saw, he thanked God and took courage.' [216]

The Apostle after his entrance into Rome was conducted by the centurion

Julius to an officer who bore the title of the Stratopedarch. [217]

This centurion, in whose charge St. Paul with his fellow-prisoners had

been for the seven months since they left Caesarea, is described in the

Acts as being of the Augustan band (speira Sebaste) or as it probably

should be more correctly translated, of the Imperial Service Corps.

That great authority, Dr. Mommsen, has been able to give an explanation

of the meaning of these unusual terms, which affords one more example

of the marked accuracy of St. Luke in his references to Roman or local

officials. Professor Ramsay has thus summarised Mommsen's conclusions.

[218] Augustus had reduced to a regular system the maintenance of

communications between the centre of control in Rome and the armies

stationed in the great frontier provinces. Legionary centurions, called

commonly frumentarii, went to and fro between Rome and the armies and

were employed for numerous purposes between the Emperor and his armies

and provinces. They acted not only for commissariat purposes (whence

the name) but as couriers and for police purposes, and for conducting

prisoners. They all belonged to legions stationed in the provinces, and

were considered to be on detached duty when they went to Rome; and

hence in Rome they were "soldiers from abroad"--peregrini. While in

Rome they resided in a camp on the Coelian Hill called Castra

Peregrinorum. In this camp there were always a number of them present,

changing from day to day, as some came and others went away. This camp

was under the command of the Princeps Peregrinorum, and it is clear

that the Stratopedarch in Acts is the Greek name for that officer.'

Julius in any case had now fulfilled his duty and handed over his

prisoners to his chief. But the exceptionally favoured treatment now

accorded to Paul by the Roman authorities in the capital itself was

even more remarkable than that which had been shown to him in Judaea,

and it may be added throughout his voyage. I have already spoken of the

behaviour of Felix to him as a proof that the Apostle was regarded as a

man of some distinction, and that at this period of his life he was in

no lack of means. This impression is deepened as the narrative of the

captivity proceeds. Festus and his assessors would not have been likely

to have troubled themselves to send to Caesar's judgment seat a poor

and obscure man. The courtesy of Julius to him and the privileged

position he occupied during the voyage must have been due in the first

instance to instructions given by the Governor. It can only have been

by express permission that Luke and Aristarchus were allowed to

accompany the Apostle in the vessel, a most unusual thing. [219] And it

was the same upon his arrival at Rome. From the very first the prisoner

was suffered to abide by himself with the soldier that guarded him,'

and to call together the chief of the Jews to meet him twice in the

friend's house [220] in which for a short time he remained, and then

for the whole of the next two years of his light captivity he lived in

his own hired house, receiving freely and without hindrance all who

came in to him. Where this friend's house or this hired dwelling was

situated we have no hint, but it must have been in the immediate

neighbourhood of, perhaps even within, the extensive barracks of the

Praetorian Guard outside the Collin Gate, for this would be necessary

for the convenience of the change of the guards to whom he was chained.

The custodia militaris at its best was most irksome, and as we learn

from his epistles was felt to be so by the Apostle, but he had at least

the opportunity, which was so near to his heart, of being able to have

unrestricted intercourse with his Roman friends, and to preach the

Gospel to all who wished to hear him. This liberty, which, as we have

seen, was conceded at once after his arrival, can only have been due to

the contents of the official report--the literae dimissoriae and

relatio--sent by Festus concerning the prisoner, which would be handed

by Julius to the Stratopedarch and by him in his turn to Burrhus, who

was in 60 A.D. still sole Praetorian Prefect. [221]

Three days only had passed before St. Paul saw the leading men of the

Jewish synagogues gathered round him in the room where he was confined.

So eager was he to be at work again in his Master's business that he

must have sent out the invitations to the heads of the six or seven

independent Jewish congregations in Rome immediately after his arrival.

Apostle of the Gentiles as he was, he always adhered to his unbroken

rule--to the Jew first. His words at the opening of his Epistle to the

Romans acquire added force in the new situation in which he now found

himself--as much as in me lies I am ready to preach the Gospel to you

also in Rome. For I am not ashamed of the Gospel; for it is the power

of God unto salvation to every one that believeth, to the Jew first and

also to the Greek.' [222] These words were indeed addressed to the

Christians of Rome, but he knew well how small a number out of the

great Jewish population in that city had been converted to the Gospel,

and even at a distance the thought saddened him, and his heart yearned

towards them, the more so because he felt keenly the prejudice which

his preaching to the Gentiles had aroused against him in the minds of

his countrymen further east. There are few more touching passages in

the writings of St. Paul, none which reveal the innermost depth of his

soul more fully than portions of the ninth and tenth chapters of the

Epistle to the Romans. No estimate of St. Paul is complete which does

not take account of these impassioned utterances: I say the truth in

Christ, I lie not, my conscience bearing witness with me in the Holy

Ghost, that I have great sorrow and unceasing pain in my heart. For I

could wish that I myself were anathema from Christ for my brethren's

sake, my kinsmen according to the flesh. . . . Brethren, my heart's

desire and my supplication to God is for them that they may be saved.'

[223] And now, as the chiefs of the Roman synagogues stand around him,

he endeavoured to persuade them that it was not for anything that he

had done against the Jewish people or contrary to the customs of the

fathers that he had been put upon his trial and compelled to appeal to

Caesar. On the contrary, he wished to make it clear to them that all

the proceedings against him were due to a misunderstanding,

because--and in these words lies the whole force of his apology--for

the hope of Israel I am bound with this chain.' The reply was a purely

non-committal one. The Jews declared that they had received from Judaea

no letters concerning Paul, nor had any of the brethren that came to

Rome spoken harm of him. They were therefore quite ready to hear what

he had to say and appointed a day for a conference. But they added,

with a cold hostility which must have chilled any hopes he may have had

of the issue of his appeal, as concerning this sect it is known to us

that it is everywhere spoken against.' [224] This declaration was no

doubt strictly correct, and is of great importance. It shows that

already those charges of atheism,' immorality, and of abominable

practices at their feasts, which were shortly to be so freely brought

against them, were being widely accepted, and that the Jews them-selves

were taking pains to dissociate Judaism from any connexion with the new

sectaries, whom they disowned. The period during which the Christians

were to find shelter beneath the privileges accorded by the Imperial

Government to the Jewish people and religion was well-nigh over. The

essential note of the Christianity preached by Paul was universalist,

that of the Judaism protected by Roman law was national and

particularist: between the two there could be no reconciliation. No

wonder that when a body of Jewish delegates more numerous apparently

than the first gathered in the Apostle's room, they remained

unconvinced by his arguments. These chiefs of the Synagogues were not

of the stuff of which converts are easily made, and though St. Luke

says they reasoned among themselves and had clearly some difference of

opinion, yet of their generally unbending attitude the scathing words

with which the Apostle closed the interview are a proof that he

regarded all his efforts as thrown away and futile. [225] It was a

repetition of what had happened at Antioch in Pisidia and elsewhere,

and there his previous experiences cannot have given him much

encouragement that now, as a prisoner accused by the Jews of Jerusalem,

he would meet with more success. In any case his breach with official

Judaism in Rome seems to have been final. At this point the actual

narrative of the Acts ceases. The next two verses, which state that he

(Paul) abode two whole years in his own hired dwelling, and received

all that went in to him, preaching the Kingdom of God the things

concerning the Lord Jesus Christ with all boldness, none forbidding

him,' [226] are a kind of appendix. The brief summary of events which

it contains forms--as did the last verses of the Gospel with the

opening passage of the Acts--a bridge of connexion with another

narrative, in which the author intended to take up the story at the

point where it is left, i.e. the departure of the Jewish delegates, and

continue it in a third treatise in fuller detail.

This abrupt breaking off of the Lukan history at a most interesting

point is much to be regretted. We are not however left without

information about St. Paul's personal condition, his missionary

activity, and his relations with the outside world during the two years

he spent in his hired house. Four epistles were written by the Apostle

during this period, containing a number of references to his life and

to the friends who were with him or helping him. Of these a group of

three, the Epistles to the Colossians and Philemon and the circular

epistle (commonly called) to the Ephesians, were clearly dictated in

rapid succession and were dispatched together, somewhere about the

middle of the imprisonment. The fourth epistle, to the Philippians, is

later; internal evidence points to a date not long before the final

trial and release.

The tone of the group of three is on the whole cheerful and full of

confidence. The Apostle is surrounded by a number of his most trusted

disciples and fellow-workers. In each of these epistles he refers to

his bonds, but in every case not to complain, nay, rather to give added

weight to his advice or his pleading. To the Colossians he writes: Pray

for us that God may open unto us a door for the Word, to speak the

mystery of Christ, for which I am also in bonds, that I may make it

manifest as I ought to speak,' while in a corresponding passage of the

circular epistle lie asks for the prayers and supplications of his

readers, on my behalf that utterance may be given to me in opening my

mouth, to make known with boldness the mystery of the Gospel for which

I am an ambassador in chains; that in it I may speak boldly, as I ought

to speak'--passages which testify that his whole thoughts at this time

were directed to the opportunity--the door--which his position gave him

for preaching the Gospel in the very heart of the world's capital.

[227] Notice on the other hand the force of the appeal with which the

Epistle to the Colossians closes--the salutation of me Paul with mine

own hand. Remember my bonds,' [228] or in that most delightful passage

from the beautiful epistle to Philemon, in which he so tenderly and

affectionately pleads with the master at Colossae to receive back the

slave Onesimus, who had run away from him and robbed him, but had now

been converted by Paul at Rome and so become Philemon's brother in the

faith. Wherefore, though I have all boldness in Christ to enjoin thee

that which is befitting, yet for love's sake I rather beseech, being

such an one as Paul the aged, and now also a prisoner of Christ Jesus:

I beseech thee for my child, Onesimus, whom I have begotten in my

bonds, Onesimus, who was aforetime unprofitable to thee, but now is

profitable to thee and to me; whom I have sent back to thee in his own

person, that is my very heart; whom I would fain have kept with me,

that in thy behalf he might minister to me in my bonds of the Gospel.'

A few verses further on the declaration if he have wronged thee at all

or oweth thee ought, put that to my account: I Paul write it with mine

own hand, I will repay it' affords one more testimony to those already

given that the Apostle at this time did not lack means. One reason for

St. Paul's cheerfulness was, no doubt, that his release was approaching

and not far distant, otherwise he would not have concluded his letter

to Philemon with the words Withal prepare for me a lodging: for I hope

that through your prayers I shall be granted unto you.' The other

reason was that he had at his side at this time a body of faithful

friends, [229] who were a comfort to him. Aristarchus and Luke, who

accompanied the Apostle on his voyage probably in the capacity of

slave-attendants, still continued their willing service. Aristarchus is

mentioned as my fellow-prisoner,' Luke as the beloved physician.'

Epaphras, a native of Colossae, one of those who had originally carried

the Gospel to that town, had arrived in Rome bringing news of the state

of the Church of which he was so prominent a member. He also is styled

by the Apostle his fellow-prisoner,' and possibly all these three lived

with him in his hired house. Then, too, Tychicus of Ephesus had joined

him in company with Paul's specially loved disciple Timothy, whom we

now find acting as his amanuensis. In addition to these were Jesus

surnamed Justus, one of the few among the circumcision who had been a

fellow-worker and a comfort to him, and Demas, of whom we know nothing,

except that he some years later deserted him.

One name remains which deserves a longer notice.

Mark, the cousin of Barnabas, saluteth you, touching whom ye received

injunctions, if he come unto you receive him,' the very phraseology of

this salutation sent by St. Paul to the Colossians suggests that more

lies behind the words than they actually express. Since Barnabas and

Paul parted in anger at Antioch in 50 A.D. because of Mark, and Paul

chose Silas to be his fellow missionary, while Barnabas took Mark and

sailed to Cyprus, no mention is made of the latter in the Acts at all

nor in the pre-captivity epistles of Paul. What was he doing during the

interval, and how are we to account for this greeting being sent by

Paul from Rome in Mark's name in 61 A.D. to the Church at Colossae?

In studying the history of the Apostolic age it should always be

remembered that the character of our extant authorities only too often

has caused a one-sided and very warped view of the expansion of

Christianity (during the period of which we are treating) to be taken.

The happy fact that St. Paul found a sympathetic biographer in his

disciple and companion St. Luke, and still more the fact that, owing to

his exceptional power and weight as a writer, a very considerable

collection of his letters have survived the general destruction of

early Christian literature, has led to a quite false estimate being

formed of the widespread and successful activity of other leading

missionaries and preachers of the Gospel. The influence they exerted

and the large area covered by their work have been too much overlooked

and ignored. The late Professor Bigg was one of the few who have shown

a really comprehensive grasp of what actually took place. In his

admirable Introduction to the First Epistle of St. Peter' he has

pointed out how small a portion of Asia Minor was ever visited by St.

Paul. He also suggests not only that many of the Churches in that part

of the Empire were planted at an early date but that the reason why St.

Paul deliberately refrained from entering Asia, Mysia and Bithynia on

his second missionary journey was that those provinces were already

being evangelised by others. [230] To say this is no disparagement to

St. Paul, he would be the last to wish to take credit for other men's

labours, and he himself expressly states in his Epistle to the

Colossians that neither the Christians of that city nor those of

Laodicea had seen his face in the flesh! [231]

Now the emphatic mention by St. Paul in this epistle of Mark as

Barnabas' cousin (with the enigmatic parenthesis that follows) appears

to me to be one of those seemingly incidental notices, which, when

placed in its right setting, is then seen to be the central link in a

chain of circumstantial evidence drawn from a variety of sources. Once

more I ask, therefore, What had been the history of Mark since in 50

A.D. he sailed with Barnabas for Cyprus? According to one of the best

authenticated traditions of these early times he went to Alexandria and

spent some years in organising the Church in that great city and in

evangelising the neighbouring districts of Egypt. [232] Another

tradition of a less trustworthy character, but reasonably probable,

relates that Barnabas himself went in the first instance with Mark to

Alexandria. [233] It is quite likely that this choice by Barnabas of

Egypt as the scene of Mark's missionary labours may have been dictated

by the fact that it lay outside the Pauline sphere of activity. Now

Eusebius tells us--and he had exceptional opportunities of obtaining

accurate information about the Alexandrian Church--that in the eighth

year of Nero's reign Annianus succeeded Mark the Evangelist in the

administration of the Church in Alexandria. [234] The date of Mark's

leaving Egypt thus corresponds with the date at which we find him in

Paul's company at Rome, i.e. 61 A.D. When he is introduced to us it is

as one about to journey to Colossae with the Apostle's commendation.

But the question again naturally arises, why should he from Alexandria

have gone out of his way to Rome in order to visit Colossae, what was

his object? Those words of St. Paul--Mark, the cousin of Barnabas,

about whom ye received injunctions'--gives, I think, the answer. If

Mark is thus described to the Colossian Christians as the cousin of

Barnabas,' it follows that Barnabas was well known in Colossae, and

that the injunctions referred to were Barnabas' injunctions, and, if

so, that Barnabas himself had been with Paul and had been one of those

who had furnished him with information about the state of the Asian

Churches. The course of events, that the passage suggests to me, is

this. One of the objects of the Epistles to the Colossians and

Ephesians was to give comfort to the hearts of these Asian Christians,

who were afflicted by hearing of St. Paul's imprisonment at Rome.

Barnabas, at Colossae, on receiving the news had resolved to go to his

old friend in this crisis of his fate and at the same time revisit the

scenes of his previous labours in Rome and in Italy. He travelled by

Alexandria to see Mark, and finding that the work of organisation there

was satisfactorily advanced, it was agreed between them that Mark

should seek a new field for his energies in Asia Minor and that

Barnabas should write to prepare the minds of the Colossians for his

cousin's coming among them. Meanwhile, as Pauline influence was still

strong in the Asian cities--he first took Mark with him to Rome to

effect a reconciliation between him and Paul and secure a few words of

commendation from the Apostle, as a further credential to the former

deserter. It has been pointed out above that the traditional date of

Mark's departure from Egypt synchronises with the date at which we find

him at Rome with St. Paul making ready shortly to depart for Colossae.

The presence of Barnabas at Rome at this time is vouched for by the

Gnostic Acts of Peter [Actus Petri Vercellenses], which state that

Barnabas accompanied Timothy, when the latter was sent a little later

by Paul to Macedonia as the bearer of the Epistle to the Philippians.

[235] The same argument holds good here as in the case of the mention

of Barnabas in the opening of the Clementine Recognitions'; his name

would never have been introduced in documents written expressly to

exalt the position of St. Peter, unless he had actually visited Italy

and worked there. There are strong grounds for believing that Timothy

after carrying out his mission to Philippi went on to Ephesus and made

that town the centre of his ministerial activity for some years. The

Pastoral Epistles represent Timothy and Mark as together a few years

later in this same district. In a future lecture I shall bring forward

reasons of considerable weight for holding that the Epistle to the

Hebrews was written by Barnabas and sent by him to Rome from some place

not far from Ephesus, where he had been in touch with Timothy. [236]

There is much that is disputable in all this, but all critics who

approach the subject with an open mind must at least admit that a

cumulative presumption has been established in favour of the conclusion

that Barnabas and Mark were together in Italy and Rome in 61 A.D. and

afterwards in Colossae.

At the time when the Epistle to the Philippians was written the

circumstances and surroundings of St. Paul had undergone a complete

change. He had no longer around him a group of trusted friends and

companions. Only Timothy (whom in the opening salutation we find as

sharing with Paul the responsibility of joint authorship of the

epistle) is left of those mentioned in the earlier epistles, the rest

being probably dispersed on various missions. The situation is in fact

precisely similar to that described in the Second Epistle to Timothy,

and curiously it was at the time of his trial in each case that the

Apostle has to complain of being thus left alone. [237] As on the

occasion of his second trial he sorrowfully writes only Luke is with

me,' so now of his intimate disciples there is only Timothy.

Epaphroditus, the bearer of a gift from the Church of Philippi to the

Apostle, was indeed still in Rome, having been detained by a sickness

that had been well-nigh unto death, but he was about to return as the

bearer of the epistle, and such was the unselfishness of St. Paul,

moved as he was by the tenderest feelings of gratitude and affection

towards these Philippians, who had always from the very first been the

most liberal and helpful of all the Churches that he founded, that he

was ready to spare even Timothy from his side to go with Epaphroditus

to testify to the Apostle's deep sense that once again they had borne

his needs in kindly remembrance. He has no one like-minded' with

Timothy to fulfil this office, and he promises that as soon as I shall

see how it will go with me' he will send this beloved disciple, of whom

he touchingly says ye know the proof of him, that as a child serveth a

father, so he served with me in the furtherance of the Gospel.' [238]

Those words, as soon as I shall see how it will go with me,' tell their

own tale. St. Paul was no longer in his own hired house' but in the

Pretorian camp, where he was in closer confinement while his case was

being brought at last before the Imperial Appeal Court. This alone can

be the meaning of the passage, now I would have you know, brethren,

that the things that are happening to me have rather turned out unto

the progress of the Gospel, so that my bonds became manifest in Christ

in the whole Praetorium and to all the rest; and that most of the

brethren in the Lord, being confident through my bonds, are more

abundantly bold to speak the Gospel without fear.' [239] The publicity

of the trial, in fact, and the opportunity that it gave the Apostle in

the course of his defence against the charges brought against him to

set forth the true nature of the faith that he preached had caused the

message of the Gospel to be known throughout the Imperial Court, the

Praetorian Guards, and generally in Rome. The whole tone of the epistle

shows that so far all had gone well, that the brethren were filled with

confidence that the issue would be favourable, and that Paul himself,

although not free from serious anxiety and quite prepared for death

should it come, is full of hope that he will speedily be released and

be able once more to revisit his beloved Philippians. [240]

This Epistle differs widely in character and contents from those to the

Colossians and Ephesians. In the latter St. Paul was combating certain

subtle forms of heretical belief of a gnostic character which had been

creeping in and making headway among the mixed Greek and Oriental

populations of a group of Asian Churches, to whom he him-self, though

well known by name and repute was, except at Ephesus itself, personally

a stranger. To Philippi he writes, as a Roman citizen to Roman

citizens, as a friend to dear friends, as an Apostle to a body of

personal disciples who had above all others shown him unceasing

sympathy and kindness. His Epistle is primarily a letter of thanks

called forth by the gift of money that had been sent to him by the

hands of Epaphroditus. [241] Such a letter was bound to be rich in

personal references and allusions. I have already referred to those

which relate to the hopes and fears aroused by his pending trial. He

had however other troubles that worried him. Despite all he had endured

and was enduring for the Gospel's sake, it is clear that there was a

Judaising faction among the Roman Christians, who even now could not

abate their opposition and spite against the Apostle of the Gentiles.

Most of the brethren in the Lord,' he writes, being confident through

my bonds, are more abundantly bold to speak the word of God without

fear. Some indeed preach Christ of envy and strife; some also of good

will; the one do it of love, knowing I am set for the defence of the

Gospel; but the other proclaim Christ of faction, not sincerely,

thinking to raise up affliction for me in my bonds. What then? Let but

in every way, whether in pretence or in truth, Christ be proclaimed;

and therein I rejoice, yea, and will rejoice.' Who they were of whom he

is here speaking is revealed in the later warning: Beware of the dogs,

beware of the evil workers, beware of the concision; for we are the

circumcision, who worship by the spirit of God and glory in Jesus

Christ and have no confidence in the flesh.' [242]

Among the Philippian Christians there had been discords, the opening of

the fourth chapter pointing to the existence of acute dissensions

between two women, named Euodia and Syntyche, possibly deaconesses, and

probably each of them with a following. I exhort Euodia and I exhort

Syntyche,'' writes the Apostle, the word exhort being repeated, as

being addressed to each separately, to be of one mind in the Lord.' He

then proceeds, Yea, I beseech thee also, true yokefellow, help them [to

be reconciled]; seeing that they laboured with me in the Gospel

together with Clement also and my other fellow-workers, whose names are

in the book of life.' These words have caused much difficulty to

commentators, and have been interpreted in many different ways. To

myself their meaning does not seem doubtful. The passage is a sudden

parenthesis and is addressed by St. Paul to Timothy, the man whose name

is coupled with his own at the beginning of the Epistle, and who was

sitting at his side as his amanuensis. He was his yoke-fellow, since he

was sharing with him the duty and the burden at that very moment of a

common task. He commends him to the Philippians in the words I have no

man like-minded, who will truly care for your state.' The word here

descriptive of the character of that care which Timothy alone could be

trusted to give, be it noted, is the same word which is used as the

epithet qualifying the yoke-fellow' of chapter iv. 3, a word which in

the original Greek signifies genuine.' This identity of epithet is of

some evidential significance in support of the identification of the

yoke-fellow with Timothy, and it is strengthened when we find that the

Apostle again uses this same epithet in the opening salutation of the

First Epistle to Timothy, where he addresses that disciple as my true

[or genuine] child in the faith.' [243]

The appeal of St. Paul to his true yoke-fellow' to strive to heal the

dissensions between the two women Euodia and Syntyche is accompanied by

the suggestion that he should secure the help of Clement and the rest

of my fellow-workers' in the task of conciliation. Who this Clement

was, we do not know. Origen, Eusebius and others regard this passage as

a reference to the well-known Clement, who wrote in the name of the

Roman Church an Epistle to the Corinthians, but it is extremely

doubtful whether they had any sound historical authority for their

statement. The name of Clement was not uncommon, and this Clement may

have been one of the leading Christians in Philippi. Nevertheless it is

not at all impossible that he may have been the Roman Clement. The

title fellow-worker'--sunergos--is frequently used by St. Paul of those

like Timothy, Titus, and others, sent out by him on some mission as his

delegates. Clement may have been thus sent to Philippi by Paul. It will

be observed that he alone is named, and this implies that he stood

apart from the rest as a person of some authority. The final salutation

is of some interest. The brethren who are with me salute you'--the

brethren here being those of his companions, not inhabitants of Rome,

who were still at his side. All the saints'--i.e. the body of Roman

Christians--salute you, but especially those of Caesar's household.'

Why especially? Surely because Paul was now during his trial confined

in the barracks close to the palace, and he had therefore special

opportunities of intercourse at this time with those members of the

Roman Church who belonged to the vast Imperial household--numbering

many thousands of freedmen and slaves. This phrase and the earlier one,

my bonds have become manifest in Christ in the whole Praetorium,'

supplement and partly explain one another. The spread of the Gospel

among Caesar's household was no new thing. Already in his Epistle to

the Romans St. Paul had sent his salutations to those who were of the

households of Aristobulus and of Narcissus. These households had almost

certainly even in 57 A.D. been incorporated in the household of the

Emperor. [244]

Over the further progress and issue of the trial a veil falls. It was

during the early months of this year 62 A.D. that Burrhus died, and a

little later Seneca retired from public life. Burrhus had been sole

Praetorian Prefect, but Nero now reverted to the usual custom of

appointing two. One of these, Sofonius Tigellinus, has left an infamous

name as a man who encouraged the cruel propensities of Nero and

pandered to all his vicious excesses. It is probable therefore that the

trial of Paul took place while Burrhus was still prefect, and that it

may have been furthered by the friendly offices of Seneca. [245] That

he was acquitted at the beginning of 62 A.D. there can be no reasonable

doubt. Clement of Rome, a contemporary, affirms that Paul after-wards

travelled to the far West, and the fragment of the Muratorian Canon,

about 200 A.D., states that he carried out his intention of visiting

Spain. The Pastoral Epistles also refer to extensive journeyings of the

Apostle later still in Asia Minor. What probably occurred was that when

Paul was brought before the Court the charges preferred against him in

the literae dimissoriae of Festus would be read and considered, and

then an interval of time would be given for the appearance of

witnesses. Then, as no witnesses came, and the relatio of Festus was

found to be favourable, a dismissal followed. [246]
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Jew, born in Cyprus, who pretended to be a magician and endeavoured to
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provinces, more especially the corn supply. It was originally named
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our companions. Thus rescued from destruction, I landed at Dicaearchia,

called by the Italians Puteoli.' This passage is interesting, for here

as in Acts xxvii. 27 we find the term Adriatic' applied to the sea

between Greece and Cyrenaica. Comp. Strabo, ii. 123: Ionion pelagos, ho
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Foro hora quarta: dederam aliam paullo ante Tribus Tabernis.'--Cicero,
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[216] Acts, xxviii. 15: ohus idon ho Paulos eucharistesas to theo
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[218] Berlin. Akad. Sitzungsberichte, 1895, pp. 501 ff; Ramsay, St.
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years (Acts xxviii. 30). xenia suggests a room in a friend's house.
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Philem, 1. Tychicus, Col. iv. 7, 8, Eph. vi. 21, 22. Onesimus, Col. iv.

9, Philem. 10. Mark, Col. iv. 10, Philem. 23.

[230] Bigg, Internat. Commentary, Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude,

pp. 73-4.

[231] Col. ii. 1.

[232] Eus. Hist. Eccl. ii. 16. 24. Also in the Hieronymian version of

Eusebius' Chronicle; Sch�ne, ii. 155; Lipsius, Die Apokryphen
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[233] Periodoi Barnaba, c. 26 (Tischendorf, p. 73). Mark is supposed to

be the narrator. elthontes de epi ton aigialon [of the village Limnes

in Cyprus] heuromen ploion Aiguption kai anelthontes eis auto

katechthemen en Alexandreia kakei emeina ego didaskon tous echomenous

adelphous . . . . .

[234] Eus. Hist. Eccl. ii. 24.

[235] The Actus Petri Vercellenses are portions of the Periodoi Petrou

which formed the basis of the Clementine Recognitions and Homilies,

found in the Latin Cod. Vercellensis. See Lipsius, vol. ii. 1st half,

pp. 174 ff; also vol. ii. 2nd half, p. 272. Speaking of the departure

of Paul into Spain the passage runs praeterea quod non esset Romae

Paulus neque Timotheus neque Barnabas, quoniam in Macedoniam missi

erant a Paulo.'

[236] Tim. i. 19, 20; vi. 12-14; 2 Tim. ii. 11; comp. Heb. xiii. 23.

[237] Phil. ii. 11; comp. 2 Tim. iv. 9-11.

[238] Phil. ii. 19-30.

[239] Phil. i. 12-15. See Lightfoot, Epist. to Philippians, pp. 97-102;

Ramsay, St. Paul the Traveller, pp. 356-360; Expositor, March 1913, pp.

277-80.

[240] Phil. i. 19-25; also ii. 17 and 24.

[241] The supposition that Paul at this time was in no lack of

financial resources is fully borne out by the language of the passage

in which be expresses his gratitude to the Philippians for their kindly

thought in providing for his necessities. His words are quite plain on

this point: Not that I speak in respect of want,' and again: Not that I

seek for the gift, but I seek for the fruit that increaseth to your

account. But I have all things and abound: I am filled, having received

from Epaphroditus the things that came from you. . . .' The whole

passage is worth careful study. Phil. iv. 10-20.

[242] Phil. i. 14-18; iii. 2, 3.

[243] Phil. iv. 3: gnesie sunzuge; ii. 20: oudena gar echo isopsuchon,

hostis gnesios ta peri humon merimnesei; 1 Tim. 1: Timotheo gnesio

tekno en pistei.

[244] Supra, p. 26.

[245] The very remarkable coincidence in thought and phrase between the

writings of Seneca and Paul led to a tradition arising of actual

intercourse between them, and even of Seneca having secretly become a

Christian. Ithas been shown conclusively by Lightfoot (in his

Commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians) and others that there are

no grounds for such a supposition. It is however possible that he may

have heard of St. Paul from Burrhus, from his brother Gallio, or

others, and have been interested in a man whose language and moral

sentiments were in certain respects so closely akin to his own. As

Seneca was Consul suffectus during Paul's imprisonment he must have had

some acquaintance with the case. That a member of the Annaean gens in

the next century was a Christian seems to be proved by an inscription

discovered at Ostia in January 1887. D. M.

M. ANNIO

PAVLO PETRO

M. ANNEVS PAVLVS

FILIO CARISSIMO See Lanciant, Pagan and Christian Rome, p. 17.

[246] Clement, 1 Ep. to Car. c. v.: epi to terma tes duseos. Murat.

Canon, lines 37, 38: Sed profectione Pauli ab urbe ad Spaniam

proficiscentis.' There was a law of Claudius, which permitted the

discharge of a prisoner if the prosecutors did not put in an appearance

after a certain time. Dion Cassius, lx. 28.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

LECTURE V.

1 Peter iv. 16: If a man suffer as a Christian, let him not be ashamed,

but let him glorify God in this name.'

The reasons that were given at the close of the last lecture for

holding that St. Paul was released from his bonds and left Rome at the

beginning of the year 62 A.D. are greatly strengthened by the

consideration of certain facts recorded by Josephus. He tells us that

during the short procuratorship of Festus a serious quarrel had arisen

between King Agrippa and the priestly party at Jerusalem. Agrippa had

built a lofty tower to his palace, from the top of which he was able to

overlook the Temple courts. This the Jews bitterly resented, and in

their turn erected a high wall to block out the view. Agrippa thereupon

applied to Festus, who at first commanded the Jews to pull down the

wall and then, fearing an outbreak of violence, afterwards permitted

them to send an embassy to lay the matter before Caesar. This embassy

consisted of twelve persons headed by the High Priest Ishmael, son of

Fabi, and Hilkiah the treasurer. The probable date of their arrival in

Rome was April or May, 62 A.D., for Festus died in the spring of this

year. Nero had just married his mistress, the beautiful and profligate

Poppaea Sabina, to satisfy whose ambition he had first divorced his

long-suffering wife Octavia and was within a few weeks to order her

murder. Now Poppaea was, if not actually a Jewish proselyte, one of

that outer circle of adherents to Judaism known as God-fearers.' Her

influence with the Emperor was now exerted on behalf of the Jewish

embassy, with the result that Nero decided in their favour. Ishmael and

Hilkiah were, however, retained at Rome as hostages, a very necessary

precaution, for Agrippa on hearing the news had at once deposed Ishmael

from the High Priesthood, and Jerusalem was in a very disturbed state.

[247] Had these two men been in Rome at the time of Paul's trial, they

would have been important witnesses in support of the charges against

him, and it would not have been difficult with the help of Poppaea to

secure his condemnation. [248]

The growth of a bitter feeling of hostility between the Jews and the

new Christian sect which had sprung up out of their midst was in this

sixth decade of the first century becoming more accentuated. The men of

the synagogues hated this new faith, which had for a number of years

found shelter under the protection of the privileges accorded to

Judaism, as a religio licita, throughout the empire, but which by its

principle of universalism struck a blow at the very foundations of

Judaic exclusiveness. And it was against the Jewish converts, much more

than against the far larger number of Gentiles who had embraced the

Gospel, that their anger was especially directed. The Jewish Christians

were in the eyes of their orthodox fellow-countrymen traitors to their

race and to the traditions of their fathers. Hence the vindictive spite

with which St. Paul was pursued, and the fierce outburst of fanaticism

at Jerusalem which in this very spring of 62 A.D. had led to the

stoning of St. James the Just. [249] The animosity of the Roman Jews

was probably much less pronounced than that of the fierce priestly

fanatics in Judaea, but they would naturally be anxious not to add to

the hatred and contempt in which they were held by all classes of the

population of Rome, by allowing public opinion to regard Christianity

as a mere sect of Judaism. [250] About this time it is certain that the

distinction between Jew and Christian began to be generally recognised,

and rumours to spread abroad, which probably had their origin in Jewish

malice, by which the Christians were accused of holding impious orgies

and horrible Thyestean feasts and of being a secret society of

anarchists and criminals. It is not difficult to see that such slanders

might be based upon distorted versions of Christian teaching, of the

baptism of infants in the Catacombs, and of the nocturnal meetings of

the brethren for the holding of the Agape meal and the partaking of the

Eucharist. [251]

The exact date of the last visit of St. Peter to Rome cannot be fixed

with certainty, but a number of considerations point to the year 63

A.D. as the time of his arrival. That St. Peter was martyred in Rome

towards the end of the reign of Nero is a fact, as I have previously

shown, established by overwhelming evidence. [252] That he resided

there for some length of time before his death is witnessed to by a

weight of tradition which only prejudice and prepossession can put on

one side, as without evidential value. By some curious perversity of

critical aberration it was precisely the Ebionite fictions, which have

come down to us in the 3rd century pseudo-Clementine literature, which

Baur and Lipsius and their followers adopted as historical, accepting

their representation of Peter and Paul as the heads of two rival and

hostile Christian factions and as passing their lives in continuous and

acute conflict, while rejecting the tradition universally accepted in

every part of the Christian world for fifteen centuries, which regarded

these two Apostles as the joint founders of the Roman Church, working

in harmony for the common cause, and sealing their testimony by death

in the city where both alike spent their last days. This T�bingen

theory, worked out with much literary ingenuity and all the resources

of erudition, had for some decades a great vogue, but being

fundamentally false it could not live long when tested by the results

of scientific archaeological research, and has at length been

practically abandoned. Christian archaeology indeed has during the past

half century made giant strides, especially at Rome itself, and the

accumulating evidence furnished by the excavations and explorations in

the Catacombs and elsewhere has been most illuminating, and tends more

and more by the testimony of still existing monuments, tombs, and

inscriptions to verify the general correctness of early Christian

tradition. [253]

St. Peter's final sojourn in Rome has a permanent record in the first

Epistle bearing his name, which is from the historian's standpoint a

document of the utmost value. Its authenticity was never questioned in

ancient times and the external witness to its genuineness is

unimpeachable. [254] If on subjective grounds doubts have been thrown

on its authorship, its date and the place from which it was written, it

has been simply because its contents, being on the face of them that

which they claimed to be--Petrine, Neronian, and Roman--naturally

clashed with theories which denied to it any of these attributes. With

the death and burial of the T�bingen fictions, let it be hoped that the

doubts about the genuineness of this Epistle may also find decent

interment.

The salutation of the Epistle is addressed to the elect sojourners of

the Dispersion, in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, in

other words to the Jewish Christians scattered throughout the four

Roman provinces (for Pontus and Bithynia formed one province) which lay

north and west of the Taurus mountain range. [255] This region then, it

may be assumed, had been the scene of Peter's missionary labours for a

number of years before the visit to Rome during which the epistle was

written. Taken in conjunction with the strong body of evidence from

other sources for a residence of St. Peter in Rome during the latter

part of Nero's reign, [256] and with the internal evidence of the

epistle itself--that it was written in that city during the earlier

stages of the persecution which followed the great fire of 64 A.D., the

words of ch. v. v. 13, the Church (or the sister) which is in Babylon

elect together with you saluteth you,' are not difficult of

interpretation. To Jewish readers the term Babylon, as symbolically and

figuratively connoting the great city of oppression and corruption on

the Tiber, was, if one may judge by the use made of it in the

Apocalypse, so familiar as to be at once intelligible. The 5th book of

the Sibylline Oracles, in a passage of Jewish origin referring to the

misdeeds of Nero, and possibly written not long after the fall of

Jerusalem, likewise employs the name Babylon for Rome simply and

directly, as St. Peter does. [257]

The epistle is remarkable for the extent of its indebtedness to other

New Testament writings, and especially to those of St. Pau1. [258]

There is no lack of originality in either thought or diction in this

essentially Petrine document, but St. Peter's mind appears to have been

one of those that absorbed what he had heard or read so completely that

he reproduced it almost unconsciously, and yet in reproducing

transformed the borrowed phrase or idea, so as to make it his very own.

It is peculiarly interesting to note that this Epistle plainly

testifies that the Apostle was intimately acquainted with those two

great epistles of St. Paul, the Epistles to the Romans and to the

Ephesians, [259] and that he was deeply impressed by them. This being

so, it follows not only that there was at this time no opposition

between Peter and Paul, such as fills the foreground of Christian

Baur's imaginative representation of the relations between the two men,

but that any earlier divergencies of view had been replaced by the

closest agreement and by practical identity in the general character of

their teaching. Further the fact that the language of these two

Epistles, Ephesians and Romans, should have been thus fresh in the

memory of St. Peter, when dictating his own letter, is one of those

undesigned coincidences which afford the strongest circumstantial proof

that the historical setting is in exact accordance with that

traditional interpretation of documentary evidence which I have been

endeavouring to show is the correct interpretation. St. Paul, as we

have seen, had sent from Rome in 61 A.D. an Epistle to the Church in

Colossae and another circular epistle, commonly called the Epistle to

the Ephesians, but in reality addressed to a whole group of Asian

Churches. In the Epistle to Colossae the Apostle in sending the

salutation of Mark, the cousin of Barnabas, who was then with him

states that he (Mark) was about to visit them, and he gives to him his

commendation. [260] St. Peter in writing, also from Rome, to these same

Asian Churches a few years later adds to the salutation from the Church

that of Marcus my son.' [261] Now St. Peter, according to the opening

passage of his Epistle, had been working himself in Asia Minor in the

years preceding this last Roman visit. The natural inference therefrom

is that Mark had, while journeying through those Churches to which the

Epistle of the Ephesians had been sent, joined himself to his old

chief, and then accompanied him once again to Rome, as his interpreter.

The many references to the Epistle to the Ephesians by St. Peter in

these circumstances are not more than what might reasonably be

expected. Moreover in. Christian Rome, the Apostle on his arrival so

soon after Paul's release would find himself in a Pauline atmosphere,

and being a man keenly susceptible to influences from without,

familiarity with the Epistle to the Romans could scarcely fail to

exercise that profound effect upon his mind which is reflected in his

utterances. But not only was Mark a living bond between the two

Apostles at this period; the concluding paragraph of this Epistle seems

to imply that Silvanus also, Paul's former missionary associate, had

been with Peter in Asia Minor, that he had accompanied him to Rome,

that he was now acting as his amanuensis in writing his epistle to the

Churches of the Dispersion, and that he was destined to be its bearer.

The words through Silvanus, a faithful brother in my judgement, have I

written to you briefly' stand at the beginning of the short postscript

to the epistle, which was in all probability written by St. Peter in

his own hand, and it has been taken to signify that in the body of the

epistle the more cultured scribe was allowed more or less a free hand

in putting into literary form the rough-hewn Greek which fell from the

lips of the Apostle. [262]

An event took place when St. Peter was in Rome, but some months before

he wrote his Epistle, which was fraught with terrible consequences to

the Christians. On July 19, 64 A.D., a fire broke out at the end of the

Great Circus adjoining the Palatine and Caelian Hills, amidst shops

containing inflammable wares. For nine days the conflagration raged,

with most disastrous results. Of the fourteen districts into which Rome

was divided, four only escaped uninjured, three were totally destroyed,

in the other seven only a few scarred and half-ruined houses remained.

Nero was at Antium at the time, but he hurried to Rome only to see his

own palace buildings on the Palatine and Esquiline, filled with works

of art, consumed by the flames. From 400,000 to 500,000 persons found

themselves homeless and most of them destitute. The Emperor threw

himself with energy into the formidable work of dealing with such an

emergency. He opened to the people the Campus Martins, the public

buildings of Agrippa and his own gardens, where he erected temporary

shelters for the homeless. He brought up supplies of corn and lowered

the price. The Sibylline Oracles were consulted and propitiations

offered to the Gods. But in spite of all these acts, which should have

won him popularity, manifold rumours were soon afloat attributing the

fire to incendiaries carrying out Nero's own orders. It was commonly

believed that he wished the ancient city to be burnt down, with its

dark, narrow, close-packed streets in order that he might build a new

one to be called after his own name. [263]

The work of rebuilding in any case was one in which he delighted and on

which he lavished vast sums of money. Broad, well-built streets of

stone brought from the quarries of Gabii and Alba, with long

colonnades, replaced the narrow and tortuous alleys which had

disappeared. Above all he now appropriated an immense area for the

erection of a magnificent palace for himself, to which the name of the

Domus Aurea was given, surrounded by open fields, woods and lakes, in

which nature and art vied with each other in creating a scene of

perfect sylvan beauty. All this is told us by Tacitus, who then

proceeds to describe the effect upon the public mind of all this

activity on the part of the Emperor:--but neither man's efforts to give

relief, nor the largess of the prince, nor the propitiations of the

Gods were able to dissipate belief in the sinister report that the fire

had been ordered. Wherefore to efface the rumour, Nero contrived that

accusations should be brought against a set of people hated for their

abominations, whom the populace called Christians, and subjected them

to the most exquisite torments. The author of this name, one Christus,

had in the reign of Tiberius been executed by the procurator Pontius

Pilatus; and the pernicious superstition, though repressed for the

moment, began to break out afresh, not only in Judaea, the origin of

that evil, but also in Rome, where all things horrible and shameful

from every quarter collect together and are practised.' [264]

With these sentences Tacitus begins the famous passage, so full of

difficult and debateable points, in which he describes the Neronian

persecution of the Christians. Before, however, proceeding further, and

as a necessary preliminary to any detailed consideration of the passage

as a whole, I wish to point out what seems to me a fundamental error on

the part of almost every writer upon the subject: the error of

connecting the criminal process set on foot by Nero against the

Christians, and its culmination in the horrible fete in the Vatican

Gardens too closely with the Great Fire, either as regards the time or

the character of the charges. Most writers assume that the Christians

were accused of being incendiaries almost as soon as the last flames

were extinguished, and that the Vatican holocaust took place in the

month of August 64 A.D. Now such a supposition runs directly counter to

the Tacitean narrative and derives no support from any other source.

The section of Book XV of the Annals' comprising seven chapters (38-44)

forms a continuous story and treats of a considerable interval of time.

The words wherefore to efface the rumour' . . . are in strict

dependence on the sentence that precedes them--but neither man's

efforts to give relief, nor the largesses of the prince, nor the

propitiations of the Gods were able to dissipate belief in the sinister

report that the fire had been ordered.' With the utmost distinctness

and clearness of which language is capable Tacitus here declares that

Nero did not try to shift odium from himself by inflaming odium against

the Christians, until he had exhausted all the means for gaining

popularity and diverting the suspicions of the crowd, which the

historian has just recapitulated. Now it is simply impossible that the

gigantic administrative task, first, of providing food and temporary

shelter for some hundreds of thousands' of homeless and destitute

persons, and, afterwards, of clearing away the ruins and debris of so

vast a conflagration, of laying out and planning new and spacious

streets and of setting to work to build them with stone brought from

distant quarries, can have been carried out in less than five or six

months. In all probability the Emperor did not give instructions for

the prosecution of the Christians until the early part of 65 A.D.

It is no objection that the whole of this section (i.e. cc. 38-44) is

included in what appears to be the Tacitean narrative of the events of

the year 64, while the account of the happenings of the year 65 begins

at chapter 48. It is the ordinary practice of this historian thus to

group together so as to form a single and complete episode in his

narrative a series of events having close connexion with one another

but really spread over a considerable space of time. A conspicuous

instance occurs in the account of the Pisonian conspiracy and its

suppression, which follows that of the fire and fills the last

twenty-six chapters of Book XV. The history of the year 65 seems to

begin in chapter 48 with the words Silius Nerva and Atticus Vestinus

then enter on the consulship, when a conspiracy was begun and at once

gathered strength, into which senators, knights, soldiers even women

had vied with one another in giving in their names, partly through

hatred of Nero, partly through a liking for C. Piso.' [265] But Tacitus

in thus writing had apparently forgotten that he had already spoken of

the conspiracy of Piso as being in existence in the year 63 A.D., and

it is evident therefore that the narrative of the growth of the plot

given in chapters 48 to 53 covers the whole intervening period. The

statement that one of the leaders, Subrius Flavus, had formed a sudden

resolution to attack Nero when his house was in flames and he was

running hither and thither unattended in the darkness' shows that as

far back as the crisis of the conflagration the Emperor only escaped by

the lack of nerve of his would-be assailant. It will thus be seen that,

while seeming to compress the rise and fall of the Pisonian conspiracy

into the first few months of 65 A.D., Tacitus is really telling of the

long-drawn-out drama of some two or three years. The two sections

therefore of the Annals,' (1) that dealing with the fire, the

rebuilding and the persecution, and (2) that which treats of the doings

of the conspirators after the failure of Subrius Flavus, are

overlapping narratives and really contemporary. What influenced Nero at

this juncture to select the Christians as his victims can only be

conjectured. Possibly the suspicions of the Roman crowd had fallen upon

the Jews, the objects at once of their detestation and contempt, as

being incendiaries, partly because their own Ghetto across the Tiber

was one of the few uninjured quarters of the city, and partly because

the hated race were at that time in especial favour at the Court. The

Jews on their part, alarmed at being the objects of popular anger,

would not be slow to use the influence of Poppaea with the Emperor, and

to suggest that the blame should be thrown on the Christians, a sect

from which they were anxious to be dissociated and on which they would

be only too glad to wreak their spite. [266] A plausible reason would

easily be found in distorted versions of the utterances of Christian

prophets' and preachers concerning that approaching destruction of the

world by fire, in which all Christians at that time firmly believed.

However this may have been, the charge of incendiarism, if ever

preferred, was only a pretext; it was as malefactors and criminals that

the Christians suffered. An examination of the extant authorities will,

I think, bear out this contention.

In the first place comes the all-important passage of Tacitus (xv. 44),

a part of which has been already given. After his reference to the

origin of Christianity he continues thus: those therefore who confessed

were first brought to trial, afterwards by the information derived from

them, an immense multitude were joined with them, not so much for the

crime of incendiarism, as for hatred of the human race. To their deaths

mockeries were added, so that covered by the skins of wild beasts they

were torn to pieces by dogs and perished or were affixed to crosses or

set on fire and, when day had fallen, were burnt so as to serve as an

illumination for the night. Nero had offered his gardens for the

spectacle, and was exhibiting a public show in the circus. He mingled

with the people in the dress of a charioteer, standing in a car. Hence

compassion began to arise, although towards criminals deserving the

extremest forms of punishment, on the ground that they were destroyed

not for the public good but to gratify a single man's savage cruelty.'

[267]

Since the publication of Mommsen's article Der Religionsfrevel nach

r�mische Recht' in 1894, [268] the views of the writer, as the greatest

authority upon the history of the early Empire, gained wide acceptance,

and have now a large and growing number of adherents. According to this

view stated briefly the early persecutions of the Christians were mere

matters of police and were dealt with by the summary powers, coercitio,

possessed by the executive magistrates at Rome and by the governors,

proconsuls, procurators and their deputies, in the provinces. Now the

subject of this article is in no sense specially the Neronian

persecution or the interpretation of the passage of Tacitus which we

are considering. It is a paper of a general character, dealing with

what I may call the normal procedure of the Roman State in its

treatment of religious offences, and no doubt it gives a perfectly

correct account of the ordinary repressive measures which were

continually being exercised against the Christians, as Christians,

certainly after the time of Trajan's rescript, but to some extent

during the whole of the FIavian period also. [269] But the Neronian

persecution was not a normal repressive measure, such as those with

which Mommsen is concerned. The persecution of 65 A.D. was the first

act of hostility of the Roman State against those professing the

Christian faith, and it was the personal act of the Emperor himself. No

one can read Chapter 44 of Book XV of the Annals' without admitting

this. From first to last Tacitus lays stress upon the personal part

taken by Nero in the whole of the proceedings. The account opens with

the statement Ergo abolendo rumori Nero subdidit reos et quaesitissimis

poenis adfecit, quos per flagitia invisos vulgus Christianos

appellabat,' and in the closing scene hortos suos ei spectaculo Nero

obtulerat.' That in the popular view Nero was the prime mover

throughout could scarcely be more strongly expressed than in the words

in saevitiam unius.'

The evidence of Suetonius is scarcely less direct. His biography of

Nero strikes a kind of balance between the praiseworthy and beneficent

deeds of the Emperor and the much longer list of black crimes and

histrionic follies, apparently with the object of showing that the

latter far outweigh the former. Among the good and commendable deeds

comes the brief notice--the Christians, a race of men holding a strange

and noxious superstition, were visited with punishments.' [270] The

impious sect was only worthy of mention because the severity of their

punishment reflected a certain measure of personal credit upon Nero's

administration. That of Tertullian is remarkable. In his Apology' to

the Emperor Septimus Severus he writes: Consult your records

[commentarios]; there you will find Nero first savagely attacked with

Caesarean sword this sect then rising chiefly at Rome. But of such an

initiator of our condemnation we are even proud. For he who knows that

man can understand that nothing except what is great and good was

condemned by Nero.' Again in the Scorpion'--we have read the lives of

the Caesars; Nero was the first to stain with blood the rising faith at

Rome.' [271] Tertullian was himself a jurist learned in the law, and as

the quotations above testify, he bases his statements and arguments

upon documentary evidence, both the works of historians and state

records. Since, therefore, the Emperor personally initiated the

persecution of the Christians in 64-65 A.D.--ergo abolendo rumori Nero

subdidit reos,' as Tacitus says--the trial must have taken place in the

imperial court presided over in the Emperor's absence by the Pretorian

prefects and their assessors of the Imperial Council. [272] Probably in

this matter Tigellinus took the leading part; the character of the

final tragedy in the Vatican Gardens was quite in accord with what we

are told of the fiendish ingenuity of his cruelty. There is abundant

evidence to show that Tigellinus after 62 A.D. was not merely the

instigator of many of Nero's crimes but the active and merciless agent

in the execution of them. [273]

If Nero then, in the course of the winter months of 64-65 A.D., by his

personal initiative brought the Christians to trial before his court,

knowing them to be held in general odium for their crimes, in order to

divert public attention from the widely accredited rumour that it was

by his secret orders that the city had been set on fire, let us now

proceed to examine the highly condensed and somewhat enigmatic

narrative of Tacitus with the view of further investigating the

character of the charges brought against the accused. In the first

place let us clear our minds of a misapprehension. Negatively they were

not accused of having had any hand in the actual conflagration of July,

64 A.D. Not a single writer, Christian or pagan, who refers to the

Neronian persecution ever suggests that it had any connexion with the

fire, with the single exception of the late fourth-century

chronographer, Sulpicius Severus, who, however, contents himself with

an almost slavish reproduction of Tacitus. [274] Neither Tertullian nor

Orosius, who were well acquainted with the works of Tacitus and with

other documentary sources no longer accessible to us, shows any sign of

being aware of any correlation between the charges against the

Christians and the burning of Rome. [275] There is not a trace in the

contemporary writings--1 Peter, Hebrews, the Apocalypse or 1

Clement--that such an accusation was made.

This being so, what then is the meaning of those therefore who

confessed were first brought to trial, afterwards by the information

derived from them an immense multitude were joined with them, not so

much for the crime of incendiarism as for hatred of the human race'?

Now in the first place it is surely plain that had any Christians

confessed to the crime of setting fire to Rome in July, 64 A.D., and

had they implicated the general body of their fellow-Christians in

their guilt, there would have been no need of any subsidiary charges;

exemplary punishment would have been summary and immediate, and Nero's

name would at once have been freed from the stigma that rested upon it.

But it was not freed. There is something approaching unanimity in the

verdict of the writers of succeeding centuries (for Tacitus scarcely

conceals what was his personal opinion) in ascribing the fire to Nero,

and what is more important for our present contention of contemporaries

also. The above-named Subrius Flavus, a tribune of the Pretorian guard,

when on his trial before Nero, as a conspirator, in April 65 A.D., did

not scruple to tell the Emperor to his face that he was an incendiary,

and Tacitus is at pains to state I have given the man's very words.'

[276] Pliny the Elder also, in his Natural History' published before 79

A.D., writing upon the longevity of certain trees remarks that they

lasted until the fires of the Emperor Nero with which he burnt the

city. . . ,' and he concludes in words that leave not the smallest

doubt as to his conviction in this matter, They would have remained

afterwards by cultivation green and young had not that Prince hastened

the death even of trees.' [277]

The incendiarism of which the Christians were accused and of which they

made open confession was an incendiarism in will not yet realised, but

in their firm and absolute conviction immediately to come, and

meanwhile eagerly watched for and desired. In Christian circles this

one belief during the early decades of the second half of the first

century overpowered all others, and transformed all men's ideas and

their outlook upon life, that the second Advent of Christ was at hand,

and it would be preceded by the destruction by fire of the world and

with it the great city of Rome. In every part of the New Testament

there are evidences that the Christians of the period with which we are

dealing expected that the end of all things' [278] would be consummated

in their own lifetime, and the Apocalyptic literature of the time

dwells not only upon the fire which was to burn up the world and all

its wickedness, but also upon the sign that the final judgment was at

hand, by the appearance in bodily form of Antichrist, the incarnation

of Belial or Satan, and there is evidence to show that the enormities

of Nero had before the end of his reign led Christians to identify him

as Antichrist personified. [279] The open expression of such views at

such a time would not escape the notice of Tigellinus' secret police,

and the offenders, no doubt, when arrested (exactly as Tacitus reports)

made no attempt to deny or explain away the language they had used.

Confessing that they were Christians and that a belief in the

approaching destruction by fire of wicked Rome and of the world of

which it was the head was to them as Christians an article of faith, it

is easy to see how by their information' the whole body of Christians

became included in the accusation. That afterwards under torture some

of the more weak-kneed prisoners may have turned traitors and furnished

the government with the names and meeting-places of their fellow

disciples, and in the stress of agony may even have given false

evidence concerning the crimes with which popular opinion charged them,

is not impossible. The language of the Epistle to the Hebrews rather

supports such an hypothesis, as do certain passages of The Shepherd' of

Hermas. [280] The proceedings against the Christians for the use of

language threatening a coming judgment upon the world and its

destruction by fire can be paralleled by the account given by

Philostratus of the visit of the sophist and wonder-worker, Apollonius

of Tyana, to Rome in 66 A.D. We read how Tigellinus, who controlled the

sword of Nero, expelled from Rome' the cynic Demetrius, a friend of

Apollonius, for destroying the Baths by his language, and secretly he

[Tigellinus] began to keep his eye on Apollonius against the time when

he should say something unguardedly that could be taken hold of. . . .

All the eyes that Government sees with were turned to scrutinise him:

his discourses or his silences; his sitting or walking; what he ate and

with whom--all was reported. . . .' Finally, we read a little further

on that Apollonius was overheard saying concerning the Emperor: Pardon

the gods for taking pleasure in buffoons,' and on this being reported.

Tigellinus sent officers to arrest him, and he had to defend himself on

a charge of sacrilege against Nero.' The representation here given of

the power and methods of procedure of Tigellinus and of the action that

he took in the year 66 in regard to Apollonius and his companion

furnishes us with the means of filling in with detail the story of what

happened to the Christians in the preceding year told by Tacitus in

barest and briefest outline. [281]

The offences with which the Christians were charged under Nero appear

to have been, according to Tacitus, of the same character as those of

which Pliny the Younger speaks in his famous letter from Bithynia to

the Emperor Trajan, as the crimes adhering to the name,' [282] and

which we find described in the writings of the second-century Christian

Apologists, perhaps more succinctly than any other by Athenagoras

(about 177 A.D.), who writes Three things are alleged against us:

Atheism, Thyestean feasts, Oedipodean intercourse.' The refusal to take

part in the ceremonies or to recognise the gods of the national

religion constituted the crime of Atheism. The secret assemblies, the

bringing of children to them for the rite of baptism, the words of

consecration in the Holy Eucharist, the salutation with a holy kiss,'

were travestied by the enemies of Christianity into charges of murder,

cannibalism, and promiscuous intercourse, which were accepted as true

by public opinion already in the days of Nero, and which still remained

a fixed article of popular belief and execration when Tertullian wrote

his Apology' about a century and a half later. [283] These were the

flagitia to which Tacitus attaches the epithets atrocia and pudenda,

abominations horrible and shameful.

That the Christians were also condemned for the crime of magic' may he

inferred from the fact that their religion is styled by Tacitus a most

pernicious superstition--exitiabilis superstitio--and by Suetonius a

strange and maleficent superstition -- superstitio nova ac malefica --

(the word maleficus having juristically the special signification of a

magician or sorcerer), and the punishment in the Vatican Gardens was

that specially assigned to those convicted of practising magical arts.

[284]

The crime of hatred of the human race,' however, was the charge which

included all these other accusations, and henceforth during the

succeeding centuries was to render the mere name of Christian a

sufficient ground for summary punishment. This charge, as we have seen,

may have originated in the suggestions of Jewish malice, sustained by

the reports which no doubt reached the ears of the authorities--through

the agency of some of that host of spies and informers (delatores)

employed by Tigellinus--of the incendiary discourses in which certain

noxious religious fanatics, called Christians by the populace, were

openly expressing their belief in the imminent destruction of the world

and its inhabitants by fire without any concealment of the joyful

anticipation with which they awaited the Divine judgment that was

impending over a city which was in their eyes the home of iniquity and

of every sort of blasphemy. But when those first arrested were brought

before the magistrates it was soon found that the fiery words of these

enthusiasts were not nearly so damning as the principles in which they

gloried and which forbade them to recognise the national gods or the

religion of the Roman people, or to take part in any of the public

religious ceremonies or spectacles, or in that worship of the genius of

Caesar, who was the personification of the state. Thus that law of

maiestas, which in the reign of Tiberius had been such a powerful

instrument for the assertion of the imperial authority, and which after

a period of disuse had been revived by Nero in 62 A.D., to be during

this very spring of 65 A.D. employed by him with such terrible effect

in securing the condemnation of those implicated rightly or wrongly in

the Pisonian conspiracy, was no less a ready implement in the hands of

Tigellinus for striking at the humbler Christians as enemies of the

Roman state. It is of this lex de maiestate that Tertullian writes in

his appeal ad Nationes' (c. 7) under Nero condemnation [of this Name]

was firmly established.' And a few lines further on, Although all his

other acts were rescinded this Neronian ordinance alone remained

permanent.' [285] Henceforth the mere confession that he was a

Christian rendered a man an outlaw. It has been argued that the name of

Christian' was not yet in common use in the days of Nero, and that

Tacitus and Suetonius being writers of the second century may have

employed the term proleptically. Apart from the fact that both these

historians drew their material from contemporary sources, St. Peter in

his first epistle, which, as we hold, was written while the Neronian

persecution was gathering force, distinctly says If a man suffer as a

Christian let him not be ashamed, but let him glorify God in this

Name,' and, the Acts of the Apostles already completed before 62 A.D.,

it testifies not only that the word was popularly used in Antioch about

40 A.D., but that it was familiar to a man in the position of King

Agrippa in 59 A.D. With the constant intercourse between Antioch and

the capital, the nickname would be carried to Rome probably quicker

than to any other place, and the familiar Latin form of the word would

be speedily popularised even so early as the time of Claudius. [286]

Pliny in his letter to Trajan most clearly points out that condemnation

of Christians for the name only was already of long standing in 112

A.D. His chief object in writing to the Emperor was to know whether he

was to punish for the Name itself, if crimes were wanting, or for the

crimes adhering to the Name.' [287]

Let us now see how far the evidence from contemporary Christian sources

confirms that derived from Pagan authorities of a later date. That of

the 1st Epistle of St. Peter has already been quoted to show that in 65

A.D. Christians were punished for the name. This epistle was written in

an atmosphere of persecution. The Apostle as one who has been an

eyewitness of persecution in Rome sends a letter of exhortation and

warning to the Judaeo-Christians of the Roman provinces of Asia Minor,

who were at the time he was writing passing through trials of the same

character as those which their brethren in the capital had just been

experiencing. Three times does Peter refer to the charge of being

evildoers or malefactors, [288] twice to the ordeal of punishment by

fire. [289] His exhortations are largely directed to the object of

entreating his readers to prove by the goodness of their lives and

their obedience to lawful authority that the accusations of being

criminal evildoers was unfounded. [290] But on the other hand if ye be

reproached by the name of Christ, blessed are ye'; if a man suffer as a

Christian, let him not be ashamed but let him glorify God in this

name.' [291] The testimony of the Epistle to the Hebrews, which was

most probably sent from Asia Minor to Rome in the following year 66

A.D., and of the Apocalypse, of the date 70 A.D., is similar to that of

St. Peter in that both refer to the severity of the sufferings which

the Roman Christians had endured, and also to the fact that the

persecution which had begun in Rome had afterwards spread to Asia

Minor. The evidence that Tacitus did not exaggerate either the horrors

of the scene in the Vatican Gardens nor the large number of those who

perished is abundantly corroborated. Ye endured'--says the Epistle to

the Hebrews--a great conflict of sufferings; partly being made a public

spectacle by insults and afflictions: and partly by becoming partakers

with them that were so used,' [292] while the writer of the Apocalypse,

to quote only one of many passages, speaks of the woman seated on the

Seven Hills as drunken with the blood of the Saints and of the martyrs

of Jesus.' [293] Still more remarkable are the added details given by

Clement of Rome in what seems to be the description of an eyewitness.

Enough of ancient examples,' he writes, let us pass on to the athletes

of very recent times, let us take the noble examples of our own days.'

Then after telling of the deaths of St. Peter and St. Paul he

proceeds:--to these men {the Apostles] of holy living was gathered

together a great multitude of the elect, who having suffered through

jealousy many insults and tortures, became very splendid examples

amongst ourselves. Persecuted through jealousy, women after having

suffered, in the guise of Danaids and Dirces, terrible and monstrous

outrages, attained the goal which made sure to them the race of faith,

and those who were weak in body received a noble reward.' [294]

I have already shown that the arrest of the first batch of accused

Christians cannot have taken place till several months after the fire

of July 64, probably in the early spring of 65 A.D. The language of

Tacitus may be held to imply that there were, as in the case of Pliny's

proceedings in Bithynia, several questionings and trials of the

prisoners, and some time would elapse between the first confessions of

which the historian speaks and the final seizing of the immense

multitude' for the holocaust in the Gardens. One thing, moreover, may

be regarded as certain: that such a nocturnal spectacle would not have

been planned so long as the night air was chilly, nor would Nero with

his scrupulous care for the preservation of his divine voice [295] have

appeared at night in the open on a car in the garb of a charioteer in

cold weather. But if this were the case then an additional motive

appears for the arresting in the spring of 65 A.D. of this crowd of

humble Christians in order that their execution might be a spectacle to

glut the eyes of the Roman populace. In the middle of April the plot of

the Pisonian conspirators to take Nero's life during the festival of

Ceres was discovered. He grasped at the opportunity of getting rid of a

number of illustrious and wealthy men, the confiscation of whose goods

helped to fill his treasury, depleted by the building of the Domus

Aurea and other extravagances. Some undoubtedly were guilty, but once

more public opinion condemned Nero. He was perpetually,'says Tacitus,

under the lash of popular talk, which said he had destroyed men of

rank, who were innocent, out of jealousy or fear.' [296] Thus

confronted with a fresh crop of disquieting rumours, while those of his

complicity in the conflagration were still current, it may well be that

he sought at the great fetes that were given in gratitude for his

escape from death to win a fleeting popularity and divert criticism

from himself by devising the spectacle of the illumination with living

torches and of the rest of the unspeakable barbarities of that night.

But if so, the arrest of the ingens multitudo must have been

synchronous with the trials and condemnation of the Pisonian

conspirators. May it not be that in this fact may be found the

explanation of that passage of Tacitus in which he relates how Nero

sent out bodies of soldiers in every direction, and how in long

succession troops of prisoners in chains were dragged along and stood

at the gates of the imperial gardens'? [297] Mr. Henderson in his Life

and Principate of Nero,' [298] commenting on these trials of April 65

A.D., says The temporary measures of repression and punishment were

grossly exaggerated . . . . Forty-one persons in all were implicated;

of these twenty were certainly guilty, sixteen of them suffered death,

the others were acquitted--only one certainly innocent person was

slain.' Who then were these troops of prisoners in chains? Is it not

possible that the ingens multitudo who were arrested and convicted in

chapter 44 are identical with the continua et vincta agmina of chapter

58? If the two events were really contemporaneous, Tacitus may have

misread some record and converted Christian prisoners into Pisonian

conspirators.

In dealing with the question of the Neronian persecution and its date,

one important authority cannot be neglected, that of Orosius, who wrote

his Historiae adversus Paganos under the direction of his master and

friend St. Augustine (410-20). In the seventh book of his history, in

which is found the account of the fire and the persecution, Orosius

shows himself to be thoroughly acquainted with the writings of

Suetonius, Tacitus, and Josephus, all of which he quotes by name. The

passage which specially concerns us runs as follows: The boldness of

his [Nero's] impiety towards God increased the mass of his crimes, for

he was the first at Rome to visit the Christians with punishments and

deaths, and through all the provinces he commanded that they should be

tortured with a like persecution, and having endeavoured to extirpate

their very name he killed the most blessed Apostles Peter by the cross,

Paul by the sword. Soon calamities in heaps began on every side to

oppress the wretched state, for in the following autumn so great a

pestilence fell upon the city that according to the registers [in the

temple] of Libitina there were thirty thousand funerals.' These last

words are a direct quotation from Suetonius, who however as usual gives

no date to the pestilence. This is however given by Tacitus, who thus

concludes his narrative of the events of 65 A.D.: The Gods also marked

by storms and diseases a year made shameful by so many crimes. Campania

was devastated by a hurricane. . . . the fury of which extended to the

vicinity of the City, in which a violent pestilence was carrying away

every class of human beings . . . houses were filled with dead bodies,

the streets with funerals.' [299]

Orosius thus confirms the evidence of 1 Peter, the Hebrews, and the

Apocalypse, that a general persecution in the provinces was concurrent

with that in Rome; and his express statement that the pestilence

happened in the autumn following the persecution fixes the date of the

trials and execution of the Christians, as having taken place in the

earlier part of 65 A.D.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[247] Josephus, Ant. xx. 8. 11: te gunaiki Poppaia, theosebes gar en,

huper ton Ioudaion deetheise charizomenos, he tois men deka prosetaxen

apienai. Poppaea was buried after the Jewish custom, Tac. Ann. xvi. 6;

Hist. i. 22.

[248] The above was not an isolated act of interference by Poppaea on

behalf of the Jews. Josephus in his autobiography tells us of the hard

case of certain priests who were his friends. They had been sent in

irons to Rome by Felix to be tried before Caesar, and remained there in

strict confinement without trial for some four years. Josephus

describes how in 63 A.D. he went to Rome to see if he could do anything

on their behalf. After a perilous voyage, in which he was shipwrecked

in the Adriatic, he finally, like St. Paul, landed at Puteoli, and

there met a Jewish actor, named Aliturus, who was a favourite with

Nero. By this man's help he obtained an introduction to Poppaea, who

not only secured for him the liberation of the priests but gave to him

some costly presents before his return to Judaea.--Josephus, Vita, c.

3. Josephus tells us that he was at this time twenty-six years of age,

and as he was born in the year of the accession of Caligula, i.e. 37

A.D., this fixes the date of his voyage to Rome as 63 A.D.

[249] Josephus, Ant. xx. 9. 1; Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. ii. 23.

[250] It was not until the second century that the hatred between Jew

and Christian became irreconcilable. In the period we are considering

the Christians had no enmity against the Jews, as a race. Despite the

bad treatment he received at their hands at Antioch in Pisidia,

Iconium, Thessalonica, Corinth, Ephesus, and, above all, at Jerusalem,

St. Paul always showed the strongest affection for his

fellow-countrymen, and in his preaching held fast to the rule the Jew

first.' But Tertullian's words synagogas Iudaeorum fontes

persecutionum' were true always. Tert. Scorp. 10.

[251] The well-known Roman archaeologist, Orazio Marucchi, has

discovered in the 1st-century cemetery of Priscilla on the lower floor

an ancient baptistery that he has identified with the Coemeterium ad

Nymphas Beati Petri ubi baptizaverat,' Acta Liberii [according to their

Acts the Martyrs Papias and Maurus were interred via Nomentana ad

nymphas Beati Petri ubi baptizabat']. In any case this baptistery dates

from the first century and the local traditions in the Acta are

generally correct. Marucchi, El�ments d'Arch�ologie Chr�tienne, ii.

385-6, 457-61; also Le Memorie degli Apostoli Pietro e Paolo in Roma,

pp. 93-102. The language of Tacitus (Ann. xv. 44) and Suetonius (Nero,

31, 39) testifies that the charges against the Christians in the time

of Nero were of the same kind as those mentioned in detail at a later

date by Justin Martyr, Dial. c. Tryph. 10, 17, 108; I Apol. 26;

Athenagoras, Apol. 3; Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. vi. 1 (as to the charges

brought against the Christians at Lyons).

[252] See pp. 47-51.

[253] G. B. de Rossi, Roma sotterranea cristiana, 4 vols. 1864-1877;

Inscriptiones Christianae urbis Romae VII� saeculo antiquiores,

1864-1888. De Rossi examined over 15,000 epitaphs in the Catacombs.

Bullettino di archeologia cristiana, 1863-1894, etc. Nuovo Bullettino

di archeologia cristiana (edited by Orazio Marucchi), 1895; Orazio

Marucchi, El�ments d'arch�ologie chr�tienne: I. Notions g�n�rales,' II.

Itin�raire des Catacombes,' III. Basiliques et �glises 1906-9. Roma

sotterranea Christiana (Nuova serie) Cimitero di Domitilla,' No. 4,

1909; Le Memorie degli Apostoli Pietro e Paolo in Roma, 1903, etc.; P.

Wilpert, Principienfragen der christlichen Arch�ologie, 1892; R.

Lanciani, Pagan and Christian Rome, 1892, and New Tales of Old Rome; J.

S. Northcote and W. R. Brownlow, Roma Sotterranea, 2 vols. 1879.

[254] On this point Renan (L'Ant�christ, Introd. p. vii) may be quoted:

La I Petri est un des �crits du Nouveau Testament qui sont le plus

anciennement et le plus unanimement cit�s comme authentiques.' 1 Peter

is quoted in the Epistle to the Hebrews, of which the date is probably

66 A.D., and in Clement, 1 Corinthians, an epistle written by a

disciple of St. Peter.

[255] There was regular intercourse between Rome and the seaports of

provincial Pontus, especially Sinope. Possibly, as Dr. Hort suggests,

Silvanus may have had special personal reasons for beginning his

journey as the bearer of the Epistle from this point. As Bithynia

adjoined Pontus and formed part of the same province the route of

Silvanus would be a circuit ending at a point not far from that at

which it began. See Dr. Hort's special note on The Provinces of Asia

Minor included in St. Peter's address': Hort, 1st Epistle of St. Peter,

pp. 157-185; also the very interesting Introduction to Bigg's 1st

Epistle of St. Peter, pp. 67-80.

[256] See Dr. Chase's article on Peter in Hastings's Dictionary of the

Bible, in which references will be found to the literature bearing on

the subject.

[257] The Sibylline Oracles, Book v. p. 143: Pheuxetai ek Babulonos

anax phoberos kai anaides.. The subject of this passage is the flight

of Nero from Rome. Zahn gives the date 71-74 A.D. in Zeitschrift f�r

Kirchliche Wissenschaft und Leben, 1886, p. 337 ff.

[258] St. Peter in many passages shows an acquaintance with the Epistle

of St. James. In this there is nothing remarkable, considering the

close association of the two early Christian leaders. Far more striking

are the numerous echoes and reflections of our Lord's sayings, as they

are recorded in the four Gospels. These Petrine reminiscences of the

Master's words do not, however, seem to be derived from any canonical

gospel we now possess. Possibly St. Peter made use of some

pre-canonical source, i.e. that which the critics have named Q.' Far

more probably he was in the habit of quoting from memory in his

preaching the sayings of Jesus, which his love for the speaker had

enshrined in his mind unforgettably. It is not unlikely that 1 Peter

contains many phrases and thoughts which may have their source in

sayings of the Lord unrecorded in the extant Gospels. It is noteworthy

that the phraseology of 1 Peter contains several coincidences with that

of the Fourth Gospel, a piece of evidence strongly testifying to the

historical character of the Johannine record.

[259] In the Authorised Version of 1 Peter will be found more than

forty marginal references to Romans, more than twenty to Ephesians.

[260] Col. iv. 10.

[261] 1 Pet. v. 13.

[262] 1 Pet. v. 12: dia Silouanou humin tou pistou adelphou, hos

logizomai, di oligon egrapsa. Compare the words of Dionysius of Corinth

quoted in Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. iv. 2. 11, who speaks of the epistle of

Clement as hemin dia Klementos grapheisan.. The Epistle was sent in the

name of the Church of Rome, but the general assent of antiquity makes

Clement to have been the author. He had no doubt general instructions

agreed upon by the Presbyterate, i.e. by Bishop Linus and the body of

episcopi who were his coadjutors and of whom Clement was one. He

appears, according to Hermas, to have acted as the secretary of the

Presbyterate in their intercourse with foreign churches and to have

been given a free hand in the actual composition of the letter. To a

less extent this was probably the case with Silvanus in his

transcription of Peter's dictation.

[263] See Tacitus, Ann. xv. 38--41; Suet. Nero, p. 38; Dion Cassius,

lxii. 16--18; Pliny, Nat. Hist. xvii. 5. Of these Suetonius, Dion and

Pliny agree in ascribing the crime of incendiarism to Nero. Tacitus

does not commit himself to any positive statement: sequitur clades

forte an dolo principis incertum, nam utrumque auctores prodidere.' The

legend of Nero's fiddling while Rome burned' is probably a fiction, but

there must always be strong doubts whether or no he was the author of

the fire.

[264] Tac. Ann. xv. 44: sed non ope humana, non largitionibus principis

aut deum placamentis decedebat infamia, quin iussum incendium

crederetur. Ergo abolendo rumori Nero subdidit reos et quaesitissimis

poenis adfecit, quos per flagitia invisos vulgus Christianos

appellabat. Auctor nominis eius Christus Tiberio imperitante per

procuratorem Pontium Pilatum supplicio adfectus erat; repressaque in

praesens exitiabilis superstitio rursum erumpebat, non modo per

Iudaeam, originem eius mali, sed per urbem etiam, quo cuncta undique

atrocia aut pudenda confluunt celebranturque.' Subdidit reos' means

brought to trial with the malicious object of shifting the hatred of

the people from himself upon the Christians.'Compare Ann. 1. 6: quod

postquam Sallustius Crispus . . . comperit metuens ne reus subderetur,

iuxta periculoso ficta seu vera promeret.'See also Suetonius, Nero, 16:

affiicti suppliciis Christiani, genus hominum superstitionis novae ac

maleficae'; and Pliny in his letter to the Emperor Trajan: nomen ipsum,

si flagitiis careat, an flagitia cohaerentia nomini puniantur' . . .

nihil aliud inveni quam superstitionem pravam et immodicam.'

[265] Ineunt deinde consulatum Silius Nerva et Atticus Vestinus, coepta

simul et aucta coniuratione, in quam certatim nomina dederant senatores

eques miles, feminae etiam, cum odio Neronis tum favore in C. Pisonem,'

Ann. xv. 48. Cf. xiv. 65: Romanus secretis criminationibus incusaverat

Senecam ut C. Pisonis socium. . . . Unde Pisoni timor, et orta

insidiarum in Neronem magna moles sed inprospera.' In xii. 56, 57

Tacitus speaks of the piercing by Claudius of (Monte Salviano) the

mountain intervening between Lake Fucinus and the river Liris with the

object of creating an outlet for the lake into the river, and he seems

to place the execution of the work and fetes attending its inauguration

all in the year 53: sub idem tempus inter lacum Fucinum amnemque Lirim

perrupto monte, quo magnificentia operis a pluribus viseretur etc.'

Suetonius tells us that the work employed 30,000 men for eleven years,

Claud. 20. See also Pliny, Nat. Hist. xxxvi. 15, 24.

[266] Allard, Hist. des Pers�cutions, pp. 42-3; Renan, l'Ant�christ,

pp. 154-5; 1 Clement, 5, dia zelon kai phthonon. Nero must have been

well aware of the existence of the Christians, many of whom were to be

found in his own household. Difficulties must have arisen at times with

the freedmen and slaves who refused to take part in any pagan

ceremonies or sacrifices or to attend public spectacles.

[267] Igitur primum correpti qui fatebantur, deinde indicio eorum

multitudo ingens haud proinde in crimine incendii quam odio humani

generis coniuncti sunt. Et pereuntibus addita ludibria, ut ferarum

tergis contecti laniatu canum interirent, aut crucibus adfixi aut

flammandi, atque, ubi defecisset dies, in usum nocturni luminis

urerentur. Hortos suos ei spectaculo Nero obtulerat et circense

ludicrum edebat, habitu aurigae permixtus plebi vel curriculo

insistens. Unde quamquam adversus sontes et novissima exampla meritos

miseratio oriebatur, tamquam non utilitate publica sed in saevitiam

unius absumerentur' (Ann. xv. 44). Correpti = (1) seized by violence;

(2) dragged violently to trial. Compare continua hinc et vincta agmina

trahi ac foribus hortorum adiacere. Atque ubi dicendam ad causam

introissent' (Ann. xv. 58) of the Pisonian conspirators. Fatebantur can

only mean made open confession.' Indicio eorum: this may possibly mean

that some turned renegades (see Heb. vi. 5, 6), but it includes

information of all kinds. Many no doubt made no concealment about their

being Christians and the views that they held as to the approaching

destruction of all things by fire. It may also mean that papers and

other proofs were found by search of the houses of the accused.

Coniuncti: this is the reading of MS. Med. and on the ground that the

more difficult reading should be preferred, I adopt it with Henderson,

Ramsay, Boissier and others, and also because it seems to me to give

the right interpretation of the words that precede, haud proinde in

crimine incendii quam odio humani generis.' The other reading is

convicti.

[268] Der Religionsfrevel nach r�mische Recht' (Historische Zeitung,

1890, t. lxiv. 389 ff) (see also Expositor, 1893, vol. viii. 1-7).

[269] Among the many modern writers on early Christian persecution the

following works are specially deserving of mention: Mommsen, R�misches

Strafrecht, 1899; Arnold, Die Neronische Christenverfolgung, 1888;

Schiller, Gesch. des R�m. Kaisserreichs unter der Reg. des Nero, 1872;

Allard, Histoire des Pers�cutions pendant les deux premiers si�cles,

1892; Callewaert, Les premiers Chr�tiens, furent-ils pers�cut�s par

�dits ou par mesures de police?' (Rev. d'hist. eccl�s. Louvain 1901, p.

771 ff; 1902, p. 6 ff, 326 ff, 601 ff); Duchesne, La prohibition du

Christianisme dans l'Empire romain' (Misc. di storia ecclesiastica a

stud. ausil. 1902, i. 1); Le Blant, Les pers�cutions et les martyrs,

1903; Gu�rin, Etude sur le fondement jurid. des pers�cutions dirig�es

contre les Chr�tiens pendant les deux premiers si�cles de notre �re'

(Rev. Hist. de droit franc. et �trang. 1895, pp. 600, 713); Renan,

L'Ant�christ, 1873; Boissier, Fin du Paganisme, 1892; Parfumo, Le fonti

e i tempi dello incendio Neroniano, 1905; Ramsay, The Church and the

Empire, 4th edit. 1905; Christianity in the Roman Empire' (Expositor,

1893, viii, pp. 8-21, 110-119, 282-296); Hardy, Christianity and the

Roman Government, 1894; Henderson, Life and Principate of the Emperor

Nero, 1902; Klette, Die Christenkatastrophe unter Nero, 1907.

[270] Afflicti suppliciis Christiani, genus hominum superstitionis

novae et maleficae' (Suet. Nero, 16). These words occur in the midst of

a number of sumptuary regulations enforced by Nero. The epithet

maleficae suggests that one of the charges was that of sorcery or

magic.

[271] Tertullian, Apol. c. 51, 21; Scorp. c. 15; Ad Nat. 1, 7: sed tali

dedicatore damnationis nostrae etiam gloriamur.' The word dedicator in

Tertullian's writings has the signification auctor, initiator, see

Oehler's Index Verborum in his edition of Tertullian's works. In the

passage from Scorp. occur the words si fidem commentarii voluerit

haereticus, instrumenta Imperii loquentur.'

[272] Tac. Ann. xiv. 51, 60; xv. 37, 50, 72; xvi. 19, 20; Hist. i, 72;

Suet. Galba, 15; Plutarch, 0tho, c. 2; Tac. Ann. xv. 58: Atque ubi

dicendam ad causam introissent . . . pro crimine accipi cum super

Neronis ac Tigellini saevas percontationes, Faenius quoque Rufus

violenter urgeret.' The trial of the Pisonian conspirators thus took

place before Nero and the two Pretorian Prefects, April 65. A little

afterwards Seneca was accused of complicity, and his answers to the

charge were brought by a tribune to the Court. Tacitus (Ann. c. 61)

thus relates it: Ubi haec a tribuno relata Bunt Poppaea et Tigellino

coram, quod erat saevienti principi intimum consiliorum. . . .

[273] See Juvenal, Sat. i, 155-157:

Pone Tigellinum: taeda lucebis in illa,

Qua stantes ardent, qui fixo gutture (pectore) fumant

Et latum media sulcum diducit arena.

On this passage an ancient Schol. comments: In munere Neronis arserunt

vivi de quibus ille iusserat cereos fieri, qui lucerent spectatoribus.

. . . Maleficos homines taeda, papyro, cera super vestiebat, sicque ad

ignem admoveri iubebat ut arderent.'

[274] Sulp. Sev. Chron. ii. 29.

[275] This negative evidence of Tertullian comes out the more forcibly

as his Apology was addressed to the Emperor Septimius Severus, and to

the chief magistrates of the Roman Empire. Orosius roundly charged Nero

with being the incendiary: denique urbis Romae incendium voluptatis

suae spectaculum fecit' (Hist. adv. Paganos, vii. 7).

[276] Ipsa rettuli verba,' Tac. Ann. xv. 67.

[277] Duraveruntque, quoniam et de longissimo aevo arborum diximus, ad

Neronis principis incendia quibus cremavit Urbem, annis CLXXX . . .

postea cultu virides iuvenesque ni Princeps ille accelerasset etiam

arborum mortem,' Pliny, Hist. Nat. xvii. 1.

[278] 1 Thess. iv. 16-18; 2 Thess. i. 7-10; 1 Cor. xv. 51-2; Rom. xiii.

11-13; Tit. ii. 12, 13; Heb. ix. 37; 1 Pet. iv. 7; 2 Pet. iii. 10-12;

Rev. xviii. 1-21, xxii. 10-12, 20.--See Turner, Studies in Early Church

History, pp. 226-7.

[279] Rev. xiii., xvi. 10, 19, xvii. 5-9; Ascension of Isaiah [80-90

A.D.] 14 (2, 5) and 18. Orac. Sibyllina, iii. 63-93 [about 80 A.D.],

iv. 179-182, v. 158-162. There are many other passages of

Judaeo-Christian origin which are difficult to date, as the books in

their present form contain many ancient fragments. See also Apoc. of

Baruch, xxxvi.-xl., which Dr. Charles dates before 70 A.D., and iv.

Esdras a little earlier.

[280] Heb. vi. 4-6, x. 26-29, 39. The title of Confessores was one in

which the Christians of later centuries gloried. Compare 1 Tim. vi.

12-13. Compare Hernias, Pastor, Sim. ix. 21. 3, 28. 4, Vis. iii. 2. 1,

the persecution to which Hermas refers was probably that of Nero.

[281] The translation from Philostratus' Apollonius is that of Prof. J.

S Phillimore, recently published by the Clarendon Press, 1912, vol. ii.

43-45, bk. iv. cc. 42, 43, 44. Prof. Phillimore in his Preface sides

with the majority of critics in asserting that this work of

Philostratus is a Romance. At any rate, many sections of it may

undoubtedly be regarded as imaginative fiction, But, as in the Acta

Sincera of the Martyrs, the romance is built upon a basis of historical

fact, and the fictitious details fill in the framework of a real

biography. The portion of the book which treats of Apollonius' visit to

Rome in 66 A.D. gives strong evidence of its historicity. The name of

the consul Telesinus, the inauguration of the Gymnasium and Baths by

Nero and his later departure for Greece, the personality of Demetrius

the Cynic, and the character and activity of Tigellinus are all

historical. The original Greek of two important passages stands thus:

Tigellinos gar, huph' ho to xiphos en tou Neronos, apelaunen auton tes

Rhomes . . . apangelthentos de to Tigellino ton logon touton pempei

tous axontas auton es to dikasterion hos apologesaito me apebein es

Nerona.

[282] Flagitia cohaerentia nomini,' Plin. Ep. x. 97.

[283] Athenagoras, Supplicatio 3; also Justin Martyr, 1 Apol. 26, 2

Apol. 12, 13; Dial. c. Tryph: 10, 17, 108; Tertullian, Apo1. 2, 4, 7,

8, 39; Ad Nat. 2. In the account of the persecution at Lyons and

Vienne, 177 A.D., which has been preserved by Eus. Hist. Eccl. v. i.,

the same charges are brought forward: katepseusanto hemon Thuesteia

deipna kai Oidipedeious mixeis.

[284] Gebhardt, Acta Martyrum Selecta, 119: Magi estis quia novum

nescio quod genus religionis inducitis.' Cod. Iust. ix. tit. 18: de

maleficis et mathematicis.' Suetonius, Nero, 16: Afflicti suppliciis

christiani, genus hominum superstitionis novae et maleficae.' Paulus,

Sent. v.: Qui sacra impia nocturnave ut quem obtruncarent, defigerent,

obligarent, fecerint faciendave curaverint, aut crucibus suffiguntur

aut bestiis obiiciuntur. . . . Magicae artis conscios summo supplicio

adfici placuit, id est bestiis obiici aut crucibus suffigi; ipsi autem

magi vivi exuruntur.'

[285] Tertullian, Ad Nat. i. 7: Principe Augusta nomen hoc ortum est,

Tiberio disciplina eius inluxit, sub Nerone damnatio invaluit. . . . Et

tamen permansit erasis omnibus hoc solum "institutum Neronianum" iustum

denique ut dissimile sui auctoris.' The lex de maiestate was a

juridical creation of Tiberius and so would not be affected by the

rescissio actorum of the latter after his death: addito maiestatis

crimine, quod tunc omnium accusationum complementum erat,' Tac. Ann.

iii. 38. Nero himself was spoken of by Pliny the Elder as hostis

generis humani' (Hist. Nat. vii. 8. 45. 46). Attilio Profumo in his

learned work Le Fonti ed i Tempi dello Incendio Neroniano (p. 227),

commenting on the passage above quoted from Tertullian's Ad nationes,

thus states the conclusions at which he arrived: (1) Non esser mai

esistita n� legge n� altra disposizione giuridica qualsiasi che

colpisse nominativamente e solo, come tali, Christiani. (2) Le

persecuzioni contro di essi furono sempre fatte in forma giuridica e

legale, applicando loro 1' "institutum" delle tre accuse--suntuaria, di

sacrilegio, di maest�--detto "Neronianum"; "istituto" non gi� esclusivo

per essi, ma ad essi solo e sempre applicato. (3) La natura dell'

"Institutum" istesso, spiega i periodi di persecuzione e di pace che si

alternavano per i Cristiani, senza bisogno di fare o di annullare legge

alcuna; dappoich� era affidita alla suprema autorit� del Principe e

fino ad un certo limite anche a quella dei Presidi delle Province, e

1'applicazione di esso e 1'applicazione pi� o meno lata,' Tertullian,

as a jurist, uses the word institutum' correctly to signify a legal

procedure resting upon custom, not necessarily written, Compare Tac.

Ann. xiii. 32 of the domestic court for the trial of Pomponia Graecina;

isque (Aulus Plautius) prisco instituto propinquis coram de capita

famaque coniugis cognovit et insontem pronuntiavit.'

[286] Suet. Claudius, c. 25.

[287] Ipsum nomen, si flagitiis careat, an flagitia cohaerentia nomini

puniantur,' Pliny, Ep. x. 96. Pliny had no definite edict against

Christianity to guide him: cognitionibus de Christianis interfui

nunquam; ideo nescio quid et quatenus aut puniri soleat aut quaeri'--so

in Trajan's rescript Neque enim in universum aliquid quod quasi certam

formam habeat constitui potest.' In comparing the action of Pliny with

that of Tigellinus it should be noticed that there are many points of

close resemblance. Pliny writes: interim in iis, qui ad me tanquam

Christiani deferebantur, hunc sum secutus modum. Interrogavi ipsos, an

essent Christiani; confitentes iterum ac tertio interrogavi, supplicium

minatus; perseverantes duci iussi.' Thus there is the same confession

before trial, and finally punishment for the name. Though he could find

no specific law, there was no searching for precedents. Pliny knew that

for some time past the Christians had been legally regarded as the

enemies of the state and that confession of the name meant outlawry. It

should be observed that he was not hasty in condemnation, but that he

mentions having granted three cognitiones before ordering them to be

executed. Finally, an anonymous paper was placed in the governor's hand

implicating a large number of persons which led to his writing to the

Emperor for direction and advice: Propositus est libellus sine auctore,

multorum nomina continens. Qui negabant esse Christianos. . . . Alii ab

indice nominati, esse se Christianos dixerunt.' Compare with Tacitus,

Ann. xv. 44: Igitur primo correpti qui fatebantur, deinde indicio eorum

multitudo ingens. . . .' The Rescript of Trajan merely confirmed in

writing the practice, which had subsisted since the time of Nero, of

treating the very name of Christian as a crime against the State.

[288] 1 Pet. ii, 12, 14; iii. 15-17; iv. 15.

[289] 1 Pet. i. 7: dia puros dokimazomenou. 1 Pet. iv. 12: te en humin

purosei pros peirasmon humin ginomene.

[290] 1 Pet. ii. 11-17. Are the words (v. 14): hegemosin, hos dhi autou

[toi basileos pempomenois eis ekdikesin kakopoion, a reference to

instructions sent out by Nero with regard to the Christians of Asia

Minor? 1 Pet. iii. 16.

[291] 1 Pet. iv. 14-16.

[292] Heb. x. 32, 33. See also iv. 14, 15, vi. 4-6, x. 23-27, xii.

1-13, xiii. 23. For the date of Hebrews and of the Apocalypse see

Lecture VI.

[293] Rev. xvii. 6. See also ii. 3, 9, 10, 13; iii. 8-11; vi. 9-11;

vii. 13-17; xii. 10, 11; xiii. 7, 8; xvi. 6; xviii. 24; xx. 4.

[294] 1 Clem. v. All' hina ton archaion hupodeigmaton pausometha

elthomen epi tous engista genomenous athletas; labomen tes geneas hemon

ta gennaia hupodeigmata . . vi. toutois tois andrasin hosios

politeusamenois sunethroisthe polu plethos eklekton, hoitines pollakis

aikiais kai basanois dia zelos pathontes hupodeigma kalliston egenonto

en hemin. Dia zelos gunaikes Danaides kai Dirkai aikismata deina kai

anosia pathousai epi ton tes pisteos dromon katentesan.

[295] Suet. Nero, 20; Plin. Hist. Nat. xix. 6. 108, and xxxiv. 18. 1666

Tac. Ann. xv. 22.

[296] Tac. Ann. xv. 73: etenim crebro vulgi rumore lacerabatur, tamquam

viros claros et insontes ob invidiam aut metum extinxisset.' Compare

Josephus, Ant. xx. 8, 3; Suet. Nero, xxvi.

[297] Tac. Ann. xv. 58; continua hinc et vincta agmina trahi ac foribus

hortorum adiacere.'

[298] Henderson, pp. 272-4.

[299] Orosius, vii. 7 Auxit hanc molem facinorum eius temeritas

impietatis in Deum, nam primus Romae Christianos suppliciis et mortibus

affecit ac per omnes provincias pari persecutione excruciari imperavit

ipsumque nomen exstirpare conatus beatissimos Christi apostolos Petrum

cruse, Paulum gladio occidit. . . . Mox acervatim miseram civitatem

obortae undique oppressere clades, nam subsequente autumno tanta Urbi

pestilentia incubuit, ut triginta milia funera in rationem Libitinae

venirent.' Suet. Nero, 34. Tac. Ann. xvi. 13: Tot facinoribus foedum

annum etiam di tempestatibus et morbis insignivere, vastata Campania

turbine ventorum qui . . . pertulitque violentiam ad vicina urbi; in

qua omne mortalium genus vis pestilentiae depopulabatur. . . .'

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

LECTURE VI

Rev. xii. 11: They loved not their life unto death.'

The deaths by martyrdom of the Apostles Peter and Paul at Rome towards

the close of Nero's reign are among the facts of first-century

Christian history which may in these days be regarded as practically

outside controversy. The evidence of the letter of the Church of Rome

to the Church of Corinth written by Clement, [300] a first-century

document of the most authentic character, even if it stood alone, could

not seriously be challenged. Let us take the noble examples of our own

days. Through jealousy and envy the greatest and most righteous pillars

[of the Church] were persecuted and contended unto death. Let us take

before our eyes the good Apostles. Peter, who through unjust jealousy

endured not one, or two, but many toils, and having thus borne witness

went to the place of glory that was his due. Through jealousy and

strife Paul showed [how to obtain] the prize of endurance. . . . To

these men of holy life was gathered together a great multitude of the

elect, who having through jealousy suffered many insults and tortures

became very splendid examples amongst us.' The instances mentioned

here, Peter, Paul, and the great multitude, cannot be separated. If

language means anything, it means here that these several examples of

brave and patient witness unto death took place amongst us,' i.e.

recently and at Rome.

That the Church of Corinth to whom it was addressed thus interpreted

the passage in the latter half of the second century appears from the

letter of Dionysius bishop of Corinth to Soter bishop of Rome written

before 1174 A.D., in which the statement appears Both alike [Peter and

Paul], having taught together in Italy, suffered martyrdom about the

same time.' And when we learn from this same Dionysius that it had been

the custom at Corinth to read Clement's Epistle in the Church on the

Lord's Day from the earliest times, it may be assumed that the

tradition of events, which, at the date when Clement's epistle was

first received at Corinth, must still have been fresh in men's

memories, had been handed down continuously. [301]

Both these passages have been preserved by Eusebius and in the same

chapter of his Ecclesiastical History' in which the first Dionysian

extract is found, Caius, a Roman presbyter, who lived in the days of

Pope Zephyrinus (198-217), is quoted as saying I can show you the

trophies--i.e. the Memoriae or chapel-tombs--of the Apostles. For if

you will go to the Vatican or to the Ostian Way, you will find there

the trophies of those who founded the Church'--the apostles throughout

this chapter being Peter and Paul. Irenaeus, an Oriental by birth, in

his youth the disciple of Polycarp, in later life bishop of Lyons,

spent some time in Rome about 170 A.D.; he was thus in a special way a

representative man both of Eastern and Western Christianity, and he

speaks of the Church at Rome, founded and established by the two most

glorious Apostles Peter and Paul, as being the greatest, the most

ancient and well known to all.' [302] And again to this Church, on

account of its more especial eminence, all other Churches must gather,'

and he only spoke the truth, for as a recent writer (Rev. C. H. Turner)

quoting this passage has stated, in the next generation' i.e. after the

Apostles--we might say all the Churches of the Empire "made rendezvous"

at Rome.' [303] And why? Not because it was the political capital, but

because Peter and Paul there gained the crown of martyrdom, and because

at Rome their hallowed remains at the Vatican and on the Ostian Way

were piously preserved and held in reverence. The authority of the

Church of Rome during the early centuries of Christianity obtained a

general recognition accorded to no other Church, not because Rome

contained the palace of the Caesars, who persecuted the faith, but

because it was acknowledged everywhere and always that the Church of

Rome had the distinction of having been founded by St. Peter and St.

Paul and that it guarded the tombs of these two most glorious

Apostles.' [304]

Many legends gathered round the deaths of the two Apostles, but the

Acts' in which they have been preserved are of late date and mainly

pure fiction, [305] except in their topographical references, which the

archaeological researches of De Rossi, Lanciani, Marucchi and others in

recent years have shown to be generally correct. In one important point

the tradition embodied in these Acts, that the martyrdom of Peter and

Paul took place on the same day, i.e. June 29, 67 A.D.--a tradition

which for centuries was universally accepted as historical--is almost

certainly wrong. Considerable obscurity must always surround the actual

date and manner of their death, but the only contemporary evidence we

possess seems to testify clearly to an interval of time separating the

two martyrdoms.

The passage of St. Clement (already quoted) mentions the examples of

St. Peter and St. Paul in two distinct paragraphs, without any hint

that they suffered together; indeed the words about St. Paul--when he

had borne his witness before the rulers, so he departed out of this

world' --by the use of the singular he' imply that the

witness-bearer--the martyr--stood alone. [306] To this may be added the

silence of the Second Epistle to Timothy as to the presence of St.

Peter at Rome during the time of St. Paul's last imprisonment and

trial. The evidence from silence is always a very treacherous argument

to rely upon, but in this case it would indeed be strange, if St. Peter

had been tried and condemned simultaneously with St. Paul, that the

latter should not have referred in any way to his brother Apostle's

presence. As to the manner of their death Tertullian (A.D. 200) writes:

We read in the lives of the Caesars that Nero was the first who stained

with blood the rising faith. Then is Peter girt by another, when he is

made fast to the Cross. Then does Paul obtain his birthright of Roman

citizenship, when in Rome he is born again ennobled by martyrdom.' The

language of the African Father here shows plainly that he is referring

to the undoubted first-century testimony to St. Peter's death by

crucifixion from the last chapter of the Fourth Gospel. [307] Dionysius

of Corinth, as we have seen, merely states that both Apostles suffered

about the same time. The very early Judaeo-Christian Apocalypse, The

Ascension of Isaiah' [308] (79-80 A.D.), seems to have a clear

reference to St. Peter's death at the hands of Nero, but no allusion to

that of St. Paul. The Liberian Catalogue, 354 A.D., is the first

document in which the death of the Apostles on the same day is

mentioned, and from the Liberian Catalogue the Liber Pontificalis'

adopted it, and June 29 was henceforth regarded as the common

anniversary of the martyrdom of the two Apostles. The origin of this

mistake is however revealed by certain entries in authentic lists of

the feasts of martyrs annually celebrated in the Church belonging to

the second half of the fourth century, from which it appears that in

the year 258 A.D., owing to the outbreak of the Valerian persecution,

the relics of the two Apostles were taken from their resting-places at

the Vatican and on the Ostian Way and deposited for safety in a

cemetery on the Appian Way known as the Catacombs. The translation took

place on June 29, and when afterwards the relics were again restored to

their original tombs, a hymn of St. Ambrose tells us that henceforth on

that clay there were three feasts kept at Rome: one at the Vatican, a

second on the Ostian Way, a third at the Catacombs. [309] From the

beginning of the fourth century then the belief that the Apostles

suffered together in 67 A.D. on the same day became general, though a

passage in one of the poems of Prudentius written quite early in that

century is a proof that with the acceptance of June 29 as the

anniversary of both Apostles, a tradition remained of their martyrdoms

having taken place in different years. Prudentius says [310] that St.

Peter died exactly a year before St. Paul. It was the influence of St.

Jerome more than any other cause that led to the universal adoption in

the Western Church of the fourteenth year of Nero as the date of St.

Peter's death, his account of that Apostle in the De Viris Illustribus

being the basis of the notice of St. Peter which appears in the Liber

Pontificalis.' [311]

The internal evidence of St. Peter's first Epistle shows that he

survived the Vatican fete and that the extension of the persecution to

the provinces was the chief cause of his writing. It follows therefore

that he must have been in concealment during the climax of the Neronian

attack upon the Roman Christians. Now among the legends which have

grown up around the death of St. Peter there is a very beautiful one,

which may possibly have an historical foundation, I mean the well-known

Quo Vadis? story. His friends, so runs the story, had entreated the

Apostle to save his life by leaving the city. Peter at last consented,

but on condition that he should go away alone. But when he wished to

pass the gate of the city, he saw Christ meeting him. Falling down in

adoration he says to Him "Lord, whither goest Thou?" And Christ replied

to him "I am coming to Rome to be again crucified." And Peter says to

Him "Lord, wilt Thou again be crucified?" And the Lord said to him

"Even so, I will again be crucified." Peter said to Him "Lord, I will

return and will follow Thee." And with these words the Lord ascended

into Heaven . . . And Peter, afterwards corning to himself, understood

that it was of his own passion that it had been spoken, because that in

it the Lord would suffer.' The Apostle then returned with joy to meet

the death which the Lord had signified that he should die. Now the mere

existence of this ancient tradition would indicate that the crucifixion

of Peter took place while the persecution was still active, i.e. some

time in the summer of 65 A.D. [312]

That it contains a story that is authentic in the sense of being based

on events that really occurred is not improbable. The Peter described

here is the Peter of the Gospels--brave, loving, but in critical

moments irresolute. The persuasions of friends may have induced him to

seek safety in flight, but no sooner is he on his way than his

conscience reproves him. He who had just written to the persecuted

disciples in Asia if any man suffer as a Christian let him not be

ashamed; but let him glorify God on this behalf,' [313] must have felt

that he was again denying his Master, and, as in the High Priest's

palace, once more did the Lord look upon Peter. The vision came to him

now, as in former days the vision on the roof of the tanner's house at

Joppa, as perhaps overwrought with fatigue he had flung himself on the

ground to rest. There is a passage in St. John's Gospel which seems to

me to support the historicity of the Quo Vadis? tradition. [314] It was

after the Supper on the last night of the Lord's earthly life, when

(according to St. John) Simon Peter said unto Him, Lord, whither goest

Thou? Jesus answered him, Whither I go, thou canst not follow Me now,

but thou shalt follow Me afterwards. Peter saith unto Him, Lord, why

cannot I follow Thee now? I will lay down my life for Thy sake.' Two

questions at once come into the mind: (1) Was the echo of those words

haunting Peter's memory when he saw the vision? (2) Did his knowledge

of the cause of Peter's voluntary return to death move the Fourth

Evangelist to insert those verses in his narrative? Possibly both

should be answered in the affirmative.

Before leaving the subject of the Quo Vadis? tradition I should like to

point out that the remarkable language of Hebrews vi. 6, if it were

possible to regard it as suggested by the words of the Lord to Peter, I

am coming to Rome to be crucified again, acquires a living force and

becomes full of meaning as a reference to an event fresh in the minds

of the readers. The writer of Hebrews was acquainted with 1st Peter,

and if, as I venture for the moment to assume, this Epistle was

addressed to the Jewish Christians in Rome about a year or a year and a

half after St. Peter's death then the solemn words in which those who

in times of persecution shall fall away were warned that it was

impossible to renew them again to repentance--seeing that (by such an

act of apostasy) they crucify the Son of God afresh and put him to an

open shame'--recalling, as they did, the very words which had caused

Peter to turn back and welcome martyrdom, would strike home to the

hearts and consciences of any waverers that heard them. For the Quo

Vadis? story, if in any sense historical, must have been widely known

from the first.

Having made this reference to the Epistle to the Hebrews let us now

turn to the consideration of the problems that it presents.

The internal evidence tells us that this epistle was sent to a Church

containing a considerable body of Jewish Christians, who though they

spoke Greek and used the LXX. version, were accustomed to style

themselves Hebrews.' They had been exposed to a severe persecution,

having endured a great conflict of sufferings, being made a

gazing-stock both by reproaches and afflictions'--a conflict in which

certain persons had apostatised. [315] Further it would appear that

persecution had not ceased, but that some were still in bonds. [316]

Among those who had suffered were leaders, who had set an example to be

followed. [317] The place of martyrdom is plainly indicated as lying

outside the city walls. [318] Those who would be the readers of the

Epistle had not yet themselves resisted unto blood, but they needed

encouragement to persevere, and as a deterrent to the weak-kneed and

faint-hearted the terrible judgments of God against apostasy are

painted in the sternest colours. [319] Now all this applies to the

Judaeo-Christian community of Rome in the year 66 A.D.

That there was such a body of Judaeo-Christians at Rome and that the

writer of this Epistle should address them as Hebrews, there is a

sufficiency of evidence, apart from that furnished by the document

itself. In the Epistle to the Philippians, which was written at Rome

some four years before the Epistle to the Hebrews, St. Paul makes

mention of a party among the Christians there, who preach Christ of

envy and strife, of contention and not sincerely, supposing to add

affliction to my bonds.' And in this same epistle he warns the

Philippians Beware of dogs, beware of the concision, for we are the

circumcision which worship God in the spirit,' and then proceeds if any

other man thinketh that he hath whereof he might trust in the flesh, I

more. Circumcised the eighth day, of the stock of Israel, an Hebrew of

the Hebrews.' We may gather from this that the party who tried to add

affliction to the Apostle's bonds of envy, strife, and contention,'

were the party that held that circumcision was binding on Christians,

and who styled themselves Hebrews. [320] Of this extreme Jewish party,

who were Jews first and Christians afterwards, some under the stress of

persecution seem to have apostatised, probably by reverting to Judaism

and seeking protection under its privilege. Moreover in an extant

inscription one of the Jewish congregations at Rome is described as the

synagogue of the Hebrews. [321] And Professor Lanciani writes the whole

district outside the Porta Portese has retained its connexion with the

Ghetto of Ancient Rome up to our own days, being called Ortaccio degli

Ebrei, just as in bygone times it bore the name of Campus Iudaeorum or

Contrata Hebreorum. [322]

The external evidence that the Epistle to the Hebrews was addressed to

Roman Christians is circumstantially strong and convincing. It was so

familiar to Clement of Rome that in his own epistle to the Church of

Corinth he incorporates its phrases and its ideas freely, but without

mentioning the writer's name. This proves that Hebrews was well known

in Rome during the last half of the first century and that it had for

Clement an attraction which may reasonably be attributed to an

acquaintance with and respect for the author. The extent of Clement's

indebtedness may be gathered from the fact that at a later time the

actual authorship of Hebrews, despite the great dissimilarity of style,

was ascribed at him. [323] Again the frequency with which the anchor

appears as the emblem of Christian hope, in the most ancient

inscriptions found in the Catacombs, may be regarded as a testimony to

a very early and wide-spread knowledge of the Epistle to the Hebrews

among Roman Christians. [324] Into the whole question of patristic

evidence of a later date I cannot enter here, space forbids it, but it

may be stated broadly that in the middle of the second century Hebrews

was accepted at Alexandria by Pantaenus and his school as an epistle of

St. Paul's; that the great Alexandrian Fathers, Clement and Origen,

both quote Hebrews frequently as St. Paul's, though Clement expressed

doubts whether it was actually written by St. Paul, and Origen goes

further and declares that the name of the writer was absolutely

unknown. The same indecision and indefiniteness of opinion appear in

Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History' in a number of passages, and he may

be taken as reflecting the general attitude of the Alexandrian and

Eastern Churches at the beginning of the fourth century. [325] Very

different was the attitude of the Roman or Western Church during the

same period. There never seems to have been the smallest doubt in Rome

and the West at any time that the epistle was not Paul's. Not until the

middle of the fourth century does any Western writer cite any passage

from Hebrews as Pauline. Indeed, in the course of the second century a

distinct line of division between canonical and uncanonical writings

began to be drawn, and there seems to have been no hesitation in the

Western Church in placing the Epistle to the Hebrews among the

uncanonical. Irenaeus in all his works never appears to have cited the

epistle, though in his Treatise against Heresies' many passages would

have been effective. He may be regarded as a representative man of the

last quarter of the second century. Tertullian and Hippolytus, the one

at the beginning, the other in the second quarter of the third century,

both deny the Pauline authorship. Later still in that century neither

Novatian at Rome nor Cyprian at Carthage, in their controversy about

the Lapsed,' ever brings forward the passage from Hebrews vi. 2-6 which

bears directly upon it, nor do they make any quotations from this

epistle in their writings. This affords conclusive evidence that Rome

and the West, unlike Alexandria and the East, were not in two minds

about this epistle: it was not Paul's and therefore not authoritative.

But there is evidence to show that their knowledge was not merely

negative. They were sure it was not Paul's because they were acquainted

with the name of the actual writer.

Tertullian in his treatise De Pudicitia' makes the following statement:

[326] for there is extant [a testimony] of Barnabas with the title "To

the Hebrews"--a man moreover sufficiently accredited, as one whom Paul

had placed next to himself in the observance of abstinence. . . . And

at any rate the Epistle of Barnabas is more received among the Churches

than that apocryphal "Shepherd" of adulterers.' Then, after quoting the

passage at the opening of the sixth Chapter of Hebrews, Tertullian adds

He who learnt this from Apostles, and taught it with Apostles, never

knew of any second repentance promised to the adulterer and

fornicator.' Now here it will be noticed that the great African Father

is not attempting to reckon the Epistle to the Hebrews as

authoritative, or to place it among the Apostolical Scriptures; he

quotes the epistle as the work of a man whose credentials are simply

that he was a companion and fellow-worker with Apostles. But on the

question of authorship there is not a sign that he was making an

assertion about which there was any doubt. He assumes that his readers

were aware of it and would admit it. In fact as he is inveighing, as a

Montanist, against what he regarded as the lax discipline of the Church

of Rome,' he would not be likely to have quoted this passage in support

of his argument as written by Barnabas, unless he knew that his

opponents would not impugn his assertion. It is clear then from this

that the tradition of the Barnabas authorship was held without dispute

not only in Provincial Africa but in the Church of Rome itself in the

time of Tertullian. But if so, does not the existence of such an

accepted tradition in a Church where no counter-tradition existed,

except that the author of Hebrews was not St. Paul, virtually postulate

its truth?

Now it is needless for me to dilate on the fact here that Barnabas was

peculiarly qualified to be the writer of such a hortatory homily or

dissertation as the Epistle to the Hebrews. He was at once a Cypriote

Jew, brought up in close contact with Alexandrian influences and modes

of thought, and a Levite by descent, who had relatives living at

Jerusalem. The writer himself styles his epistle a Word of

Exhortation'--logos parakleseos--a technical expression for those

expositions or interpretations of Scripture which it was customary to

deliver in the synagogues, and Barnabas' very name in its Greek form,

huios parakleseos, signifies a man gifted with powers of such

exhortation. The addresses of St. Stephen to the Sanhedrin or of St.

Paul at Antioch are specimens of such hortatory expositions of

Scripture, and it has been noted how closely the Epistle to the Hebrews

follows in many places the lines of St. Stephen's speech. The influence

of St. Stephen is particularly observable in the eleventh chapter. The

whole character of this Epistle is moreover exactly in accordance with

what we should expect from the man who in the Acts of the Apostles is

brought before us as the mediator between the two schools of Judaistic

and Pauline conceptions of Christianity. His epistle, possibly written

at Paul's wish and with his full approval, was sent to Rome as an

eirenicon, with the aim of drawing nearer together the Hebrews and the

Gentiles--the party of the circumcision and those converts who were

followers of St. Paul's doctrines. His object is to show that

Christianity is the historical outcome of Judaism, and that, so far

from being in any way opposed, the Law, the Temple, and all the

characteristic Jewish rites and ceremonies were but types and shadows

of the more perfect dispensation that was to come; and that they all

found their spiritual fulfilment in Christ.

It only remains to point out that the personal references in the

epistle support the hypothesis of a Barnabas author-ship. The tone of

authority is marked, [327] and has led some commentators on this ground

to hold that, even if St. Paul was not the actual writer, the epistle

was sent to its destination in his name. But there was one man who

could write with an authority second only to that of the chief

Apostles, Barnabas, and, if the destination of the epistle were Rome,

from what has already been said of the connexion of Barnabas with the

Roman Church [328] it is certain that after St. Peter's death the words

of no other leader would carry so much weight with the

Judaeo-Christians there as his. From one passage we gather that the

writer had not been a personal hearer of the Lord, and from the Acts it

would appear that Barnabas did not become a Christian until some short

time after the Great Day of Pentecost. [329] Lastly, the writer, who

had himself been in bonds, sends the news that Timothy had been

released, [330] and that he was hoping that he would shortly be able to

pay a visit to his readers with Timothy as his companion. But according

to the First Epistle to Timothy, that disciple had at Ephesus confessed

a good confession before many witnesses' [331] ; this city, then, it

may be safely inferred, had been the scene of Timothy's imprisonment

and release. But it will be remembered that in the last lecture some

reasons were given for believing that Barnabas and Timothy were the

joint bearers from Rome of the Epistle to the Philippians, and that

from Philippi they went on to Asia Minor. [332] If then Barnabas were

the author of Hebrews, nothing would be more natural than that they

should be in 66 A.D. the one in Ephesus, the other in some neighbouring

town, and that Barnabas should be planning in company with Timothy to

journey once again to Rome. The words they of Italy salute you' are a

fitting greeting, if sent to Rome by a man well known to the Christian

congregations in Italy, and to whom Italian Christians sojourning in

the province of Asia would resort as a proved friend and teacher:

conditions which, unless tradition be altogether untrustworthy, apply

pre-eminently to Barnabas and to no one else,

At the close of the year 66 A.D. or the beginning of 67 A.D. we find

St. Paul again at Rome. In the interval that had elapsed since his

release in the year 62 A.D., he seems first to have carried out his

intention of making a missionary journey to Spain and then to have

revisited the scenes of his former labours in Asia Minor and Greece.

Clement in his Epistle to the Corinthians speaks of his having reached

the farthest bounds of the West,' [333] and the Muratorian fragment on

the Canon speaks of the departure of Paul from the city on his journey

to Spain.' [334] The authorities for his later travels are the Pastoral

Epistles. With those travels, or with the authenticity of the Pastoral

Epistles as a whole, these lectures have no necessary concern. It is

enough that the autobiographical sections of the Second Epistle to

Timothy should be recognised as derived from a genuine Pauline source,

and this recognition is generally conceded even by some who most

strenuously deny that the entire epistle as we possess it was written

by Paul, [335] for it is these sections only which deal with the second

imprisonment of the Apostle in Rome. At the same time I should like at

this point to record my complete agreement with the conclusion of Sir

William Ramsay that it is far more difficult to frame any rational

theory how these letters came into existence, if they are not the work

of Paul, than it is to understand them as composed by him, and as

completing our conception of his character'; and again, regarded in the

proper perspective, they [the Pastorals] are historically perhaps the

most illuminative of all the Pauline epistles; and this is the best and

the one sufficient proof that they are authentic compositions.' [336]

In the Second Epistle to Timothy we find Paul at Rome in prison

awaiting inevitable death in the calm consciousness of having fought

the good fight and finished his course. [337] Of what befell him on his

arrival at Rome we know nothing. But his previous captivity of two

years and trial would make him well known as a Christian leader, and

the swarms of informers [338] would lose no time in denouncing him to

the authorities as suspect. Possibly he may have been arrested under

the edict of 66 A.D. forbidding philosophers to reside in Rome, which

had sent Apollonius into banishment. Clement tells us he was brought

before the governors,' [339] which, in the absence of Nero in Greece

accompanied by Tigellinus, may be taken to mean the freedman Helius, to

whom the government had been entrusted, and Nymphidius Sabinus, the

Pretorian Prefect. [340] In any case, whatever the original cause of

his arrest, it was as a malefactor (kakourgos) that he was--at the time

he was writing--suffering hardship even unto bonds; in other words, he

was being charged with the crimes imputed to those who bore the name of

Christian. [341] Already he had been once before the tribunal, and

bitterly does he complain that he could find no one to stand by his

side and aid him in his defence, but by God's help he had been able

fully to proclaim his message so that all the Gentiles might hear, and

he had for the time been delivered from the mouth of the lion' [342]

and escaped immediate condemnation. But he was still in prison, his

enemies were busy, and he does not anticipate any issue but death. In

his captivity, however, he is feeling lonely and deserted. Of his

personal friends and disciples some like Demas had openly forsaken him,

others were engaged on various missions, Prisca and Aquila probably in

consequence of the persecution had left Rome and were once more at

Ephesus. Only the faithful Luke was with him. [343] For some reason or

other the Apostle appears in these last months of his life to have been

under a cloud. Sadly he recalls to Timothy--this thou knowest, that all

that are in Asia turned away from me,' [344] and the whole tone of the

Epistle shows that the Roman Christians as a body were, if not

unfriendly, at least unsympathetic. There were of course exceptions,

such as Eubulus, Pudens, Linus, and Claudia, who send their salutations

by him to Timothy, and well-authenticated tradition points to two of

these, Pudens and Linus, as being among the foremost leaders of the

Roman Church at the close of the seventh decade of our era. [345] The

whole soul of Paul however is filled with a longing desire to see once

more his own beloved son Timothy before the end, and twice does he

earnestly in the course of the concluding verses of this most touching

and noble letter beseech him--do thy diligence to come shortly unto

me'--do thy diligence to come to me before winter.' [346] And then the

veil falls. Whether Timothy arrived in time to comfort the Apostle in

the final hours of his life we shall never know. We trust it was so.

All tradition says that St. Paul, as became his status as a Roman

citizen, suffered martyrdom by decapitation, being led out of the city

to the third milestone upon the Ostian Road, at the spot known as Aquae

Salviae. The site of his tomb is now covered by the basilica which

bears his name. [347]

A document now claims our attention which has a closer relation to Rome

and throws more light upon the feelings with which first-century

Christianity regarded the World- Empire of the Caesars than any other

book of the New Testament. I mean the apocalypse of St. John. The

Apocalypse is full of references to historical events of which the

author had quite recently been himself an eyewitness at Rome, or which

were fresh in the memories of the Roman Christians with whom he had

been associating, and it can be dated with great exactitude from

internal evidence as having been written at the beginning of the year

70 A.D. The witness of the contents of the book itself, as will be

shown, amply justifies such an assertion. There is how-ever a certain

amount of external evidence, which has had much more weight than it

deserves, apparently supporting a later date. I think it best to deal

with this first, with the object of tracing to its source the error on

which I believe it rests. The witness of Irenaeus, 180 A.D., is no

doubt important, especially on the question of the authorship of the

Apocalypse, for he had himself in Asia been instructed by Polycarp, who

was a personal disciple of St. John. Now Irenaeus several times states

that John the disciple of the Lord, whom he identifies with the author

of the fourth Gospel, was the writer. [348] The vexed question of this

identity only concerns us now in as far as it throws light on the

passage of Irenaeus bearing upon the date, which I proceed to quote. It

is commonly rendered as follows: We are not bold enough to speak

confidently of the name of Antichrist. For if it were necessary that

his name should be declared clearly at the present time, it would have

been announced by him who saw the revelation. For it was seen no such

long time ago, but almost in our generation toward the end of the reign

of Domitian.' But surely this rendering is wrong. It should be for he

[St. John the writer] was seen . . . almost in our generation toward

the end of the reign of Domitian.' [349] It is of the Seer and his

ability to declare the name of Antichrist that Irenaeus is speaking.

The misunderstanding about the meaning of the passage is largely due to

Eusebius, who after a reference to Domitian's persecution proceeds in

this [persecution] report affirms that the Apostle and Evangelist John,

who was still living, in consequence of his testimony to the divine

word was condemned to dwell on the island of Patmos,' and then he

quotes Irenaeus in support of his statement. Now Eusebius was very

familiar with the works of Origen, and more particularly his

commentaries, and it seems to me that in making this statement he had

in his mind the following comment by Origen upon St. Matthew xx. 22:

And the sons of Zebedee were baptised with the baptism, since Herod

killed James the [brother] of John with the sword, while the king of

the Romans, as tradition teaches, condemned John bearing testimony

through the word of truth unto the island Patmos. And John speaks of

the things concerning his testimony, not saying who condemned him . . .

and he seems to have beheld the Apocalypse in the island.' [350] Origen

does not give the name of the Roman king, since, as he says, John does

not tell us who condemned him. He certainly does not say that the Roman

king was Domitian, indeed he is but repeating what Irenaeus had said

before, who after discussing the meaning of the number of the Beast'

declares himself in doubt, for if it were necessary that his name

should be declared clearly at the present time, it would have been

announced by him who saw the vision.' But the enigma, which Irenaeus

and Origen both left unsolved, is no longer sealed to us. In his Life

and Principate of the Emperor Nero' Mr. Henderson writes The number of

the Beast is now fairly generally admitted to be' Nero Caesar. [351]

Eusebius, again, after speaking of Trajan succeeding Nerva in the

Empire writes: About this time also, John, the beloved disciple of

Jesus, at once Apostle and Evangelist, still surviving in Asia,

supervised the Churches there, having returned from his banishment to

the island after the death of Domitian.' He then refers to Clement of

Alexandria and Irenaeus as his authorities. With Irenaeus we have

already dealt. The words of Clement are: For when the tyrant was dead

he (John) departed from the island of Patmos to Ephesus; he also, when

called upon, went to the neighbouring districts of the Gentiles, in

some appointing bishops, in some organising entire Churches.' [352] But

Clement does not say the tyrant' was Domitian, the name might with even

greater propriety be applied to Nero.

The evidence of Victorinus and of Jerome next calls for notice.

Victorinus, who suffered martyrdom in 303 A.D., is a pre-Eusebian

witness to the tradition. In his commentary on the Apocalypse, which is

the earliest extant, he writes When John saw these things, he was in

the island Patmos, condemned to the mines by Domitian Caesar. There it

was therefore that he saw the Apocalypse; and when already the Elder

had thought that he through his passion would receive acceptance,

Domitian having been slain all his sentences were quashed and John,

freed from the mines, then afterwards published this same Apocalypse,

which he had received from God.' [353] Jerome is still more explicit:

In his fourteenth year when Domitian was stirring up the second

persecution after Nero, John having been banished into the island

Patmos wrote the Apocalypse . . . but when Domitian had been slain and

his acts on account of their excessive cruelty repealed by the Senate

in the reign of Nerva he returned to Ephesus.' [354]

Now the first comment I make on all these passages is, that one and all

of these early Christian writers that I have quoted had no doubt that

the author of the Apocalypse was John the Apostle, the son of Zebedee;

rightly or wrongly that was their belief, yet he is at the close of

Domitian's reign condemned to exile in a lonely island as a criminal

(to work in the mines according to Victorinus), and after his release

by Nerva he returns to Ephesus, and as Clement of Alexandria (quoted by

Eusebius) tells us--he also when called upon went to the neighbouring

districts of the Gentiles, in some appointing bishops, in others

organising Churches &c. . . .' But John, son of Zebedee, must in the

year 96 A.D. have been well-nigh a centenarian; is it seriously

contended that he at such an age could have survived the hardships of

such an exile, even without the mines, or that he would have been able

physically, had he survived, to have taken in hand in the reign of

Nerva the organisation over a large area of the Churches in Asia and

the neighbouring districts? It is on the face of it absurd. The

evidence for this late date is moreover, when critically examined,

decidedly weak. It is extremely doubtful whether any of the three

earliest authorities which refer to the exile at Patmos support it.

Eusebius, as we have seen, read his own interpretation of the words of

Irenaeus into the passages from Origen and Clement, neither of whom

here names Domitian. Of the other two witnesses, however, Victorinus

certainly did not write under the influence of Eusebius, and the

similarity of his version of the tradition to that of Jerome seems to

point to their common derivation from some documentary source, which

connected the condemnation to Patmos and the subsequent release with

the names of Domitian and Nerva. But, as I shall now proceed to show, a

condemnation by Domitian and a release by Nerva is not merely not

inconsistent with but is strongly confirmatory of the fact, attested so

strongly by the internal evidence of the book, that the Apocalypse was

written in the early part of the year 70 A.D.

Let us examine that portion of the internal evidence which chiefly

concerns us in this lecture, the portion which reflects the events of

contemporary history in the city of Rome.

In the seventeenth chapter of the Revelation the great city which

reigneth over the kings of the earth' is brought before us under the

likeness of a woman seated un a scarlet-coloured beast with seven

heads, which are explained to be seven hills, and on her forehead is

written her name of Mystery--Babylon the Great, the Mother of Harlots

and the Abominations of the Earth. On this woman drunken with the blood

of the saints and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus [355] judgment

is pronounced. Again in the following chapter the Seer repeats this

last indictment: And in her was found the blood of prophets and of

saints and of all that were slain upon the earth.' [356] There are

other passages of similar import, but these two are sufficient to make

it clear that the writer is referring to the Neronian persecution with

its multitude of victims, and not to that of Domitian, which was not a

general persecution at all, but a series of isolated acts directed

chiefly against a few influential persons, including members of his own

family.

Again both in chapter xiv. 8, and chapter xviii. 2, an angel is

represented as crying with a mighty voice Fallen, fallen is Babylon the

Great,' and the lurid picture which is given of that fall is no mere

effort of ecstatic imagination, it is the picture of a real event,

fresh in the memory. As we read of the kings of the earth and the

merchants of the earth standing afar off and weeping and lamenting for

her, as they see the smoke of her burning, and crying out Alas, alas

that great city Babylon, that mighty city; for in one hour is thy

judgment come,' and as we read again--of the winepress of the wrath of

God being trodden without the city and blood came out of the winepress

even to the horses' bridles'--there is but one occasion in the whole of

the first century to which such a description could be applied: the

writer had seen it with his own eyes--the storming and burning of the

Capitol by the foreign mercenaries of Vitellius, and the subsequent

capture and sacking of the city by the infuriated Flavian army under

Mucianus and Antonius Primus on December 19 to 21, 69 A.D. At no other

time, certainly not in the end of Domitian's reign, was it possible to

speak of Rome as fallen, or for the Seer to have raised his triumphant

cry Rejoice over her, thou heaven, and ye holy apostles and prophets;

for God hath avenged you on her' (Rev. xviii. 20).

The following passages from the Histories' of Tacitus, if read side by

side with the passages telling of the fall of Babylon the Great in the

Apocalypse, will carry conviction that both writers are describing one

and the same unique event. Of the burning of the Capitol Tacitus writes

The fire extended itself to the porticoes adjoining the temples; soon

the eagles that supported the cupola caught fire, and as the timber was

old they fed the flame. Thus the Capitol . . . was burned to the

ground. . . . From the foundation of the city to that hour the Roman

republic had felt no calamity so deplorable, so shocking as that.' And

again of the capture of the city by the Flavian troops: The city

exhibited one entire scene of ferocity and abomination. . . . Rivers of

blood and heaps of bodies at the same time; and by the side of them

harlots, and women that differed not from harlots--all that unbridled

passion can suggest in the wantonness of peace--all the enormities that

are committed when a city is sacked by its relentless foes--so that you

could positively suppose that Rome was at one and the same time frantic

with rage and dissolved in sensuality. . . . lamentation was heard from

every quarter, and Rome was filled with cries of despair and the

horrors of a city taken by storm.' [357] Well might they who stood afar

off as they saw the smoke of her burning and the terror of her torment

exclaim Alas, alas that great city Babylon, that mighty city; for in

one hour is thy judgment come.' [358] Even the description--mother of

harlots and of the abominations of the earth'--what a realistic

intensity and force it gains, as the utterance of one who had seen with

his own eyes the scenes in the streets of Rome on those terrible

December days.

In the course of eighteen months four emperors had perished and Italy

had been the scene of continuous and savage civil war. In consequence

of the events just described Vespasian became emperor, but at the

opening of the year 70 A.D. both he and his elder son Titus were

abroad. Vespasian in Egypt, Titus in Judaea. Domitian was the sole

representative of his family in Rome, and he was at once presented to

the people by the victorious Flavian general, Mucianus, was saluted as

Caesar, and made praetor. His father and brother were appointed

consuls, but as they were absent, Domitian was invested with full

consular authority--imperio consulari. For six months he in conjunction

with Mucianus acted as regent, administered public affairs, restored

order and distributed offices. His name, says Tacitus, [359] was placed

at the head of all despatches and edicts. Though but a boy of eighteen

his head became filled with ambitious ideas, and he began, says

Suetonius, [360] to use his power in so arbitrary a manner as to give

proof of what he was to become later. To such an extent was this the

case that Dion Cassius [361] tells us that Vespasian wrote to him from

Alexandria I am much obliged to you, my son, for letting me still be

emperor, and for not having as yet deposed me.'

Such incendiary language as we find in the Apocalypse, if used

publicly, would at such a time soon bring down upon the offenders the

repressive arm of those charged with the maintenance of order in the

capital after the terrible experiences of the year 69 A.D. Tradition

says that John narrowly escaped martyrdom [362] ; however this may be,

there is a high probability that his deportation to Patmos took place

very early in the year 70 A.D. (in January or February) through a

sentence passed in Domitian's name. In the month of June of that year

Domitian and Mucianus left Rome to take part in a campaign in Gaul, and

a little later Vespasian arrived in Rome and at once assumed the

direction of affairs. [363] Suetonius informs us that from the

beginning he was anxious to conduct himself with great moderation and

clemency. [364] One of his first cares was to take in hand the

administration of justice, which had been sadly interrupted by the

civil wars, and to examine into the accumulation of law-suits which had

arisen, and to provide for the restitution of what had been seized by

violence in the disorders of the time. Now Vespasian associated Titus

with himself in the government in the course of the year 71 A.D. and

was very jealous during the whole of his reign of allowing authority to

be vested in any but members of his own family. But Vespasian took as

his colleague in the consulship in 71 A.D. M. Cocceius Nerva. Now

Nerva--the future emperor--was the representative of a family

distinguished for three generations as jurists, and no doubt his

appointment at this particular time was due to Vespasian's desire to

have a skilled lawyer at his side for dealing with the mass of

sentences of exile and of confiscation which were the legacy of the

successive revolutions. Nerva held office during the first nundinum of

71 A.D., and it is permissible to believe that in accordance with

tradition one of the sentences quashed by him was that which sent John

to Patmos. If by an order of Nerva he were now released, his exile

would have lasted almost exactly one year. [365]

The external evidence, which was supposed to be adverse to the

acceptance of the early date for the writing of the Apocalypse, having

thus been transformed into an argument in its favour, we will now

proceed by a further examination of certain crucial passages of the

book to make assurance on this matter doubly sure.

The opening verses of chapter xi. imply that the Temple of Jerusalem

was still standing, and that there was no expectation of the

destruction of the Shrine itself. But the outer court was to be given

to the nations, who for a period represented by 42 months would trample

it under foot. [366] This statement must have been made at the time

when the legions of Titus were already closing round Jerusalem and its

doom was sealed, but before it was known that the desperate character

of the defence would carry with it the entire destruction of the city

and its world-famous sanctuary. That Jerusalem was not destroyed when

the words (xi. 8) were written--their dead bodies lie in the street of

the Great City, which spiritually is called Sodom and Egypt, where also

their Lord was crucified'--is evident. In 95 A.D. the city was in

ruins.

The central theme of the Apocalypse is the struggle between Christ and

Antichrist, between Christianity and the Imperial World-Power of Rome.

To St. John the Roman World-Power is Antichrist and both of them are

personified by Nero. The baleful figure of Nero dominates the entire

picture of the struggle between the forces of good and evil. The wild

beast, [367] coming up out of the sea with its seven heads and ten

horns, and the imagery connected with it, was suggested to the Seer by

the apocalyptic visions of Daniel vii., the fourth kingdom of Daniel

being identified by him with the Roman Empire. The name of the beast

[368] is expressed by a number--the number of a man'--and the number is

Six Hundred and Sixty-Six. Irenaeus discusses the meaning of this

number which concealed the name of Antichrist, and already when he

wrote his treatise Against Heresies' in 180 A.D. the key had been lost.

And he is puzzled by the fact that he found in some MSS. the number 616

instead of 666--one such MS. exists still--and he supposes it due to

the error of copyists. But there is a solution now generally accepted,

and whose correctness this very variant reading actually confirms. For

if the Greek spelling of Nero Caesar be transliterated into Hebrew and

the numerical values of the Hebrew letters added together they make

666. If however the Latin spelling be treated in the same way, the

total comes to 616. Nero then was Antichrist, and the interpretation of

the seven heads, the ten horns and the other symbolic imagery of this

portion of the Apocalypse must be approached from the point of view

that they all belong to the Neronian period. St. John was not an

historian, his mind was stored with the language and ideas of Daniel

and Ezekiel and other Apocalyptic writers, who had preceded him; and

his own Apocalypse was but one out of a number of Jewish or

Judaeo-Christian Apocalypses of the first century, with some of which

he shows himself to be acquainted. Nevertheless in all that he writes

there is a distinctive historical background, and it is limited to what

he himself knew of the actual contact of Christianity with the Imperial

power at Rome: a contact which began in the days of Claudius and which

had issued in the reign of Nero in a conflict for life and death, which

was still undecided. Indeed I may go further and say that it is only

when the Apocalypse is treated historically as a Neronian document that

any satisfactory interpretation can be found for the imagery of certain

difficult passages. For example, nothing is more remarkable in the

years which followed Nero's death than the belief that gained firm

possession of the popular imagination, that the Emperor was not really

dead, but that he had fled to the East and would speedily reappear and

once more possess himself of power. In 69 A.D. a false Nero was put to

death in the island of Cythnus, and twenty years later another Nero

pretender raised a revolt in Asia. [369] The Christian Sibylline

Oracles are evidence as to the character and prevalence of this Nero

legend in the reign of Vespasian, [370] and the references to it in the

Apocalypse are a proof of the strong impression which it had made upon

the writer. In the thirteenth chapter, after describing the beast with

its seven heads and ten horns, St. John proceeds: and I saw one of his

heads as though it had been smitten unto death; and his death-stroke

was healed'; and in chapter xvii. verses 7, 8, he writes I will tell

thee the mystery of the woman, and of the beast that carrieth her,

which hath the seven heads and the ten horns. The beast that thou

sawest was, and is not; and is about to come up out of the abyss, and

goeth into perdition.' Then a few verses further on comes the passage

which has caused so much trouble to commentators, in no small measure

because they allow themselves to wander out of a strictly limited field

of investigation--i.e. the Neronian cycle. St. John says (verses 9-12)

'The seven heads are seven mountains, on which the woman sitteth: and

they are seven kings; the five are fallen, the one is, the other is not

yet come; and when he cometh, he must continue a little while. And the

beast that was, and is not, is himself also an eighth, and is of the

seven; and he goeth into perdition.' Now the key to this passage is

found as soon as it is recognised that it deals with no other period of

Roman history than that which I have called the Neronian cycle'--the

period during which the Church and the Empire, Christ and Antichrist,

were first brought face to face as forces irreconcilably opposed. For

note that throughout Nero is not merely one of the seven heads, he is

identified with the Beast itself. [371] In one passage (xiii. 3) he is

the head that was smitten unto death and his wound was healed,' in

another (xiii. 14) the beast that had the wound of a sword and did

live,' and again (xvii. 8) the beast that was, and is not, and yet is.'

Now the words five are fallen' (epesan) imply that in each of these

five cases there was a violent death Augustus and Tiberius could not be

described as fallen,' even had their reigns come within the Seer's

purview. The five are Claudius, who adopted Nero as his son and heir,

Nero himself, Galba, Otho, and Vitellius. The one who is' signifies the

man for the moment invested with imperial power, Domitian, the acting

Emperor, who banished the writer. The one not yet come' is the real

Emperor Vespasian, who had not yet arrived at Rome to take into his

hands the reins of government, and he will continue only a short

while,' for Nero--the beast that was, and is not, who is also an

eighth, and is of the seven'--will quickly return from the East whither

he had fled, and once more seat himself on the throne. And his end is

perdition,' for after his return will immediately follow the great

struggle between Christ and Antichrist, when the latter will be

overthrown and cast alive into the lake of fire. [372] Again the ten

horns with ten diadems,' of chapter xiii. verse 1, are generally

considered to be the governors of the chief provinces of the Empire,

and this is borne out by the reference to them in chapter xvii. verses

12-13: And the ten horns that thou sawest are ten kings, which have

received no kingdom as yet, but they receive authority as kings, with

the beast, for one hour'; and then a few verses lower and the ten horns

that thou sawest, and the beast, these shall hate the harlot, and shall

make her desolate and naked, and shall eat her flesh, and burn her

utterly with fire.' Is there not a direct reference here to the events

of the two preceding years? The revolt of Vindex was the signal for the

overthrow of Nero. The armies of Galba, Otho, Vitellius, and Vespasian

in succession occupied Rome, and the imperial city was held in

subjection by foreign troops, sacked, and its most sacred edifices

burnt. All these five men were governors of provinces.

Lastly it seems to me impossible to dissociate the gathering together

of the nations to battle at Armageddon, the nations which are in the

four corners of the earth, Gog and Magog, to gather them together to

the war, the number of whom is as the sand of the sea,' [373] from the

actual gathering of the nations in those battles near Bedriacum which

had taken place in the year 69. Gog and Magog had come to signify in

the Apocalyptic literature the uncivilised tribes of the earth, and

surely if ever Armageddon was realised in the history of the world it

was in that second battle of Bedriacum ending in the sack of Cremona in

which the armies of Vitellius and Vespasian contended for the mastery.

On the one side were troops from Italy, Spain and Portugal, Gaul, the

German Rhine frontier, even from far distant Batavia and Britain; on

the other, legions from the Danube frontier, and behind these the

armies of Syria, Judaea and Egypt, with auxiliaries from the

furthermost East, from the borderlands of the Euphrates and Tigris.

[374] The Seer is not describing these battles, but he saw the medley

of troops from every nation under heaven actually fighting in the

streets of Rome, and the scenes he witnessed still so freshly imprinted

in his mind are vividly reflected in the imagery of his vision.

Renan [375] has pointed out in his well-known work L'Ant�christ' that

the portents, scourges, and convulsions of nature which in the

Apocalypse follow upon the opening of the seals, the blowing of the

trumpets, and the emptying of the vials were far from being merely

imaginative. The years that preceded 70 A.D. were years marked by every

kind of disaster and catastrophe. Earthquakes were frequent and

violent, especially in that part of Asia to which John addressed his

seven letters. [376] The great pestilence at Rome in 65 A.D. was

followed by a wild hurricane, which laid waste the Campagna. [377] All

sorts of portents were said to have foreshadowed the death of Nero in

68 A.D. and the succession of political convulsions that followed.

[378] This same year 68 was marked by a famine at Rome, [379] the year

69 by a very disastrous inundation of the Tiber. [380] It was no wonder

that a visionary mystic like St. John should have perceived the signs

of the consummation of all things in such a series of catastrophes,

political and physical. Surely there could not be a more convincing

piece of circumstantial evidence for fixing the date of the book.

Moveover as the Seer in the island of Patmos sat brooding over and

recording his visions, before his very eyes there was a spectacle which

has left its traces upon his language. The volcano in the neighbouring

island of Thera was in violent activity during the greater part of the

first century, after which it had a long period of quiescence until 726

A.D. No one can read a number of passages in the Apocalypse [381]

without feeling that the writer must have been the witness of a

volcanic eruption on a grand scale, and there are other passages which

point to familiarity with such scenes. Now the very remarkable fact

stands recorded, that on two separate occasions, in 196 B.C. and in 46

A.D., so extraordinary was the violence of the eruptive forces in the

very neighbourhood of this island that new islands came into existence,

whose modern names still recall the character of their origin. A vivid

description is given by Strabo of the eruption of 196 B.C.: Midway

between Thera and Therasia flames rushed forth from the sea, causing

the whole of it to boil and be on fire, and afterwards an island,

twelve stadia in circumference, composed of the burning mass was thrown

up as if raised by machinery.' [382] Compare with this the language of

Rev. viii. 8, 9: and the second angel sounded, and as it were a great

mountain burning with fire was cast into the sea: and the third part of

the sea became blood; and the third part of the creatures that were in

the sea and had life died, and the third part of the ships were

destroyed.' All these graphic touches are such as we should expect from

a writer who had actually resided in a group of islands where such

catastrophic convulsions had recently taken place. There was an

eruption in Thera in 6o A.D., and the following decade was marked by

continued seismic and volcanic disturbances.
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Chase's admirable article on St. Peter in Hastings's Dict. of the

Bible; 1 Clem. v: kai marturesasm epi ton hegoumenon houtos apellage

tou kosmou.

[307] Tert. Scorp. 15. See also Praescript. 36: Ista quam felix

ecclesia . . . ubi Petrus passioni dominicae adaequatur'; Adv. Marc.

iv. 5; John xxi. 18, 19: Verily, verily I say unto thee, when thou wast

young, thou girdedst thyself, and walkedst whither thou wouldest; but

when thou shalt be old thou shalt stretch forth thy hands and another

shall gird thee and carry thee whither thou wouldest not. Now this he

spake signifying by what manner of death he should glorify God.' Comp.

xiii. 36. Seneca (Cons. ad Marciam, 20) writes of those crucified

brachia patibulo explicuerunt.' The tradition that St. Peter at his own

request was crucified head-downwards was first mentioned by Origen,

aneskolopisthe kata kephales (Op. ii. 24 de la Rue), in his Commentary

on Genesis to which Eusebius refers (Hist. Eccl. iii. 1). This shows

that the tradition was known early in the third century, and the letter

of Seneca quoted above is evidence that such a method of execution was

not unknown in Rome, for he writes: Video istic cruces non unius quidem

generis, sed aliter ab aliis fabricatas; capite quidem conversos in

terrain suspendere.' It is impossible to say whether this tradition of

the mode of St. Peter's death be true, on the whole it is improbable.

[308] Ascension of Isaiah, Charles, pp. 25 and 95, iv. 2, 3: A lawless

king, the slayer of his mother: who himself, even this king, will

persecute the plant which the Twelve Apostles of the Beloved have

planted. Of the Twelve one will be delivered into his hands.' Comp. ten

phuteian en phuteusousin hoi dodeka apostoloi and the words of the

letter of Dionysius of Corinth, ten apo Petrou kai Paulou phuteian

genetheisan Rhomaion te kai Korinthion. Eus. Hist. Eccl. ii. 25. In the

Ascension of Isaiah St. Paul is not reckoned among the Twelve.

[309] On the Liberian Catalogue, its sources and its relation to the

Liber Pontificalis, see Duchesne's great edition of the Liber

Pontificalis; Light-foot's excursus on the early Roman succession in

his Apostolic Fathers (St. Clement of Rome), part I. vol. i. 201-345;

Harnack, Chron. der Altchristl. Literatur, vol. i: Die �ltesten

Bischofslisten,' 79-230; also the chapter The Western Church' in

Turner's Studies in Early Church History, 1912. The burial and tombs of

the Apostles Peter and Paul and the translation of their bodies for a

time to the Catacombs are the subject of a special Note, Note E,

Appendix. The fact of the date of the translation and of the triple

feast being on June 29 will be found in Duchesne, pp. civ-cvii; also in

Barnes, St. Peter in Rome, pp. 107 ff. In the Hieronymian Martyrology

(in a Codex discovered by De Rossi at Berne) the following entry

occurs: III Kal. iul. Romae, natale sanctorum Petri et Pauli: Petri in

Vaticano, via Aurelia; Pauli vero in via Ostensi; utriusque in

Catacumbas; passi sub Nerone, Basso et Tusco Consulibus.' The words

passi sub Nerone must be regarded as in a parenthesis, the date of the

consulship of Bassus and Tuscus is 258 A.D. A somewhat earlier and more

abbreviated entry is found in the so-called Feriale Philocalianum

(335-354 A.D., Duchesne). The title of the document is Depositio

Martyrum, and we find III. Kal. iul. Petri in Catacumbas et Pauli

Ostense Basso et Tusco Consulibus.' A hymn attributed to St. Ambrose

(Daniel, Thesaurus hymnologicus, Halle, 1841, No. 71) has this verse:

Tantae per urbis ambitum

Stipata tendunt agmina,

Trinis celebrator viis

Festum sacrorum Martyrum.

This hymn was written for the Feast of St. Peter and St. Paul on June

29. The trinis viis' signifies the Aurelian, the Ostian, and the Appian

Ways.

[310] Prudentius, Peristephanon, hymn xii.

Prima Petrum rapuit sententia legibus Neronis,

Pendere iussum praeminente ligno.

\* ? \* ? \* ? \* ? \* ? \* ? \* ? \*

Ut teres orbis iter flexi rota percucurrit anni

Diemque eundem sol reduxit ortus,

Evomit in iugulum Pauli Nero fervidum furorem,

Iubet feriri gentium magistrum.'

St. Augustine (Sermons, 296-7) held a similar opinion.

[311] Duchesne, Lib. Pont. vol. i. p. 119: Ce d'but, de m�me que

plusieurs autres parties de la notice, �tant emprunt� au De Viris de

Saint-J�r�me.' C. H. Turner in his chapter on St. Cyprian's

correspondence in Studies in Early Church History, p. 101, writes; The

older critics, following St. Jerome's statement (De Viris, lxvii.) that

Cyprian suffered eodem die quo Romae Cornelius sed non eodem anno,"

naturally placed Cornelius with Cyprian on September 14. But we know

from the Liberian Catalogue that Cornelius died at Centumcellae, and

September 14 was perhaps the day of the translation of his remains to

Rome.' Hence it appears how easily these confusions of dates may have

arisen through the commemoration of a depositio. The passages of St.

Jerome bearing upon the date are: (1) Simon Petrus . . . Romam pergit,

ibique viginti quinque annis cathedram sacerdotalem tenuit usque ad

ultimum Neronis annum, id est, quartum decimum' (c. i.). (2) Paulus

Apostolus . . . quarto decimo anno Neronis eodem die quo Petrus, Romae

pro Christo capite truncatur . . . anno post passionem Domini XXXVII'

(c. v.). (3) Hic [Lucius Annaeus Seneca] ante biennium quam Petrus et

Paulus martyrio coronarentur, a Nerone interfectus est' (c. xii.).

Seneca was put to death end of April, 65. A.D.

[312] Lipsius, Die Apokryphen Apostelgeschichten.and Apostellegenden,

2er Band, 1e H�lfte, p. 318. The following extract is from the Passio

Petri by pseudo-Linus: Ut autem portam civitatis voluit egredi, vidit

sibi Christum occurrere. Et adorans eum ait: "Domine, quo vadis?"

Respondit ei Christus: "Romam venio iterum crucifigi." Et ait ad eum

Petrus: "Domine, iterum crucifigeris?" Et dixit ad eum dominus: "Etiam,

iterum crucifigar." Petrus autem dixit: "Domine, revertar et sequar

te." Et his dictis dominus ascendit in coelum . . . Et [Petrus] post

haec rediens in se ipsum, intellexit de sua dictum passione.' Compare

St. John, xiii. 36, 37: Dicit ei Simon Petrus: Domine, quo vadis?

Respondit Iesus: Quo ego vado, non potes me mode sequi: sequeris autem

postea. Dicit ei Petrus: Quare non possum te sequi modo? animam meam

pro te ponam.' Wordsworth's edition of the Vulgate.

[313] 1 Pet. iv. 16; also see ii. 19-21, iii. 14-18.

[314] If, on the other hand, the Quo Vadis? story were a pure invention

of a later age, then the original romancer must have based it on the

two passages St. John, xiii. 36, 37, and Hebrews, vi. 6, taken with St.

John, xxi. 15-23.

[315] Heb. x. 32, 33, comp. vi. 6, x. 39, 15-25.

[316] Heb. xiii. 3.

[317] Heb. xiii. 7.

[318] Heb. xiii. 12, 13.

[319] Heb. xii., the whole chapter.

[320] Phil. i. 13, 14, iii. 2-5. The very words St. Paul uses of these

opponents at Rome, dia phthonon kai erin, are the words used by Clement

of the causes which led to St. Peter's death, dia zelos kai phthonon,

and to St. Paul's dia zelos kai erin.

[321] Corp. Inscr. Graec. 9909, see Garrucci's Cimitero degli antichi

Ebrei, p. 39. This synagogue doubtless belonged to a small isolated

settlement of Jews, which had only one place of worship; it therefore

had no distinctive name, but was known simply as the synagogue of the

Hebrews.

[322] Lanciani, New Tales of Old Rome, p. 248. The love of the

Hellenist Jews of the Dispersion, living as strangers and sojourners in

a foreign land, for the name of Hebrews was probably due to the desire

to emphasise the fact that they were the heirs of the promises made to

Abraham who by faith sojourned in the land of promise as a stranger'

(Heb. xi. 9). Corp. Inscr. Graec. 9922 is a striking proof that the

Roman Jews called themselves Hebrews': Alupis Tiberieus kai hoi autou,

Ioustos kai Alupis, Ebr?oi, meta tou patros auton hode kinte.

[323] Origen, Hom. in Hebr. quoted by Eus. Hist. Eccl. vi. 25;

Philastrius, de Haeres. 89; Jerome, de Viris Illustribus, 15. Others

suggest that Clement was the translator into Greek of an Epistle of

Paul written in Hebrew. Eus. Hist. Eccl. iii. 37. Euthalius, Migne,

P.G. lxxv. 776.

[324] Marucchi, Arch. Chr�t. ii. 173.

[325] Eus. Hist. Eccl. vi. 14, 25, 41. Origen believed the thoughts to

be those of St. Paul, the actual language and argument those of a

disciple. As to the authorship however he declares--tis de hograpsas

ten epistolen to men alethes theos oiden. Later the opinion at

Alexandria that Paul himself was the author became dominant and at last

accepted by all.

[326] Tertullian, De Pudicitia, 20: Volo tamen ex redundantia alicuius

etiam comitis apostolorum testimonium superinducere, idoneum

confirmandi de proximo iure disciplinam magistrorum. Extat enim et

Barnabae titulus ad Hebraeos, adeo satis auctoritatis viri, utquem

Paulus iuxta se constituerit in abstinentiae tenore (1 Cor. ix. 6). Et

utique receptior apud ecclesias epistola Barmabae illo apocrypho

pastore moechorum.' Another and a much later witness, that in the

Western Church the authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews was

assigned to Barnabas, is to be found in the Index Claromontanus, D. 2,

a MS. of the sixth century. In the stichometrical catalogue of the

books of the Old and New Testaments at the end of this codex there is

no mention of the Epistle to the Hebrews. After Jude, however, and

before the Apocalypse comes the epistle of Barnabas,' the length of

which is set down as 850 stichoi or lines, the Apocalypse as 1200. This

corresponds to the length of the Epistle to the Hebrews and not to that

of the epistle of the pseudo-Barnabas, which the stichometry of

Nicephorus, 850 A.D., shows to be practically the same as the

Apocalypse, i.e. pseudo-Barnabas, 1360 stichoi; Apocalypse, 1400. The

position of the epistle in the Codex Claromontanus and the length

assigned are well-nigh positive proof that the Epistle of Barnabas here

signifies the Epistle to the Hebrews.

[327] Renan, L'Ant�christ, xvi-xvii: I1 (l'auteur) n'en tenait pas

moins un rang �lev� dans l'Eglise; il parle avec autorit�; il est

tr�s-respect� des fr�tres auxquels il �cit; Timoth�e para�t lui �tre

subordonn�. Le seul fait d'adresser une �pitre � une grande Eglise

indique un homme important, un des personnages qui figurent dans

1'histoire apostolique et dont le nom est c�l�bre . . . L'attribution �

Barnab� est la plus vraisemblable.'

[328] Supra, pp. 80-2.

[329] 2 Acts, iv. 36-7.

[330] Heb. x. 32, xiii. 23.

[331] 1 Tim. vi. 12 and i. 3.

[332] Supra, p. 121.

[333] Clement, 1 Cor. v.: epi to terma tes duseos elthon. In the year

66 A.D., according to Philostratus, Apollonius of Tyana being banished

from Rome turned westwards to the land which they say is bounded by the

Pillars. He intended to see Gades and the tides of the ocean, for he

heard some report of the philosophy of the men in those parts and their

proficiency in religion.' In 68 or 69 A.D. he was once more in Greece.

See Phillimore's Philostratus, ii. 48, 63 ff.

[334] Profectione Pauli ab urbe ad Spania proficiscentis.' The

Muratorian fragment is generally supposed to be of the age of

Hippolytus, if not his work. Lightfoot (Apostolic Fathers, part i. vol.

ii. 405 ff) places its date towards the close of the second century.

Also Zahn and Harnack.

[335] Salmon (Int. to N.T. p. 511) writes: As for the general Pauline

character of these letters there cannot be a better witness than Renan,

who, while continuing to assert them not to be genuine, every now and

then seems staggered by the proofs of authenticity that strike him. He

says in one place "Some passages of these letters are so beautiful that

we cannot help asking if the forger had not in his hands some authentic

notes of Paul which he has incorporated in his apocryphal composition'

(L'Eglise Chr�tienne, p. 95).' Of those who reject the Epistle (2 Tim.)

Hausrath, Pfleiderer and Ewald recognise the sections i. 15-18, iv.

9-22 as fragments of a genuine Pauline letter. Salmon, p. 303.

[336] Ramsay, Hist. Commentary on 1st Epist. to Timothy,' Expositor,

Ser. vii. 7, June 1909, p. 488, and Ser. vii. 8, p. 1. Prof. Vernon

Bartlett (Expositor, Ser. viii. 25, Jan. 1913, p. 29) writes: When one

approaches these Epistles fresh front the few pages on them in Hort's

Lectures on Judaistic Christianity, and in The Christian Ecclesia, and

from Sir W. M. Ramsay's recent "Historical Commentary on the Epistles

to Timothy" in the Expositor, one feels the subject has been lifted to

a new level of reality and that much criticism between Baur and

J�licher is simply out of date and irrelevant.'

[337] 2 Tim. iv. 6-8.

[338] Henderson's Principate of Nero, p. 392.

[339] Clement, 1 Cor. v.: marturesas epi ton hegoumenon.

[340] Dion Cassius, lxiii. 12: houto men de tote he ton Rhomaion arche

duo autokratorsin hama edouleuse, Neroni kai Helio; oude echo eipein

hopoteros auton cheiron en.

[341] Comp. 1 Pet. ii. 12, iii. 16, iv. 13, 16, 19.

[342] 2 Tim. iv. 17: Helius--probably.

[343] 2 Tim. iv. 10-13, 19, 20.

[344] 2 Tim. i. 15.

[345] 2 Tim. iv. 21. Linus is no doubt the man who appears in the

episcopal lists as the first bishop of Rome after Peter. Pudens was a

man of senatorial rank, who according to tradition played a

considerable part in the early history of the Church in Rome. See

Appendix, Note C.

[346] 2 Tim. iv. 9, 21.

[347] See Appendix, Note E, The Tombs of St. Peter and St. Paul.

[348] For the question of the identity of John the Apostle the son of

Zebedee, John the disciple of the Lord, who reclined on His Breast at

Supper, John the author of the Epistles and the Fourth Gospel, and John

the Presbyter--see the convincing arguments of Dom John Chapman,

O.S.B., in his John the Presbyter and the Fourth Gospel: Clarendon

Press, 1911.

[349] Irenaeus, Adv. Haer. v. 30. 1-3; Eus. Hist. Eccl. iii. 18 and v.

8: tounoma autou di ekeinou an errethe, tou kai ten apokalupsin

heorakotos; oude gar pro pollou chronou heorathe, alla schedon epi tes

hemeteras geneas, pros to teleites Dometianou arches. That John is the

subject before heorathe seems to follow necessarily from the words

which precede in the same passage--marturounton auton ekeinon ton kat'

upsin Ioannen heorakoton. . . .

[350] ho de Rhomaion basileis, hos he paradosis didaskei, katedikase

ton Ioannen marturounta dia ton tes aletheias logon eis Patmon ten

neson; didaskei de ta peri tou marturiou autou Ioannes, me legon tis

auton katedikase.

[351] Henderson, Life of Nero, p. 440. See infra, p. 173.

[352] Eus. Hist. Eccl. 23.

[353] Migne, P.L. v. 1665.

[354] De Viris Illust. 9.

[355] Rev. xvii. 3-7, 9.

[356] Rev. xviii. 24. Compare vi. 9-11, 14, xiii. 15, xvi. 5-7.

[357] Tac. Hist. iii. 72, 83, iv. 1. Rev. xiv. 8, 17-20, xvii. 16,

xviii. passim.

[358] Rev. xviii. 10.

[359] Tac. Hist. iv. 3, 44-47, 51, 68; Josephus, Bell. Iud. iv. 11. 4.

[360] Suetonius, Domitian, 1.

[361] Dion Cassius, lxv. 22, lxvi. 1-3.

[362] Tertullian (Praescrip. 36), after speaking of the martyrdoms of

Peter and Paul, relates that John was cast into burning oil but escaped

unhurt. Jerome in his commentary on Matt. xx. 23 refers to the same

tradition. Whatever the grounds of the tradition, there can be no

question that the writer of the Apocalypse speaks of himself as a

partaker in the tribulation.'

[363] Gsell, R�gne de 1'Enap�reur Domilien, pp. 13-14.

[364] Suetonius, Vespasian, 8, 10.

[365] Gsell, 17-18. C.I.L. vi. 1984. In the ten years from 70 to 79,

Vespasian filled the office of [ordinary] consul nine times, Titus

seven times, Domitian once. Domitian was consul suffectus five times

during the same period. In 80 Titus and Domitian were consuls. For

complete list see Bouche-Leclerc, Institutions Rornaines, p. 603. For

Nerva and his father and grandfather, see Profumo, Le fonte ed i tempi

dello Incendio Neroniano, p. 511 ff. Pauly, Real-Encyclop�die, under

Cocceius.

[366] Rev. xi. 1, 2. See Daniel, vii. 25, three and a half years or 42

months. It is the time of the duration of the Fourth Kingdom or Roman

Empire.

[367] Rev. xiii. 1. At a short distance from Patmos the island of Thera

or the Wild Beast rises out of the sea.

[368] Rev. xiii. 18. Irenaeus, cont. Haer. v. 30. C. 11 gives the

reading 616. In Philostratus, Apollonius of Tyana, Apollonius is

represented as saying on his arrival at Rome--In my travels, which have

been wider than ever man yet accomplished, I have seen many, many wild

beasts of Arabia and India; but this beast, which is commonly called a

Tyrant, I know not how many heads it has, nor if it be crooked of claw,

and armed with horrible fangs. However they say it is a civil beast and

inhabits the midst of cities; but to this extent it is more savage than

the beasts of mountain and of forest, that whereas lions and panthers

can sometimes by flattery be tarried and change their disposition,

stroking and petting this beast does but instigate it to surpass itself

in ferocity and devour at large. And of wild beasts you cannot say that

they were ever known to eat their own mothers, but Nero has gorged

himself on this diet.'--Phillimore's tr. vol. ii. p. 38.

[369] Henderson's Life and Principate of Nero, p. 440. Tac. Hist. ii.

8: vario super exitu eius rumore eoque pluribus vivere eum fingentibus

credentibusque.' Sueton. Nero, 57: edicta quasi viventis et brevi magno

inimicorum malo reversuri.' The pretender of 69 A.D., driven by stress

of weather to the island of Cythnus, was taken by Calpurnius Asprenas,

Governor of Galatia, and put to death. Tac. Hist. ii. 8, 9. Dion

Cassius, lxiv. 9; also Tac. Hist. i. 2: mota prope etiam Parthorum arma

falsi Neronis ludibrio.'

[370] Sibylline Oracles, v. 143-147, 361-373. This portion of the

Sibylline Oracles was written 71-74 A.D.: so Bousset, Zahn and Charles.

Pheuxetai ek Babulonos [Rome] anax phoberos kai anaides

hon pantes stugeousi brotoi kai photes aristoi;

olese gar pollous kai gasteri cheiras epheken. 143-5.

\* ? \* ? \* ? \* ? \* ? \* ? \* ? \*

hexei d' ek peraton gaies metroktonos aner

hos pasan gaian kathelei kai panta kratesei. 363-4.

See also iv. 119-122, 137-139; this part of the Sibylline Oracles is

dated about 80 A.D. See also Ascension of Isaiah, iv. 2-4. It is of

importance to notice, says Dr. Charles in his note on this passage,

that the persecution under Nero is the only one known to the writer (p.

25).

[371] Rev. xi. 7: And when they shall have finished their testimony the

beast that cometh up out of the abyss shall make war with them, and

overcome them, and kill them.' Dr. Charles in the Introduction to the

Ascension of Isaiah (p. lxiv) makes the following comment on this

passage: The antichrist in this instance makes his advent in Jerusalem

(see v. 8), therefore before 70 A.D.'

[372] Rev. xix. 20.

[373] Rev. xvi. 14-16, xx. 8.

[374] Henderson, Civil War in the Roman Empire, pp. 21-35, 128-144.

[375] Renan, L'Ant�christ, pp. 327-329.

[376] Tac. Ann. xiv. 13, 27; Suet. Nero, 20; Philostratus, Apollonius,

vi. 38, 41; Seneca, Quaest. Nat. vi. 1: Mundus ipse concutitur . . .

consternatio omnium'; Sibyll. orac. iii. 471 ff.

[377] Tac. Ann. xvi. 13; Suet. Nero, 39.

[378] Tac. Ann. xv. 47; Hist. i. 18, 86; Dion Cassius, lxiii. 26.

[379] Suet. Nero, 45; Sibyll. Orac. iii. 475 ff.

[380] Tac. Hist. i. 86; Plutarch, Otho, 4.

[381] Rev. vi. 12-17, viii. 5-9, xvi. 3, 18, 20, 21.

[382] See Pauly, Real-Encyclop�die under Thera.' The name of the island

described by Strabo as thrown up was Hiera, now Nea Kaumeni; that

thrown up in 46 A.D. Theia, now Mikra Kaumeni. Seneca, Nat. Quaest. vi.

21; Dion Cassius, lx. 29; Orosius, vii. 6. The modern name of Thera is

Santorin (a corruption of St. Irene), see Encyclopaedia Britannica (ed.

1911) under Santorini'
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LECTURE VII

1 Cor. i. l0: Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord

Jesus Christ that ye all speak the same thing, that there be no

divisions among you.'

Before proceeding to the consideration of that earliest official

document of the Roman Church commonly known as the First Epistle of

Clement to the Corinthians,' some reference should be made to the order

of the episcopal succession in that Church. It is only necessary to

touch upon it briefly here, for it has been treated so fully and

thoroughly by many writers that it appears sufficient to state the

conclusion arrived at and generally accepted, viz. that the order of

names is that given by Irenaeus, Linus, Anencletus or Cletus, Clemens,

and that the traditional terms assigned to their episcopates, Linus

twelve years, Anencletus twelve years, and Clemens nine years, are

approximately correct. If Linus became bishop in 68 A.D. this would

make the close of the episcopate of Clemens to coincide with the first

year of the second century. [383]

As to the exact character of the office that they held, and of the

organisation of the Church during these decades, there has been much

difference of opinion, and from lack of the necessary material to clear

up doubtful points such difference of opinion will probably always

continue to exist. The constitution of the Mother Church of Jerusalem

after 42 A.D. seems to have followed strictly the Jewish model, James

and the elders or presbyters corresponding to the High Priest and the

Sanhedrin. [384] The position of James was undoubtedly monarchical, but

there is no strict analogy between his position and that of the

Christian bishop of the time of Ignatius. James's position was

exceptional. His authority, derived at once from near relationship to

the Lord and from his own lofty personal character, placed him on a

level with the acknowledged leaders of the Twelve. He ranked with Peter

and John, as one of the pillars of the Church. [385] But just as the

earliest local organisation of the Church at Jerusalem followed the

Jewish model that was at its side, so did that of the Christian

communities which sprang into being among the Diaspora. There is no

hint given that the presbyters that were ordained in every city were

officials of a type unknown to the Synagogue. [386] Each Christian

ecclesia like each Jewish synagogue had its presbyters, and in large

cities, like Rome, as there were a number of distinct synagogues, so

there were several distinct Christian congregations or Churches, such

as the Church in the house of Aquila and Prisca. In so far as there was

a new departure, it lay in the fact that the Christian presbyter was a

spiritual as well as an administrative official. Little as we are told

in the New Testament on the subject, the picture drawn in the

Apocalypse of the four and twenty presbyters seated round the throne of

God and taking the leading part in the worship of Heaven seems to place

this beyond reasonable question.

But though the original model of Christian organisation was the

Synagogue, more and more as the Gentile element increased and became

predominant would the separate congregations or ecclesiae gradually

acquire Gentile characteristics, derived from the constitution of the

various associations for religious cults and other purposes, known as

collegia, sodalitates, th i a s o i or e r a n o i , which, with the

licence or at least the connivance of the state, were to be found in

every part of the empire. [387] The choice, for instance, by the early

Christians of the word ecclesia in preference to synagoge was probably

deliberate. Both words are used in the LXX, ecclesia as the translation

of the Hebrew Qatal signifying a religious assembly, synagoge as that

of the Hebrew word edhah, a general assembly of the whole people. The

adoption of the term ecclesia, says Harnack, was the happiest stroke

which the primitive (Christian) community accomplished in the way of

descriptive titles.' [388] Its choice was at once distinctive and would

have familiar associations to Gentile ears.

So, too, with the term episcopus. This word in the sense of overseer'

occurs many times in the LXX, and its ecclesiastical use was probably

suggested by familiarity with certain passages in this Greek version of

the Old Testament, which was the only Scriptures with which the vast

majority of the early Christians were acquainted. [389] But again it

must not be forgotten that the name would be the more readily adopted

by Greek-speaking Christians of Gentile origin, since it was already

well known as the title of officials engaged in secular duties, as

Overseers or Superintendents. When it first passed into Christian use

is unknown, but its earliest appearance is in the remarkable words

addressed by St. Paul to the presbyters of the Ephesian Church, whom he

had summoned to meet him at Miletus as he was journeying to Jerusalem

in 57 A.D. Take heed to yourselves and to all the flock in which the

Holy Spirit set you as overseers (episkopous) to shepherd (poimainein)

the Church of God, which He purchased with His Blood.' [390] Here we

find certain presbyters described as overseers' and their special

function as that of shepherding or tending the flock, implying that in

the local organisation of the Church their duty was not only that of

government, guidance, and discipline, but of the provision of spiritual

food. Again in the Epistle to the Philippians St. Paul salutes the

saints in Christ Jesus with the overseers and deacons.' Turning to the

Pastoral Epistles we have the qualifications set forth carefully, which

should guide Timothy and Titus in their choice of persons fit for the

Church's official ministry. [391] From these instructions two facts

seem to come out clearly: that while all episcopi were presbyters, only

a limited number of the presbyters were episcopi. In other words these

titles cannot be used convertibly. An episcopus, or presbyter-bishop if

one may so style him, differed from the ordinary presbyter in that he

had certain superadded duties of oversight and superintendence such as

were connoted by his name. There is a spiritual side to his office: he

must be apt to teach,' able to exhort in the sound doctrine and to

convict the gainsayers'; and a business or administrative side: he must

be blameless, as God's steward.' [392] The language of St. Peter, Ye

were as sheep going astray but are now returned to the Shepherd and

Bishop of your souls,' [393] while it seems to point to an equivalence

of the two terms Shepherd and Bishop--pastor and episcopus--no less

significantly marks out the sphere of duty--as the pastorate of souls.

That it was possible to be a presbyter without having a specific local

charge, just in the same way as in modern days there are priests

without cure of souls, seems to be conveyed in another passage of this

epistle, where St. Peter addresses the presbyters, as their fellow

presbyter, exactly as St. John at a later date styled himself simply

the presbyter ' in the opening salutation of his second and third

Epistles, and indeed it was as John the Presbyter that he was best

known in his old age. [394] Certainly neither Peter nor John was a

local official. The whole passage runs as follows: the presbyters

therefore among you I exhort who am your fellow-presbyter . . . tend

(shepherd) the flock of God which is among you, exercising the

oversight (acting as episcopi) not of constraint but willingly like

God; nor yet for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; neither as lording

it over your allotted charges, [395] but making yourselves ensamples to

the flock.' The presbyters therefore who were addressed were

presbyter-bishops, and it may be gathered they had each of them a

separate cure, over which they had independent spiritual rule, and

moreover that they received stipends, otherwise it would not have been

necessary to warn them against the danger of seeking after filthy

lucre. It will be at once seen how appropriate is the name of rulers'

which is applied to these officers of the Church in the Epistle to the

Hebrews. The exhortation obey your rulers and submit to them; for they

watch in behalf of your souls, as they that shall give account' [396]

at once emphasises the authority which, as we have seen, these

presbyter-bishops exercised, and likewise defines the double sphere of

their jurisdiction and the two aspects of their office, as at once

shepherds of souls' and God's stewards.'

Thus after the martyrdom of the Apostles Peter and Paul such evidence

as we possess points to the government of the Church in Rome passing

into the hands of that inner committee of the presbyterate consisting

of those who had spiritual charge of the several congregations or

domestic Churches in the capital. At their head we find a president,

either elected or chosen by seniority of office, bearing the title of

The Bishop, but at first differing in no way from the other

presbyter-bishops except in precedence, as primus inter pares.

The analogy between the earliest Christian organisation and that of the

Synagogue has already been pointed out. The presbyters ordained by the

Apostles from city to city were to a certain extent the Christian

counterparts of the Jewish presbyters, but, as the Christian Church had

no Temple and no priestly caste entrusted with the conduct of

sacrificial worship, the Christian presbyter differed from the Jewish

in that his functions were not merely administrative but spiritual and

liturgical. In the same way the government of the Church by a committee

of presbyter-bishops representing the several congregations with a

Bishop-president at their head was analogous to that of cities like

Alexandria, in which the Jewish population was large, where the

government was entrusted to a gerousia or committee of archons

representing the several synagogues, whose president bore the name of

Gerousiarch. [397] The contention of Dr. Hatch in his Bampton Lectures

that the Christian presbyters were purely administrative and judicial

officers is not, as we have shown, borne out by a careful examination

of the scriptural references to their functions, nor is the supposed

evidence of the Didache' to the existence in the latter part of the

first century of a hierarchy of Apostles, Prophets and Teachers, whose

authority was supreme in spiritual matters and to whom the presbyters

and deacons were subordinate, really tenable. Notably to the Prophet a

lofty position is assigned in the Didache,' especially in the conduct

of worship and in the celebration of the Eucharist. [398] The discovery

of this work and its first publication in 1883 has had an immense

influence in moulding the opinions of recent writers on the early

organisation of the Church, particularly those of Harnack, [399] but it

may be asked what proof is there that its picture of first-century

Church life and order is trustworthy? We have indeed the witness of

many passages in the Acts and Epistles to the fact that the prophet

with his peculiar charismatic gift of ecstatic (chiefly eschatological)

utterance occupied a prominent place in the early Christian

communities, but these passages also testify not merely that the

prophet, as such, had no definite place in Church organisation, but

that his influence was intermittent and even spasmodic, and that, at

Corinth for instance, he might be a disturbing factor in the

assemblies, an element, to use St. Paul's words, of confusion rather

than of peace.' [400] The truth is that there are very cogent reasons

for holding the Didache' to be a fourth-century document, whose author

in his presentation of first-century Christianity drew largely upon his

imagination. [401] It is not wise therefore to base any arguments or

theories about the true character of the earliest organisation of the

Church upon a writing whose date is very disputable and whose origin

and sources are unknown.

Leaving therefore the Didaches' on one side let us now try to

supplement the evidence as to the state of the Church in Rome and

elsewhere about 68 A.D. that has been gathered from the canonical books

of the New Testament, evidence that on the face of it is very

incomplete and obscure, by an examination of two works both of them

Roman and at one time regarded as almost canonical, I mean the

(so-called) First Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians' and The

Shepherd of Hermas.' These writings with the Epistles of Ignatius are

first-class authorities, but clearly much depends upon a knowledge of

the date of their first appearance. That of Ignatius' epistles has been

determined within very narrow limits, 107 to 109 A.D. The notice about

Hermas in the Muratorian fragment and the Liberian catalogue is, as I

shall attempt to show later, most probably a blunder. The date of

Clement's Epistle was at one time regarded as uncertain, but since the

publication of Light-foot's great work on the Apostolic Fathers, the

opinion of scholars has become practically unanimous that it was

written at the close of the reign of Domitian, about 96 A.D.; indeed

this date may be regarded as one of the accepted results' of

present-day criticism. I feel therefore how very bold it is on my part

to venture even to hint at a difference of view. I have never however

been able to convince myself that this accepted result' is correct, and

I welcome the opportunity afforded me by these lectures for stating my

reasons for doubting the soundness of the arguments on which it is

based.

Of the authenticity of the anonymous epistle which opens with the words

[402] the Church of God sojourning in Rome to the Church of God

sojourning in Corinth' or of the accuracy of the early, continuous, and

widespread tradition, which assigned the actual authorship to that

Clement who in the earliest lists of the bishops of Rome stands the

third in order from the Apostles, there is absolutely no question.

[403] The patristic evidence is conclusive, and is admitted as such.

But the corollary to this postulate, that because Clement was the

author therefore the epistle was written during the time of his

episcopate, 92 to 101 A.D., does not follow. Nevertheless the

assumption has been made with surprising unanimity, and it has led to

the date at which this letter was sent to Corinth being assigned to the

time when the Church found deliverance from the persecution of Domitian

by that tyrant's assassination. Nay, to such an extent has this

pre-supposition gained possession of the mind even of a writer like

Bishop Lightfoot, so eminently careful and cautious in the handling of

historical evidence, that in his criticism of the chronology of the

early Roman succession, he writes The date of Clement's epistle is

fixed with a fair degree of certainty at 95 or 96 A.D., as it was

written during or immediately after the persecution under Domitian.

This year therefore must fall within the episcopate of Clement.' [404]

But surely this is something like arguing in a circle, for I venture to

say that there does not exist any definite evidence, internal or

external, that the epistle was written during or immediately after the

persecution of Domitian. It will be my object to show that such

evidence as we possess points to a very different conclusion, viz. that

when Clement gave literary expression to the message from the Church in

Rome to the Church in Corinth he was not yet the official head of the

Roman Church, and further that the probable date of the epistle is the

early months of 70 A.D.

It will be necessary to deal with the arguments for and against

seriatim.

The cause of the writing of the epistle was the outbreak of schism and

dissension in the Corinthian Church described by the writer as that

abominable and unholy sedition, foreign and strange to the elect of

God, which a few head-strong and self-willed persons have kindled to

such a pitch of madness, so that your name, once respected and widely

spoken of and worthily beloved of all men, hath been greatly defamed.'

[405] The cause of this sad change is ascribed to jealousy and envy,

and the examples of Cain and Abel, of Jacob and Esau, of Joseph, of

Moses, and of David and Saul are brought forward as warnings of the

evil consequences which indulgence in jealousy and envy produces. The

writer then proceeds: But let us cease to speak of examples of ancient

days, and let us come to those who very recently were athletes [of the

faith]; let us take the illustrious examples of our own time. Through

envy and jealousy the greatest and most righteous pillars were

persecuted and contended even unto death. Let us take before our eyes

the good apostles.' [406] Then follow references to the martyrdoms of

St. Peter and of St. Paul. This epithet good' has exercised the minds

of critics, but there seems to be no doubt that it is the true reading.

Lightfoot remarks Such an epithet may be most naturally explained on

the supposition that Clement is speaking in affectionate remembrance of

those whom he had known personally, otherwise the epithet would be out

of place.' Does not the same comment apply, it may be asked, to the

readers of the Epistle? Peter and Paul were regarded as the founders of

the Corinthian as well as of the Roman Church, and the epithet points

to their memory being still quite fresh. Then in the following chapter

Clement gives a description of the climax of the Neronian persecution;

briefly but with graphic strokes he tells us how to these men of holy

living was gathered together a great multitude of the elect, who having

suffered through jealousy many indignities and tortures became very

splendid examples amongst ourselves. Persecuted through jealousy, women

after having suffered in the guise of Danaids and Dirces terrible and

monstrous outrages attained the goal which made sure to them the race

of faith and those who were weak in body received a noble reward.' If

any one were to read those paragraphs for the first time without any

presuppositions or arri�re-pens�es, would they doubt that they told of

scenes of horror which not only the author but all those in whose name

he wrote had literally before their eyes, and which still haunted the

minds of the witnesses?

Further, if Clement had just passed through the persecution of Domitian

in which so many Christians of illustrious rank suffered, with whom as

bishop he must have had intimate relations, is it conceivable that none

of their examples should have been brought forward, but only those of

an already distant persecution, whose memory more recent events must

have tended to throw into the background? But it is said that Clement

is speaking of what happened under Domitian in the sentence which

follows the opening salutation--by reason of the sudden and successive

troubles and calamities which have befallen us, we consider that we

have been somewhat slow in giving attention to the questions in dispute

among you.' [407] But it may be asked, is it possible to read into

these words so large a reference? The Domitianic persecution, when it

came, must have touched Clement himself and his fellow-Christians at

Rome far too severely and closely for the subject to have been

dismissed thus casually and once for all in the ten opening words of a

sentence containing fifty-nine words? When one considers that according

to the opinion of the critics this Epistle was written almost

immediately after the death of Domitian the Persecutor, it seems mere

trifling to suppose that the deep sorrow and keen sense of bereavement

that must have been filling the Roman Church at the sad fate of so many

of its foremost members could not have found here or elsewhere in this

lengthy letter more fitting expression. But if the date of the document

be, as I hold that it is, the early months of 70 A.D., then the

reference to the sudden and successive troubles and calamities, which

have befallen us' receives a natural explanation, one written large in

the historical records of the time, [408] and a mere allusion to which

would be sufficient to account to the Corinthians for the delay of the

Roman Church in dealing with the questions on which its advice had been

sought. [409] In the whole course of its long and chequered history the

city of Rome has never experienced so many sudden and successive

troubles and calamities' as befell it in the course of the year 69

A.D., and the brief reference to them by the writer of this Epistle is

seen to be as aptly as it is tersely phrased.

The internal evidence of the Epistle is in many important respects

strongly in favour of the early date. In the organisation of the Church

only bishops and deacons' are mentioned, exactly as they are in St.

Paul's Epistle to the Philippians, while the title bishop' is to the

same extent inter-changeable with that of presbyter' as it is in the

Acts and the Pauline epistles, and the word rulers' has the same sense

as in the Epistle to the Hebrews. [410] The Apostles derive their

authority directly from Jesus Christ, the presbyter-bishops and deacons

from the Apostles, who are described as having gone through town and

country preaching the good tidings that the kingdom of God was about to

come. [411] All this is thoroughly primitive. It is too the mark of a

very early date that while Clement three times speaks of the Lord Jesus

as child or servant of God'--pais Theou--only once is the word

son--huios--used, and that in a quotation from the second Psalm taken

direct from the Epistle to the Hebrews. [412] Again as to Clement's

references to the canonical writings of the New Testament, Dr.

Lightfoot, though on other grounds he supports the late date for this

Epistle, writes thus--one important test of date in early Christian

writings lies in the Biblical quotations--both the form and the

substance. Now the quotations from the Gospels in this letter exhibit a

very early type. They are not verbal; they are fused; and they are not

prefaced by "It is written" (gegraptai) or "The Scripture saith" (he

graphe legei) or the like, but a more archaic form of citation is used,

"The Lord spake" (ho Kurios eipen) or some similar expression.' [413] A

very considerable admission. On the other hand the abundant use that is

made of the Pauline epistles, especially Romans and 1 Corinthians, of 1

Peter, and more than any other of the Epistle to the Hebrews, is very

natural in one who was the disciple and companion of St. Peter and St.

Paul, and whose conversion tradition assigns to St. Barnabas. [414]

It is difficult to see how the evidential value of c. xli. can be

explained away. It is so important as a witness for the early date that

it must be given in full. Let each of you, brethren, in his own order

give thanks [415] [at the Eucharist], keeping a good conscience without

passing beyond the appointed rule of his service [416] with reverence.

Not in every place, brethren, are the perpetual daily [417] sacrifices

offered, or the free-will offerings or the sin offerings and the

trespass offerings, but in Jerusalem alone, and there not in every

place is it offered, but before the sanctuary in the altar-court; after

the victim which is being offered has been inspected for blemishes by

the high priest and the aforesaid ministry. They then who do anything

contrary to the seemly order of His [God's] will have death as their

punishment. Ye see, brethren, how in proportion as we have been deemed

worthy of fuller knowledge, so much the greater is the danger to which

we are exposed.' Those who cling to the Domitianic date for this

Epistle are driven to strange shifts to find any plausible argument for

denying to this passage its obvious sense, that at the time when it was

written the Temple at Jerusalem was still standing, and the daily

sacrifice had not ceased. Lightfoot and others bring forward Josephus'

account of the Mosaic sacrifices (Ant.' iii. cc. 9, 10) written in 93

A.D., in which the historic present is freely used. But as Hefele [418]

pointed out some years ago, there is a wide distinction between the two

cases. Josephus, in describing a ritual system that had passed away,

employs a well-known artifice of the historian in order to lend

vividness to his narrative. Clement on the other hand brings before the

eyes of his readers the fixed order of the Jewish worship with the

purpose of showing to them that the maintenance of such order was a

Divine institution. But if the Temple had been destroyed and that order

of worship had been violently brought to an end, would not his whole

argument fall to the ground and his opponents be able to retort that

the complete disappearance of the Jewish sanctuary, its official

hierarchy and ordered ritual was a proof that such a system no longer

could claim the divine sanction?

Once more as to the dissensions at Corinth, little is told as to their

cause and character, except that the action of certain headstrong and

reckless persons' had led to some of the duly constituted presbyters

being expelled from their office, and that the ringleaders were few in

number. [419] Perhaps the example held up before the authors of the

discussion of the hierarchical order of the Mosaic cult at Jerusalem

may point to these headstrong persons' being Judaeo-Christians, who had

strong opinions about the absolute equality of all members of the

Christian community, or possibly without going so far as to object to

the existence of the office of presbyter they may have protested

against the appointment of uncircumcised Gentiles to this office.

Moreover, while we have no information to throw light upon the state of

Corinth at the end of Domitian's reign, that town had been the scene of

stirring events and activities some thirty years earlier. In the autumn

of 66 A.D. Nero went to Greece. In November 67 A.D. he witnessed at

Corinth the Isthmian games, and in that city conferred freedom upon

Achaia, a privilege which was not revoked until six years later by

Vespasian, because of the disorders that broke out. What is even more

important, Nero at this time seriously set about the formidable

engineering task of cutting a navigable canal through the Isthmus.

[420] For this purpose no fewer than 6000 Jewish prisoners, captured by

Vespasian in a battle at Tiberias on the Sea of Galilee, were sent by

that general to Corinth to carry out the excavations, [421] and at the

time of Nero's death a considerable part of the work had been

completed. It was, however, then abandoned, with the result that a very

large body of fanatical Jewish Zealots must have remained at Corinth as

slaves or freedmen, their fierce patriotism still glowing unquenched by

defeat and bondage. Here then in 69 A.D. were present all the elements

for fomenting such an out-break of strife and discord as actually took

place.

Or take the well-known reference to the story of the Phoenix, [422] and

the analogy that it offers to the Resurrection. In recounting this

legend Clement was no more credulous than his contemporaries, one of

whom, Pliny the Elder, tells us in his Natural History' that a phoenix

was brought to Rome in the censorship of the Emperor Claudius (47 A.D.)

and that it was exposed to public view in the Comitia,' adding this

fact is attested by the public annals.' [423] Now Clement, as a boy,

may have actually seen this publicly exhibited wonder, and the vivid

impression made on the youthful imagination here finds expression some

twenty-two years later. It is just one of those little touches that

give added life to the narrative and connect the personality of the

writer with the events of his time. It is to be noted that Clement does

not hint at there being anything of a miraculous character in the

resurrection of the Phoenix, he speaks of it as a fact of natural

history.

Let us now turn our attention to the passages on which the advocates of

a late date have chiefly relied. The beginning of chapter xliv. runs

thus: Our Apostles also knew through our Lord Jesus Christ, that there

would be strife about the dignity of the bishop's office. [424] For

this reason then having received perfect foreknowledge they appointed

the aforesaid [bishops and deacons] and then they further laid down

regulations [425] that if they [any of these bishops and deacons]

should fall asleep, other tried men should succeed to their ministry.

Those then who were appointed by them or afterwards by other men of

repute with the approval of the whole Church, and have ministered

unblameably to the flock of Christ in all humility, peaceably and

without arrogance [426] and who have for many years received high

testimony from all [427] --we do not consider it just that these men

should be ejected from their ministration.' Here the words our

Apostles' clearly signify St. Peter and St. Paul, held to be the joint

founders of both the Churches of Rome and Corinth. The careful advice

and warnings addressed by both these Apostles to the presbyter-bishops

in their extant writings are a proof of the truth of Clement's

assertion as to their having pre-vision about the difficulties which

might arise in the future concerning the authority and position of

these rulers' of the Church. But it does not follow, because the

Apostles laid down regulations for the filling up of these offices,

whenever they became vacant by death, or because, at the time when

Clement was writing, some of the holders of these offices had been

appointed by the Apostles, others by the choice of the presbytery with

the consent of the Church, or because among these were men who for many

years had been honoured and respected by all, that there-fore the

Epistle was written some decades after the Apostle's martyrdom. Those

who use this argument overlook the possibility that the first

presbyters of the Roman Church were appointed by St. Peter about 44 or

45 A.D., and those of Corinth by St. Paul about 51 or 52 A.D. Most of

these would be literally elders'--men well advanced in years when first

they took office--and in the interval between these dates and 70 A.D.

there must have been many vacancies by death and fresh appointments,

some directly by the Apostles, others in their absence by the Churches

in the manner ordained by Apostolical authority.

Again in chapter xlvii., after condemning in the strongest terms the

strifes, parties, and divisions which were tearing to pieces the

Corinthian Church, Clement continues: Take up the epistle of the

blessed Paul the Apostle. What was it that he first wrote to you in the

beginning (en arche) of the Gospel? In truth under the inspiration of

the Spirit he sent you a letter concerning himself and Cephas and

Apollos, because that even then you had given way to party spirit.'

Clement then proceeds to compare the apostles of renown, the great

leaders of those days (just mentioned), with the present instigators of

schism and dissension, and he denounces their conduct in the words It

is shameful, beloved, very shameful and unworthy of Christian conduct

that it should be reported that the very steadfast and primitive

(archaian) Church of Corinth should by one or two persons have been

induced to rebel against its presbyters.' Now far too much stress has

been laid by the up-holders of the Domitianic hypothesis upon this word

apxaiav as signifying ancient,' and it is said that such a description

could not have been given of a Church only twenty years old. But is it

not evident that the word apxaia was suggested by the previous word

apxrj, and that it means no more than that the foundation of the Church

at Corinth took place in the earliest days of the preaching of the

Gospel in Europe? [428]

The following particulars concerning the envoys who were the bearers of

this epistle to Corinth have been held to necessitate a late date. We

have sent faithful and discreet men who have passed their lives

blamelessly in our midst from youth to old age.' And again send back to

us quickly in peace and with joy our envoys Claudius Ephebus and

Valerius Bito together with Fortunatus also.' [429] Now the conjecture

of Lightfoot that the names of Claudius Ephebus and Valerius Bito point

to their being freedmen of the Imperial household at the time when

Messalina was Empress is probably correct. [430] But if they received

their manumission about 45 A.D., they may well have been from

thirty-five to forty years of age at that date, and so more than sixty

in 70 A.D. As there is reason to believe that Christianity was first

brought to Rome shortly after the death of St. Stephen, and as St.

Peter's first visit took place at the very time when Messalina was at

the height of her power, there is no difficulty in giving these two men

a place among the very first converts to the faith. Fortunatus is

separately mentioned, and we may infer that he was not a Roman envoy

but a Corinthian, and if a Corinthian, then although the name is not

uncommon, his identification with the Fortunatus mentioned by St. Paul

in his First Epistle to the Corinthians is more than a possibility.

[431] It is, however, extremely unlikely that the Fortunatus whose

coming to Ephesus refreshed St. Paul in 54 A.D., was still active and

travelling to and fro as an emissary between his native town and Rome

in 96 A.D., more than forty years later.

The assumption so commonly made that the Epistle, the actual authorship

of which by universal consent is attributed to Clement, the third in

order of succession of the Roman bishops, must have been written during

the period of his episcopate, 92 to 101 A.D., has in fact really no

justification. There are very strong arguments (besides those already

brought forward) to be urged against it, both negative and positive.

The Epistle is written in the name of the Church of Rome, and is

throughout anonymous. From the first line to the last there is not a

single phrase which hints at the individuality of the writer or gives

any indication that he was a man of mark and authority, the personal

pronouns used are always we' and us.' Now such self-effacement would be

perhaps natural in the young Clement of 70 A.D. It is quite in

accordance with what Epiphanius tells us (quoting apparently the lost

memoirs of Hegesippus) about his voluntary refusal to accept the post

of presiding-bishop after the death of the Apostles, [432] lest he

should cause strife and division,' and of his withdrawal in favour of

his seniors, first of Linus, then of Anencletus. But tradition asserts

with no uncertain voice that Clement held a place apart in the Roman

Church as the first century began to draw to its close. It was not his

Epistle to the Corinthians' which gave him fame, and which caused a

plentiful crop of legends to grow up around his name, but his

distinction first as being a personal disciple of St. Peter, by whom he

was ordained to the presbyterate, and also a fellow-worker with St.

Paul, and secondly from the high social position and family connexion

which tradition assigns to him, a tradition which I believe to be in

substance correct. [433] The Clement, then, who became bishop in 92

A.D. was an Apostolical man of exceptional authority, whose personality

would not lend itself to concealment. If he wrote the Epistle in 96

A.D., his name would give added weight to the advice of the Church over

which he presided. Moreover are there not strong grounds for holding

that during the quarter of a century of Flavian rule, at Rome and

elsewhere, the office of bishop had been growing in importance and

respect and dignity, and was gradually becoming monarchical in

character? Can any unprejudiced person read the language of Ignatius

without perceiving that the primitive organisation of the Roman and

Corinthian Churches, as depicted in Clement's Epistle, could not have

still subsisted unchanged until 96 A.D.? Ignatius, remember, was a

contemporary of Clement, his letters were written not more than seven

or eight years after Clement's death, and in these letters the

authoritative and autocratic position of the bishop is set forth again

and again in terms that admit of no qualification. Let no man do aught

pertaining to the Church apart from the bishop'--it is not lawful apart

from the bishop either to baptise or hold an Agape'--whenever you are

subject to the bishop, you appear to me not to be living the ordinary

life of men, but after the manner of the life of Jesus Christ.' It is

quite clear that in such statements as these Ignatius is not speaking

of any new thing. With him the office of bishop is of the very esse and

not merely of the bene esse of the Church. Without the three orders of

bishop, presbyters, and deacons there is' he declares no Church

deserving of the name.' In another passage he speaks of the bishops

established in the furthest quarters as being in the mind of Jesus

Christ as Jesus Christ is the Mind of the Father' and of the presbytery

that is worthy of God being fitted to the bishop as the strings to a

harp.' [434] These words preclude any mere local reference, and when

one considers how close was the intercourse between Antioch and Rome,

it will be seen how extremely difficult it would be to conceive of the

Great Roman Community, for which Ignatius himself expresses the utmost

veneration, [435] as not possessing that qualification without which it

would not be deserving the name of a Church.' In other words in the

year 96 A.D. the organisation of the Roman Church was not that which we

find in Clement's Epistle, nor was the position which Clement with his

antecedents must at that date have held consistent with the entire

absence of the personal note in the letter which he wrote to Corinth.

The case in fact against this Epistle having been written by Clement

during his episcopate is very strong. It only remains to draw attention

to two pieces of documentary evidence, both of which indirectly confirm

the conclusion at which we have arrived. In a passage from the letter

of Dionysius, bishop of Corinth, to Soter, bishop of Rome, which has

been preserved to us by Eusebius, the words occur to-day we have spent

the Lord's Holy Day, in which we have read your epistle; reading which

we shall at all times receive admonishment, as also [is the case] with

the former epistle written to us by Clement.' [436] Dr. Bigg in the

introduction to his Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Peter

compares the Greek words here used hemin dia Klementos grapheisan with

those of St. Peter: I have written to you by Silvanus'--dia Silouanou

humin egrapsa, and he holds that the two passages must be understood in

the same way, and he says that Dionysius's words mean clearly that

Clement was the mouthpiece or interpreter of the Church of Rome.' [437]

This implies that Clement, though no doubt a leading official, was in

putting into literary form and with a free hand the general

instructions he had received, only the servant, not the head of the

Church acting on his own initiative.

The evidence of Hermas has a double interest from the light that it

throws both on the date of The Shepherd' and upon the position of

Clement. With the date of The Shepherd' I shall deal in the next

lecture. I will merely state here that my contention will be that that

part of Hermas' work known as The Visions' and possibly the whole of it

was written in the course of the first decade of Domitian's reign. The

reference to Clement occurs at the close of the Second Vision. In the

Vision an old woman, representing the Church, had given to Hermas a

small book containing a revelation, which at her command he had copied

out letter by letter. This done the aged woman again came to him and

asked him if he had already given the book to the presbyters. On his

replying that he had not, the aged woman said--I quote the exact

words--Thou hast done well, for I have words to add. When then I shall

have finished all the words, by thee it shall be made known to all the

elect. Thou shalt therefore write two little books and shalt send them

to Clement and to Grapte. Clement will then send to the cities that are

without, for to him this [charge] has been entrusted; and Grapte will

admonish the widows and the orphans. But thou shalt read [the words]

unto this city before the presbyters, who preside over the Church.'

[438]

This passage has been variously interpreted, but it is allowed by the

great majority of critics that it contains a definite historical

allusion to Clement, the author of the Epistle from the Roman Church to

the Corinthians, and the comment of Lightfoot is perfectly just--the

allusion in Hermas seems to be an obvious recognition of the existence

of this letter. . . . Clement is represented as the writer's

contemporary, who held a high office, which constituted him, as we

might say, foreign secretary of the Roman Church.' [439] Precisely. But

such a description surely implies that at the time Clement was

occupying what can only be described as a subordinate position, since

he was charged with secretarial duties entrusted to him by others. The

particular charge was one that might very well be assigned to a younger

member of the presbyterate distinguished among his colleagues for wider

culture and greater familiarity with literary Greek. The mere fact that

his name is here coupled with that of Grapte, apparently a deaconess,

is of itself a proof that the Clement of Hermas' second Vision had not

yet become at the close of a long and honoured career the venerated

bishop of 96 A.D.

Nothing is known of Grapte outside of this reference, and some critics

have supposed that the name was not that of a real woman, but is used

here allegorically. But if so, then is it not reasonable to suppose

that the whole passage is allegorical, not historical? If Grapte be a

mere creature of Hermas' imagination, why not Clement? But those who

seek in this way to evade the difficulties attending this passage,

which is so important for fixing the dates both of Clement's Epistle

and of The Shepherd,' have really no justification for taking refuge in

allegory. The names Graptus and Grapte though rare are both of them to

be found in contemporary inscriptions. One of these inscriptions is

particularly interesting, [440] as it brings into collocation the names

of Clemens and Graptus. It tells how a certain Julius Graptus adorned a

mausoleum with plantations in the year when M. Arrecinus Clemens was

consul for the second time, in other words in the year 93 A.D. Another

inscription, [441] a fragment, contains the words Grapte uxor. This

Julius Graptus and Grapte the deaconess may well have been the children

of Nero's freedman Graptus, described by Tacitus as active in his

master's service in the year 59. Arrecinus Clemens was a near relation

of the imperial Flavians; if he were at the same time an elder brother

of Clement the bishop, then at once the mystery of the high family

connexion which the Clementine romances have woven around the name of

the bishop disappears and becomes explicable. That such a relationship

existed is no mere random suggestion. It is one which, as I shall

endeavour to show elsewhere, is well deserving of careful examination.

[442]
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[383] Lightfoot, Apost. Fathers, part i. vol. i. pp. 63- 7, 79- 81. The

whole subject is exhaustively discussed and examined in his Excursus

No. 5, pp. 201- 345, on the Early Roman Succession,'see supra, pp. 70,

71; and p. 84, note 3.

[384] Harnack, Constitution and Law of the Church, p. 34.

[385] Gal. ii. 9; also i. 19, and ii. 12.

[386] Hort, Christiana Ecclesia, pp. 62-3; Lightfoot, Philippians, pp.

191-2.

[387] Hardy, Studies in Roman History, Christianity and the Collegia,'

pp. 129-43.

[388] Sch�rer, Hist. of the Jewish People, 2 Div., vol. ii. pp. 59 ff.;

Harnack, Const. and Law, pp. 15-6; Hort, Christ. Eccl. pp. 3-18.

[389] Such passages as Ps. cviii. (cix.), quoted by St. Peter, Acts, i.

20, and Ezekiel, xxxiv. 11, or again Is. lx. 17, as quoted by Clement

of Rome, xlii. 5: katasteso tous episkopous auton en dikaiosune kai

tous diakonous auton en pistei.

[390] Acts, xx. 28. See Hort, Christ. Eccl. pp. 97-104; Harnack, Const.

and Law, p. 53. Among the numerous works on the subject of the early

organisation of the Christian Church are the following: Hatch's

well-known and most important Bampton Lectures of 1881; also his

Hibbert Lectures of 1888, The Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages upon

the Christian Church' [edited by Dr. Fairhairn and published 1907];

Sohm, Kirchenrecht, 1892; Michiel, Les Origines de l'�piscopat, 1900;

Knopf, Das Nachapostolische Zeitalter, 1906; Batiffol, L'Eglise

naissante et le Catholicisme, 1909; Gwatkin (articles in Hastings's

Dictionary) Bishops,' Church Government,' &c.

[391] Comp. 1 Tim. iii. 2 with v. 17 and Titus, i. 7.

[392] 1 Tim. iii. 2; Titus, i. 7, 9: dei gar ton episkoton anenkleton

einai, hos Theou oikonomon.

[393] The words of St. Peter deserve careful consideration. In 1 Peter

ii. 25 the Apostle writes: Ete gar hos probata planomenoi; all'

epestraphete nun epi ton poimena kai episkopon ton psuchon humon. The

Shepherd here, whose office is described by the additional term

episkopos (note there is only one article), being the Good Shepherd

Himself, the Lord Jesus Christ, of Whom all earthly poimenes kai

episkopoi were the delegates and representatives. Can it be doubted

that the Apostle had here in his mind his Master's commission so

emphatically and lovingly repeated Poimaine ta probata mou--boske ta

probatia mou? A very interesting passage is that at the opening of the

fifth chapter of this same First Epistle of St. Peter, vv. 1, 2:

Presbuterous oun en humin parakalo ho sumpresbuteros . . . poimanate to

en humin poimnion tou Theou [Comp. Acts, xx. 28] ep9iskopountes. This

last word is not found in Aleph and B, possibly omitted for

ecclesiastical reasons. Consult the excellent notes of Bigg's

commentary on ii. 23 and v. 1, 2 (Int. Crit. Commentary Series), pp.

119-50, 182-8.

[394] 2 John, v. 1; 3 John, v. 1. For the identity of John the son of

Zebedee, the Apostle, with John the Presbyter--see Chapman's John the

Presbyter. This writer's arguments go to the very root of the question.

[395] med' hos katakurieuontes ton kleron. The word kleron is

ambiguous, but its most natural interpretation is that of separate

allotted charges or cures, otherwise the expression katakurieuontes

would be unmeaning. Dr. Bigg (Commentary on 1 Peter, p. 189) remarks

that St. Paul warns the presbyter-bishop that he is to be no striker'

(1 Tim. iii. 3; Tit. i. 7) and that this implies that discipline in a

congregation, many of whom were converted slaves, might be roughly

administered.

[396] Heb. xiii. 17; also xiii. 7 and 24. Twice in Clement (1 Cor. i. 3

and xxi. 6) are the hegoumenoi and the presbuteroi distinguished from

one another, i.e. there was an inner committee of presbyter-bishops.

[397] The analogy is made the more complete by the fact that the Greek

title archon was the equivalent of a Hebrew word signifying shepherd.'

see Sch�rer, Hist. of the Jewish People, 2 Div., vol. ii. pp. 59ff,

247ff. In the inscriptions in the Jewish cemeteries at Rome the titles

archon' and gerousiarch' are frequent. Presbyter' has according to

Sch�rer never been found.

[398] Didache, x. 7, xiii. 3, xv. 1, 2.

[399] Harnack, Expansion of Christianity, vol. i. pp. 407 ff.;

Constitution and Law of the Church, p. 78 ff.; Die Lehre der Zw�lf

Apostel [Texte and Untersuchungen, ii. 1, 2, pp. 193-241]; Chronologie,

pp. 428-38.

[400] See especially 1 Cor. xiv. passim, also xii. 28, 29; and Eph. ii.

20, iii. 5, iv. 11. The passages which the author of the Didache had

chiefly in his mind were no doubt 1 Cor. xii. 28, where St. Paul writes

God hath set some in the Church, first apostles, secondly prophets,

thirdly teachers,' and Eph. iv. 11: He gave some apostles, and some

prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers' Hort

remarks (Christian Ecclesia, pp. 157-61) much profitless labour has

been spent on trying to force the various terms used into meaning so

many different ecclesiastical offices. Not only is the feat impossible,

but the attempt carries us away from St. Paul's purpose, which is to

show how many different functions are those which God has assigned to

the different members of a single body . . . ; these passages give us

practically no evidence respecting the formal arrangements of the

ecclesiae of that age; though they tell us much of the forms of

activity that were at work within them.' Dr. Bigg's account of New

Testament prophets and prophecy in his Introduction to 1 Peter, pp.

43-48, is clear and illuminating. He comments on the fact that in 1

Peter there is no allusion to Christian prophecy. For the prophets' in

sub-Apostolic times and in the Didache see his introduction to the

Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles, pp. 28-38.

[401] In Dr. Bigg's Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles (Early Church

Classics, S.P.C.K., 1898) just referred to, he gives a series of

reasons for holding this document to have been written early in the

fourth century. More recently in the Journal of Theological Studies,

April 1912, Dean Armitage Robinson announces his adhesion to Dr. Bigg's

view as to a probable late date for the Didache. The author, he argues,

was trying to represent the state of the Church in accordance with what

he thought to be the Apostles' teaching, not as it was in his own days.

His description is not derived from contemporary knowledge. See also an

article in the same journal, October 1911, by Rev. A. S. Duncan Jones,

on The Nature of the Church,' in which the writer cricicises the views

of Harnack and of Sohm on the constitution of the early Church.

[402] he ekklesia tou Theou he paroikousa Rhomen te ekklesia tou Theou

te paroikouse Korinthon.

[403] Eus. Hist. Eccl. iii. 16, 37. The epistle is called by Eusebius

megale, thaumasia, anomologemene para pasin.

[404] Lightfoot, Apost. Fathers, part i. vol. i. p. 342. The italics

are mine. Among the older writers Hefele in his Prolegomena to the

Epistle (1855) writes as to the date tota haec quaestio facillime

posset dissolvi si tempus Clementis episcopatus plane constaret.'

Workman (Persecution in the Early Church, p. 206) writes: As I incline

to a later date for the epistle of St. Clement, I see no reason to

reject the succession of bishops as Linus, Cletus, Clement. . . . The

question of succession is bound up with the date of the Epistle.'

[405] Clement, 1 Cor. i. 1.

[406] Ibid. v. 1: all' hina ton archaion hupodeigmaton pausometha,

elthomen epi tous engista genomenous athletas; labomen tes geneas hemon

ta aennaia hupodeigmata. Lightfoot translates tous engista genomenous

athletas those champions who lived very near to our tune'; Gregg (Early

Church Classics): those great ones, who are nearest to our time';

Hippolyte Hemmer, Cl�ment de Rome (1909): venons en aux athl�tes tout

r�cents.' tes geneas hemon can only mean our own time,' i.e. the time

in which all of us are living, not a period thirty years ago. When John

the Baptist cried 0 generation of vipers,' or our Lord Whereto shall I

liken this generation?' or An adulterous generation seeketh after a

sign,' or St. Peter save yourselves from this untoward generation,'

they were speaking to and of the living men and women they saw around

them, and so does Clement in this passage.

[407] dia tas aiphnidious kai epallelous genomenas hemin sumphoras kai

teriptoseis, adelphoi, bradion nomizomen epistophen pepoiesthai peri

ton epizetoumenon par humin pragmaton.

[408] See Lecture VI, pp. 168-170. Also Tac. Hist. i. 2. Philostratus,

Apollonius of Tyana (ed. Phillimore, ii. p. 58): Galba was killed at

Rome itself after grasping at the Empire; Vitellius was killed after

dreaming of empire; Otho, killed in lower Gaul, was not even buried

with honour, but lies like a common man. And destiny flew through all

this history in one year.'

[409] Unless the advice of the Church at Rome had been sought, there

could have been no reason to excuse delay in attending to the matter.

Zahn, Intr. to N.T. vol. i. p. 269, holds that Fortunatus, who is

mentioned in Clement's Epistle lxv. brought the news of the Corinthian

dissensions to Rome. See also Stahl, Patristische Untersuchungen, 1901.

[410] Clement, 1 Cor. xlii, 4, 5; x1iv. 1. 4, 5; liv. 2; lvii. 1, for

rulers. hegoumenoi i. 3, proegoumenoi xxi. 6.

[411] Ibid. xlii. 2, 3: ho Christos oun apo tou Theou kai hoi apostoloi

apo tou Christou . . . . exelthon (hoi apostoloi) euangelizomenoi ten

basileian tou Theou mellein erchesthai.

[412] Ibid. lx. 2. 3, 4, xxxvi. 4; Heb. i. 5.

[413] Lightfoot, Apost. Fathers, part i. vol. i. p. 353.

[414] Of the four epistles named, 1 Corinthians dealt with a situation

in some respects similar to that described by Clement and in the same

town. Romans and Hebrews were addressed to Rome, and 1 Peter written in

Rome. The use made by Clement of Hebrews strengthens the argument for

its Barnabas authorship.

[415] eucharisteito, perform his act of Eucharistia.

[416] leitourgia , a word transferred to Christian ministerial

services, especially that of the Eucharist, from the LXX. where it

signifies the services' of the priests in their Temple duties.

[417] endelechismon . This word is used in the LXX. to distinguish the

sacrifices that were obligatory every day from those of free will. See

Ex. xxix. 42, xxx. 8; Numbers, xxviii. 6.

[418] Hefele, Patrum Apost. opera (1855), xxxiv.: Sed res utraque,

Iosephi et Clementis, longe dissimilis est. Iosephus, sacros populi sui

ritus describens, per figuram, historicis non inusitatam, praesenti,

quod dicimus, historico utitur. Clemens, autem, ut Corinthos ad ordinem

servandum adducat, lectoribus ordinem Iudaici cultus ante oculos ponit.

Quodsi autem templum iam fuisset destructum, tota S. Patris

argumentatio fuisset infirma, ipsaque adversarios invitasset, ut

dicerent: En, eversione templi Hierosolymitani Deus ipse testatus est,

talem ordinem sibi non esse exoptatum.'

[419] Clement, 1 Cor. i. 47.

[420] Henderson, Life and Principate of Nero, pp. 392 ff., 495 ff.;

Philostratus, Apollonius of Tyana (Bewick), p. 216.

[421] Josephus, Bell. Iud. iv. 10: Out of the young men he chose 6000

of the strongest and sent them to Nero to dig through the isthmus of

Corinth.'

[422] Clement, 1 Cor. xxv.

[423] Pliny, Nat. Hist. x. 3 (Bostock's tr., p. 481); compare Tac. Ann.

vi. 28. Pliny was himself a sceptic--there is no one but doubts it was

a fictitious phoenix only.'

[424] 1 Pet. v. 1-6; 1 Tim. iii. 5-13; Tit. i. 5-11; compare 1 Cor. xi.

18, 19; Rom. xii. 6-8; Eph. iv. 11-12; Heb. xiii. 17.

[425] The reading here epinomen is probably corrupt. The translation of

I. . . . legem dederunt has been adopted.

[426] abanausos , the opposite disposition to those having banausos ,

arrogance, pride; compare 1 Pet. v. 3.

[427] memarturemenous pollois chronois hupo panton

[428] St. Paul (Phil. iv. 15) in his Epistle to the Philippians writes:

and ye yourselves also know, ye Philippians, that in the beginning of

the Gospel (en arche tou euangeliou ), when I departed from Macedonia,

no church had fellowship with me in the matter of giving and receiving,

but ye only.' And in his Second Epistle to the Corinthians (xi. 9):

when I was present with you and in want, I was not a burden on any man;

for the brethren when they came from Macedonia supplied the measure of

my want.' We thus see that St. Paul himself applies the expression en

arche tou euangeliou to his first visit to Corinth. Compare St. Luke,

i. 2 hoi ap' arches autoptai.

[429] Clement, 1 Cor. lxiii. and lxv.

[430] Lightfoot, Apost. Fathers, part i. vol. i. p. 27 ff.

[431] tous de apestalmenous aph' hemon Klaudion Ephebon kai Oualerion

Bitona sun kai Phortounato. The words sun kai place Fortunatus in a

different category from Ephebus and Bito. Th. Zahn (Intr. to N.T. vol.

i. p. 269) holds that Fortunatus was a delegate from Corinth and that

it had been he who had brought the news of the dissensions to Rome.

Lightfoot also (part i. vol. i. p. 29 and vol. ii. p. 187) is of

opinion that Fortunatus was a Corinthian and that there is no

improbability in identifying him with the Fortunatus of 1 Cor. xvi. 17.

[432] See the most interesting chapter on the Hypomnemata of Hegesippus

in Eusebiana, by H. J. Lawlor (Clarendon Press. 1912). Mr. Lawlor

produces very strong arguments and evidence (pp. 73-94) to show that

Epiphanius in writing his Panarion had before him a copy of Hegesippus'

Memoirs, and further that those Memoirs contained a great deal of

information about the early history of the Churches of Jerusalem,

Corinth, and Rome: We find that, just as in the case of Jerusalem and

Corinth, so in that of Rome, what he [Hegesippus] wrote was mainly a

r�sum� of the history of the Christian community, special attention

being paid to the circumstances under which each bishop succeeded to

his charges' (p. 85). Among other passages of Epiphanius that which

explains how it was that Clement though appointed bishop by the

Apostles Peter and Paul was not first but third in succession, i.e. the

story of his resignation in favour of Linus and Anencletus, was

probably taken from Hegesippus (p. 9).

[433] See Clementine' Homilies and Recognitions, the Epistles to

Virgins, the Apostolical Constitutions.

[434] Smyrn. 8; Trall. 2. 3, 4; Eph. 3, 4; Magn. 3, 6, 7; Philad. 4,

etc.

[435] Romans (salutation): hetis kai prokathetai en topo choriou

Rhomaion, axiotheos , axioprepes, axiomakaristos, axiepainos,

axiepiteuktos , axiagnos kai prokatathemene tes agapes , Christonomos,

Patronomos.

[436] Eus. Hist. Eccl. iv. 23.

[437] Bigg, 1 Peter, Intr. p. 5.

[438] Hermas, Vision iii. 4: grapseis oun duo biblaridia kai pempseis

hen Klementi kai hen Grapte. pempsei oun Klemes eis tas exo poleis,

ekeino gar epitetraptai; Grapte de nouthetese i tas cheras kai tous

horphanous; su de anagnose eis tauten ten polen meta ton presbuteron

ton proisamenon tos ekklesias.

[439] Lightfoot, Apost. Fathers, part i. vol. i. p. 348.

[440] C.I.L. xii. 3637:
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Emended by Mommsen.

[441] 1. C.I.L. xii. 4822: GRAPTE VXOR

[442] See Lecture VIII. pp. 227- 35, and Note D of the Appendix.
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LECTURE VIII

Daniel, xi. 3, 6: And the king shall do according to his will; and he

shall exalt himself, and magnify himself above every god till the

indignation be accomplished.'

During the period which followed the accession of the Flavian dynasty

to the Imperial throne the Church in Rome seems to have lived in

comparative repose. For more than a quarter of a century after the

martyrdom of St. Paul there is no record of any violent persecution of

the Christians. But there is no reason to believe that the ban under

which those professing the Christian faith lay since the Neronian

persecution of 65 A.D. was in any way lightened or removed. The

Christians were then condemned for crimes which were summed up by

Tacitus as constituting hatred of the human race,' in other words they

were condemned as enemies of the Roman state and people. The mere

confession of the Christian name henceforth in itself entailed

punishment. The principle of action, which Tertullian calls the

Neronian Institution, continued to be the settled policy of the Roman

government. This did not mean that the Christian so long as he lived

quietly and did nothing to bring himself under the notice of the police

was sought out and dragged before the magistrate. But it did mean that

he was an outlaw, liable as such at any moment to be dealt with

summarily by the authorities, as a mere matter of police

administration. No regular judicial trial was needed, the inquiry

(cognitio) was confined to the establishment of the charge of being a

Christian, and once established by the confession of the accused the

death penalty followed.

The policy of the Flavian emperors, Vespasian, Titus, and--during the

first part of his reign--Domitian, was on the whole both towards Jews

and Christians one of singular moderation. After the merciless

suppression of the terrible revolt in Judaea and the destruction of

Jerusalem and its Temple, the position of the Jews in the empire was

however no longer the same. As a political entity, a nation in any

sense of the word, they had ceased to exist, they were but a number of

separate communities scattered throughout the Roman world. But

Vespasian granted to them a continuation of the religious privileges

they had hitherto enjoyed on condition that all Jews were registered

and paid to Roman officials as a tax for the maintenance of the temple

of Jupiter Capitolinus the didrachma that they had previously

contributed for the support of the Temple at Jerusalem. [443] But the

very fact of this registration for fiscal purposes served to accentuate

the distinction between Jew and Christian the more clearly. The

Christian Church could no longer find shelter under the shadow of the

privileges of the synagogues.

That Titus was himself well aware of the difference, and that he was

personally hostile to Christianity, is shown by an interesting passage

in the fourth-century historian, Sulpicius Severus, which in the

opinion of scholars is generally regarded as an extract from one of the

lost books of Tacitus. It tells of a council held by Titus at the time

of the final storming of Jerusalem to decide whether the Temple should

be destroyed or not. Titus himself, it is reported, with some of his

officers held that it was necessary, so as to abolish more completely

the religion both of Jews and Christians, since these religions,

although opposed to each other, both sprang from the same origin; the

Christians had issued from the Jews; if the root were taken away, the

stem would quickly perish.' [444] With the destruction of the Temple

and the crushing out of the revolt, however, the situation was changed,

moderate and statesmanlike views prevailed, the Jews secured religious

toleration and lenient treatment, and no systematic persecution was

directed against the Christians so long as Titus lived or for some

years after his untimely death.

There is no contemporary Christian writing which throws any light upon

the state of the Church during this time, unless it be The Shepherd' of

Hermas. This remarkable work bears every mark from internal evidence of

being a product of the Flavian age. We have already seen in the last

lecture that the author speaks of a certain Clement, who, if not the

well-known writer of the Epistle to the Corinthians,' which is the

general opinion, must be a fictitious personage. Were it not for

certain statements in the documents known as the Muratorian Fragment on

the Canon' and the Liberian Catalogue' probably few would have given to

The Shepherd' a later date than the beginning of the second century.

The reference to Hermas and his book by the Muratorian writer runs

thus: [445] . . . very lately in our times Hermas wrote "The Shepherd"

in the city of Rome while his brother Pius, the bishop, was sitting in

the chair of the Church of the city of Rome, and therefore it ought to

be read; but it cannot, to the end of time, be placed either among the

prophets who are complete in number, nor among the Apostles for public

lection to the people in church.' Zahn in his Geschichte des

Neutestamentlichen Kanons' makes this comment: Careful and impartial

reading of "The Shepherd" would have shown the Fragmentist that the

same must have been written a considerable time before the episcopate

of Pius. He who holds the book, despite the name of Clement (Vis. ii.

4) and many other signs, as a work dating from about 145, must hold it

to be a pseud-epigraphic fiction, which the Fragmentist throughout does

not.' [446] The statement in the Muratorian extract quoted above is in

fact, from whatever point of view it be regarded, a blunder of the

writer who is called by Zahn the Fragmentist.' The dilemma is one from

which there seems to be no possibility of escape.

Dr. Lightfoot has very convincingly shown that this Muratorian document

contains a literal translation into Latin (somewhat corrupted in

transmission) of a Greek metrical original, and also that there are

strong reasons for assigning the authorship to Hippolytus. The literary

activity of this famous Roman writer during the closing years of the

second and the first quarter of the third century was very great. The

Muratorian Canon' may probably be dated from 185 to 200 A.D. [447] The

Liberian Catalogue,' it is generally agreed, was largely dependent on a

later work of Hippolytus, the Chronology.' Now in the Liberian

Catalogue' to the notice of Pope Pius I the following statement is

appended: under his pontificate his brother Hermes wrote a book in

which is contained the Mandate which an angel gave to him, when he came

to him in the garb of a shepherd.' [448] The two passages, Muratorian

and Liberian, are derived in fact from a common source, most probably

Hippolytean. But an examination of the character of this source may

well make one distrustful of its strict accuracy as regards names and

dates. The Liberian Catalogue' contains a number of strange errors. The

deaths of St. Peter and St. Paul are stated to have taken place in 55

A.D. Clement succeeds Linus in 67 A.D., and Anencletus, the real

successor of Linus, is duplicated and follows Clement, first at Cletus,

then as Anacletus. Clement's death is recorded as having occurred

sixteen years before he became bishop according to the generally

received date. [449] Nor were the errors confined to the first-century

episcopates. The Hippolytean source is not even accurate about Pope

Pius himself, who in the words of the Muratorian Fragment' lived very

recently in our own times.' Hegesippus and Irenaeus, both of whom

stayed some time in Rome soon after the death of Pius, both give the

order of succession as Pius, Anicetus, Soter, Eleutherus. [450] The

Liberian Catalogue' makes Pius the successor of Anicetus instead of the

predecessor. The conclusion then that we are compelled to draw is that

this particular piece of external evidence for the date of The

Shepherd' cannot be accepted as authoritative in face of the internal

evidence of the book itself. Probability points to its having arisen

through a confusion between the name of the author and the title of his

work. Bishop Pius according to a very ancient tradition had a brother

named Pastor, who was a presbyter. [451] Now in the Latin version known

as Vulgate,' which probably dates from the end of the second century,

the title of Hermas' book is Liber Pastoris.' [452] This version was

thus contemporary with the Muratorian Fragment.' It required but a

single step therefore to identify the presbyter Pastor with the author

of the allegory. The Liber Pontificalis,' while embodying the

biographical notice of Pius I which is found in the Liberian

Catalogue,' prefaces it by another paragraph in which this Pope is

spoken of as The brother of Pastor.' There is no attempt to fuse this

statement with that concerning Hermas--they are separated from one

another by intervening matter. Indeed in the two earliest forms of the

Liber Pontificalis' that we possess, the so-called Felician' and

Cononian' abridgements, the compiler of the Cononian,' evidently

perceiving the incongruity of the double reference to a brother,

deliberately refuses to apply the term to Hermas, the words frater

ipsius' being omitted. [453]

The earliest patristic references to The Shepherd' point to its having

been written considerably before the pontificate of Pius I (140-155

A.D.). Irenaeus, whose sojourn in Rome took place less than twenty

years after the death of Pius, quotes the opening sentence of the First

Mandate' as Scripture--Well then spake the Scripture, which saith.'

[454] Before a document could be thus--plainly, simply, and without

periphrasis--accepted as Scripture, it must needs have been of some

considerable antiquity, and indeed it may be regarded as evidence that

Irenaeus looked upon Hermas as an Apostolical man,' the Hermas in fact

mentioned by St. Paul in his Epistle to the Romans.

Clement of Alexandria in Egypt and Tertullian in Western Africa, in

writings which date about twenty years later than that of Irenaeus just

quoted, and almost contemporary with the first publication of the

Muratorian Canon,' both speak of The Shepherd' as Scripture.' Of

Clement Dr. Salmon says [455] : The mutilated commencement of the

"Stromateis' opens in the middle of a quotation from "The Shepherd" and

about ten times elsewhere he cites the book, always with a complete

acceptance of the reality and divine character of the revelations made

to Hermas.' Tertullian [456] before he became a Montanist in his

treatise De Oratione' rebukes the custom of sitting down for prayer,

the origin of which he attributes to the opening words of the fifth

Vision of The Shepherd.' This assigns to The Shepherd' an authority

which could only belong to a book long received as the work of an

inspired man. Origen [457] somewhat later in the third century gives as

his opinion (based no doubt on tradition) that the Hermas mentioned in

the Epistle to the Romans was the writer of The Shepherd' and adds this

scripture seems to me very useful and as I think divinely inspired.'

Such testimonies--and there are none of like date (save the Muratorian

Fragment') of an adverse character--if not conclusive, point

unmistakeably to the work of Hermas having already about it the

hallowing consecration of age and the reverence due to a sub-apostolic

writing.

The contents of this strange book are divided into two parts. The first

part contains a series of five Visions. In the last of these Visions a

noble-looking man in the garb of a Shepherd, and who is named the Angel

of Repentance, appears to Hermas, and bids him write down a series of

Precepts or Mandates, and of Parables or Similitudes, which he had come

to deliver to him. The second part of the work contains the twelve

Mandates and the ten Similitudes, which he received from the mouth of

the Shepherd. It is not my intention to discuss the question whether

the autobiographical details in this book belong to the real life-story

of a genuine Hermas, nor again the question whether the two parts of

the work are from the hand of the same author. There are few in the

present day who have doubts on either of these questions, and I shall

assume the unity of authorship of a man, who while conveying

instruction and warning, moral and doctrinal, under allegorical forms

is dealing all the time seriously with the religious experiences and

spiritual failings and trials of his own personal life and of the

contemporary life of the Christian Church in Rome. [458] But these

assumptions being granted, it will at once be seen that the use that

can be made of The Shepherd' as an illuminating historical document

depends almost entirely upon its date.

It has already been suggested that the Muratorian Fragmentist blundered

in his assertion that the work of Hermas was written during the

episcopate of his brother Pope Pius I, because he confused the author

of The Pastor' with a well-known brother of the bishop, who actually

bore that name. Now the very first line of Hermas' book compresses into

the briefest compass the life-story of the writer's youth. He who

brought-me-up sold me into Rome to a certain Rhoda.' [459] This implies

that Hermas had either been born a slave in the house of the vendor,

who did not live at Rome, or what is from the form of the

expression--ho threpsas--quite probable, that he had been a castaway

child whom the above-mentioned master had taken care of and brought up

as a slave. In the last case his parentage would be unknown and he

would have no brother. If, however, he were born a slave, three things

must be postulated before the Muratorian statement can be accepted: (1)

that in this slave household relationships were recognised; (2) that

both Hermas and his brother must have been sold in Rome and afterwards

became freedmen; (3) that the brother laid aside his original Greek

slave name for that of Pius. Negative evidence is never conclusive, but

it is certainly very strange that, if Hermas wrote his book during his

brother's episcopate, there should not be a single reference to that

brother's existence in a work in which the author several times speaks

of his family and, as has been said, repeatedly deals with the

condition, organisation, and affairs of the Church.

The allusion to Clement as a living man, entrusted with the task of

communicating with foreign cities, seems to fix the date at which the

Visions were written, as being previous to the accession of the said

Clement to the episcopate, i.e. before 92 A.D. How hopeless is the

attempt to combine a belief in the historicity of this personal

reference to Clement, as a contemporary occupying an important position

in the Roman Church, with an acceptance even in a modified form of the

statement of the Muratorian Fragmentist is exemplified by Harnack in

his Chronologie der Altchristlichen Literatur.' [460] Harnack will not

admit for a moment that the paragraph about Clement and Grapte is

fiction,' [461] so he meets the difficulty first by extending the life

of Clement to 110 A.D., then by imagining the Shepherd' to have been

written in instalments during a period of some thirty-five years, the

original little book' consisting of a portion of Vision II only. But

while admitting that the work of Hermas shows evident traces of gradual

growth to completion, it seems to me quite clear that no great interval

of time can have separated the first portion written from the last.

From beginning to end the same conditions obtain throughout both as

regards Hermas personally and as regards the internal condition and the

trials of the Church. In that very Vision II which Harnack regards as

the oldest part of the book, a great tribulation' is announced as

coming, and in Vision IV the announcement is repeated; but although

past persecutions are described in the earliest Visions' and latest

Similitudes,' [462] they differ in no way in character, and there is

nowhere any allusion to the great tribulation' as having come. Again in

the Visions' [463] Hermas is represented as having lost his wealth and

been ruined because of the wrong-doings of his family. This punishment

has fallen upon him for his neglect in not admonishing his children,

who are invited to penitence and are promised forgiveness, if from

their heart they repent. In Similitude VII' we learn that the children

have repented from their heart, and Hermas complains to the Shepherd

Angel that nevertheless his afflictions have not ceased. The reply is

Dost thou think that the sins of those who repent are straightway

remitted? The very essence of this rejoinder lies in the fact that the

time of Hermas' affliction--i.e. the period covered by the book--had

been short.

The past persecutions described by Hermas agree with all we know of the

Neronian persecution and its consequences. In Vision III mention is

made of those who have suffered scourges, imprisonments, great

afflictions, crosses, wild beasts for the Name's sake.' [464] In Sim.

IV. we read of sufferers for the sake of the name of the Son of God,

who suffered willingly with their whole heart and gave up their lives.

These when brought before the authority and questioned did not deny,

but suffered readily'; of others as fearful and hesitating, who

reasoned in their hearts whether they should deny or confess before

they suffered'; of others again--the double-minded'--who at the first

rumours of persecution through cowardice sacrifice to idols and are

ashamed of the name of their Lord.' We find in these references a

remarkable agreement with the references to the Neronian persecution in

1 Peter, Hebrews, the Apocalypse, 1 Clement and the Annals' of Tacitus,

both as to the punishments inflicted, and the various categories into

which the accused were divided, the willing and courageous martyrs, the

more timid and doubtful sufferers, and the renegades and apostates, who

denied their faith. [465] It may be gathered also from various passages

of The Shepherd' that persecution was not confined to the one violent

outburst, but that at the time when Hermas was writing those who

professed the Christian faith were living if not in peril yet in

continual insecurity, liable at any moment to be called upon to confess

or deny their faith. Such was the state of things which there is good

reason to believe subsisted throughout the first two decades of Flavian

rule.

The constitution of the Church is a subject that has no direct interest

for Hermas. The almost chance references to it in the pages of The

Shepherd' are however of considerable significance and value. The

condition of things, we find, has altered little since Pauline days.

The charismatic ministry of apostles, prophets, and teachers are

working side by side with the hierarchical officials--bishops,

presbyters, and deacons. In Vision III. 5, the white stones used for

the building of the tower, which is the Church, are described as being

The apostles, bishops, teachers, and deacons, who have walked in godly

gravity, and who have discharged their duties as bishops, teachers, and

deacons for the good of God's elect. Some of these have fallen asleep,

some still are with us.' [466] Now this passage, which recalls the

language of 1 Cor. xii. 28 and Eph. iv. 11, clearly implies that of the

original apostles, bishops, teachers, and deacons there were some still

living when Hermas wrote. It will be noticed that Hermas omits from

this list The prophets,' and elsewhere throughout this work, but in

Similitude XI he treats at length of the difference between true and

false prophets. He was himself a prophet and he is at pains to claim

for himself inspiration and a position of authority. He does not

classify The prophets' with the apostles and teachers, because he

regards the prophets apparently as possessing gifts which place them in

a category apart. From a number of passages it may be seen that Hermas,

as a prophet, both claimed and exercised the right of delivering

charges and admonitions to the rulers of the Church, and of speaking

publicly in the assemblies. [467]

Apostles and teachers are mentioned several times in Similitude IX. In

one curious passage Hermas tells how those of these apostles and

teachers who had fallen asleep in the power and faith of the Son of God

preached to those who had fallen asleep before them and themselves gave

them the seal of their preaching,' i.e. baptised them. [468] From this

it has been inferred that all the Twelve Apostles were dead when these

words were written. But surely this is not so. The apostles' of Hermas

were the whole body of those chosen and sent out as missionaries by the

Churches. Only those who had fallen asleep' could follow in their

Master's steps and preach to the dead. The position of the charismatic

ministry in the days of Hermas seems in fact to have changed little

since St. Paul wrote his First Epistle to the Corinthians.

Very important historically, however, are certain hints which may be

found in The Shepherd' about changes at work in the constitution of the

official hierarchy. Twice Hermas refers to the hierarchy under the

general title of chiefs of the Church,' [469] using the same Greek term

as is employed in the Epistle to the Hebrews and in 1 Clement. Only

once does the word presbyters occur as the designation of this official

class, when the aged woman, the Church, bids Hermas read the book she

has given him--to this city with the presbyters that preside over the

Church.' And here the word for those who preside' [470] is a technical

word found several times in the same sense in St. Paul's epistles. The

references of Hermas therefore to the constitution of the Church are

thus thoroughly primitive, and the picture drawn by him of the local

organisation essentially the same as that which we find in the Pauline

epistles. It is clear for instance that the title episcopus was not yet

confined to a single individual, but was still the common designation

of all presbyters who were charged with the cure of souls. Nevertheless

there are signs that an evolutionary movement was already in progress,

which was preparing the way for that transformation in the

signification of the word ' bishop,' which we find already accomplished

at the time when Ignatius wrote his epistles towards the end of the

first decade of the second century. This seems to be the fair and

legitimate interpretation of certain passages of The Shepherd,' to

which we will now turn our attention.

Sternly does the Prophet in Vision III rebuke the dissensions among

those who sit in the foremost seats. [471] Again in Similitude VIII the

Shepherd-Angel speaks of certain men who, though always faithful and

good, were jealous one of another about the first places and a certain

dignity' [472] (doxes tinos). But these,' he continues, are all foolish

to contend thus for the first places. Nevertheless, when they heard my

commands, being good men they cleansed themselves and repented

quickly.' Now knowing, as we do, on grounds approaching to historical

certainty that from the time of the deaths of the apostles Peter and

Paul a succession of presbyters occupied a post of pre-eminence and

dignity among their fellows--that of presiding bishop and official head

of the local Church--is it not permissible to read between the lines

that, around this office, heart burnings and jealousies not

unaccompanied by cabals and intrigues had arisen? During the two long

episcopates of Linus and Anencletus, each of twelve years according to

tradition, the office that they held had, we can scarcely doubt, been

gradually drawing to itself more and more of initiative and authority,

and becoming more monarchical in character. If then Hermas wrote, as I

am now contending he did, during the closing years of Anencletus, the

long immunity from violent persecution which the Church in Rome had

then enjoyed was precisely a period when in such a large and mixed

community, containing unstable and doubtful elements, strifes and

dissensions about precedence might arise, and ambitious presbyters be

found ready to assert with acrimony and self-assertion their equality

of privilege with one who was nominally only one of themselves, primus

inter pares it might be, but still a presbyter like the rest.

The immunity from persecution, to which I have referred, was, however,

not long to endure, and the severe trial through which the Church had

to pass before the end of Domitian's reign would doubtless be more

effective in purifying and cleansing it from those jealous,

self-seeking, and factious elements of which Hermas speaks, than his

rebukes and upbraidings. The coming tribulation, which he predicted as

being at hand, was no doubt that tribulation [473] which first-century

Christianity expected would precede, in accordance with the Lord's

words, the Second Advent and the final consummation of all things. The

prophecy proved true, however, though in a different sense from that

which the prophet intended.

Christian writers have been accustomed to couple together the names of

Nero and Domitian, as the first two persecutors of the Church. It has

already been shown that although the attack of Nero on the Christians

was but the violent outburst of a tyrant, anxious to divert public

odium from himself against a body of sectaries who were generally hated

and despised, it had permanent results and marked the real beginning of

what was to be the continuous policy of the Roman State. The

persecution of the adherents of the Christian faith by Domitian was far

less direct, and did not, as may be gathered from the letter of Pliny

to Trajan about sixteen years later, establish any fresh precedents;

for had such fresh precedents been established they would not have

escaped the notice of this writer, who was a contemporary and, as his

correspondence proves, a close observer of current events.

The origin of the persecution of Domitian was not so much religious as

fiscal. The Imperial treasury had been emptied by a series of

extravagances. In his search for fresh sources of income, Domitian

bethought him of the tax which Vespasian had in 70 A.D. imposed upon

the Jews, commanding them, as a condition for their religious

privileges being respected, to pay henceforth, as already stated, the

didrachma they had become accustomed to contribute for the support of

the Temple and its worship at Jerusalem to the Roman authority for the

maintenance of the Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus. Hitherto the

collection of this tax had been leniently carried out and had been only

demanded from those circumcised Jews who were professed members of the

synagogues. Domitian determined that all who lived more Iudaico,

including the large class of Godfearers' and indeed all who to a

greater or less extent followed Jewish customs, should be liable, and a

strict inquisition was in consequence made. [474] The exact date is not

accurately known, but what followed was the bringing to the notice of

the Government the existence of a body of people living after the

Jewish fashion but repudiating any connexion with the synagogues and

therefore having no right to shelter themselves behind the Jewish

privileges. Against them the charge of atheism and Jewish manners' was

accordingly preferred, and out of the fiscal demand there came a series

of arrests and trials in which many Christians suffered.

It must, however, be borne in mind that there does not seem to have

been any organised attack upon the Christian faith as such, but rather

that a number of individuals, both of high rank and of low, became for

various causes, during the reign of terror which marked the closing

years of Domitian's rule, suspect to the government, and paid by their

lives or their exile, and in both cases by the confiscation of their

property, the penalty for exciting the fears, the jealousy, or the

rapacity of the tyrant. [475] Moreover to a man whose proclamations

began with the words our God and Lord Domitian,' and who ostentatiously

made the restoration of the national religion one of the aims of his

policy, it was easy under the charges of atheism and Jewish manners' or

of being movers of innovations' [476] to strike at those who held aloof

from taking part in Caesar-worship or in the religious festivals and

spectacles.

Very little, practically nothing, is known of the extent to which the

general body of Christians suffered under Domitian. In as far as

persecution fell upon the humbler classes, it arose, as I have pointed

out, not as part of a systematic attack on the Christian religion as

such, but as a result of the stricter exaction of the didrachma tax.

And it was by no means confined to Rome. Wherever colonies of Jews were

settled the fiscal inquisition would be made, and thus the presence of

Christian communities brought to the official notice of the

magistrates. In their case the procedure would be summary. The mere

confession of the Name was sufficient to place the Christian outside

the law. He would be asked either to deny the faith or to suffer

martyrdom, and among the large number of those who were but half and

half Christians, doubtless very many conformed to the request and saved

their lives. Eusebius in his Chronicle' quotes the historian Bruttius

as stating that many Christians suffered under Domitian, but the

expression is a very vague one, [477] and obviously the chief interest

of the passage to Eusebius, as it is to us, is its reference to the

important fact that among the many high and influential persons whom

the tyrant visited with death or banishment were certain of his own

near relatives who were Christians. It is around the names of a very

small group of individuals that the chief interest of the Domitianic

persecution centres, an interest which has been greatly increased by

recent archaeological discoveries.

The passage from the Chronicle' of Eusebius merely tells us the name of

one of these relatives of Domitian who, according to his authority

Bruttius, suffered banishment because she was a Christian. Her name was

Flavia Domitilla, and she is described in Jerome's Latin version as

being a niece of Flavius Clemens the consul by his sister.' Her place

of banishment was the island of Pontia. The Armenian version of the

Chronicle' suggests that there may be in this passage some corruption

of the text, [478] nevertheless its general correctness is confirmed

strongly by the parallel passage from the History' of Eusebius, where

that writer basing his statement on the evidence of heathen historians,

prominent amongst whom would be the Bruttius named in the Chronicle,'

states that in the fifteenth year of Domitian amongst many others who

suffered persecution was Flavia Domitilla, a daughter of the sister of

Flavius Clemens, one of the consuls at Rome at that time, who for her

witness to Christ was banished as a punishment to the island of

Pontia.' [479]

Now this evidence of Eusebius, when compared with certain passages in

the pages of Dion Cassius and Suetonius, requires very careful

attention. Dion writes (I quote the abridgement of Xiphilinus)--in this

year (95 A.D.) Domitian put to death Flavius Clemens, being then

consul, his cousin, and Flavia Domitilla, his relation and the wife of

the same [Clemens]. Both were condemned for the crime of "atheism." On

this charge were condemned many others who had adopted Jewish customs;

some were put to death, others punished by confiscation. Domitilla was

only transported to the island of Pandateria.' [480] Now the

relationship of this Domitilla to Domitian is revealed to us plainly by

Quintilian, [481] who was tutor to the sons of Flavius Clemens and who

states that they were the grandchildren of the Emperor's sister, who

also bore the name of Flavia Domitilla. This daughter of Vespasian died

before her father, but the name of the grand-daughter appears on

several extant inscriptions, from which we learn that the Christian

catacomb in which many members of the Flavian family were buried, and

which dates from the first century, was excavated on her property.

[482] There can be no doubt that she was a Christian and that the faith

of Christ had been adopted by others closely related to Domitian.

Whether Flavius Clemens himself was actually a baptised Christian and

suffered martyrdom, it is very difficult to say. The complete silence

of Eusebius and of Christian legend and tradition would rather lead to

the conclusion that, though the consul may have been well-disposed

towards Christianity and even lived after the Christian manner, and so

have incurred the charge of atheism,' yet this was not the real cause

which led to his being executed. Like his brother Flavius Sabinus

before him he stood too near the throne for the suspicious and

childless tyrant to endure the presence in Rome of those whose

blood-relationship made them possible rivals and successors. This is

borne out by the statement of Suetonius, who after describing the

morbid state of fear and suspicion, amounting almost to semi-madness,

in which Domitian spent his last years, living in constant dread of

conspiracy and assassination, proceeds--finally he suddenly put to

death on the faintest suspicion, when he had only just ceased to be

consul, Flavius Clemens, his cousin-german, a man of the most

contemptible inactivity, whose sons, then of very tender age, he had

openly destined for his successors, and, discarding their former names,

had ordered one to be called Vespasian, the other Domitian. By this

violent act he very much hastened his own destruction.' [483] It was in

fact by the hand of Stephanus, a freedman and steward of Domitilla,

Flavius Clemens' wife, that the tyrant was stabbed a few months later.

Now Suetonius had previously given an account of the murder of Flavius

Sabinus, the elder brother of Flavius Clemens, by his cousin Domitian

for no other reason than a mistake of a herald, who on Sabinus being

chosen at the consular election, inadvertently proclaimed him to the

people not as consul but as imperator, [484] and in the passage quoted

above the historian clearly implies that it was on some similar very

slender ground of political suspicion that Flavius Clemens fell a

victim to Domitian's jealousy. Possibly his Christian principles,

however laxly held, may have compelled him during his tenure of office

to hold aloof from certain religious ceremonies and spectacles, thus

bringing down upon him the imperial anger. The words of Suetonius that

he was a man of most contemptible inertia' [485] represent a charge

which was frequently brought against the Christians, because their

religious scruples prevented them from taking an active part in the

political life and still more in the cruel and vicious amusements of

their time. The same charge is brought by Tacitus against Flavius

Sabinus, the City Prefect during the latter years of Nero. He was the

elder brother of Vespasian and the father of the Sabinus and Clemens

put to death by Domitian. He perished in defending the Capitol against

the German mercenaries of Vitellius in 69 A.D. Tacitus describes him as

at the close of his life mild in character, averse to bloodshed, and

sluggish.' He must in his official capacity have taken part in the

persecution of 65 A.D., and the effect of what he witnessed may well

have been the conversion wholly or in part of the unwilling persecutor.

The theory of the identity of Flavius Clemens the consul put to death

in 95 A.D. with Clement who was bishop of Rome at that period was at

one time seriously put forward by a number of eminent German scholars

[486] but it has now been generally abandoned. It was pointed out with

a certain amount of plausibility that the later Clementine legend

ascribing to the bishop a close connexion with the imperial family was

due to the fact that he was a mere duplication of the consul, and that

it was unlikely that there should be at once in Rome two persons

bearing the same name, one of whom occupied one of the highest official

positions in the state, and the other was the official head of the

Christian community. Dr. Lightfoot was able to show conclusively that

this theory of duplication had no foundation and was untenable, but his

own solution of the mystery surrounding Clement the bishop's

personality, that he was a man of Jewish descent, a freedman or the son

of a freedman belonging to the household of Flavius Clemens,' [487] is

equally if not more impossible. Dr. Lightfoot seems to have forgotten

that Flavius Clemens was quite a young man, probably not more than

thirty, when he died. [488] Clement the bishop, unless all that

tradition relates of him be false, must have been at least fifty in 95

A.D. He could not in any case have been the son of a freedman of the

younger man. Again if a freedman he would not have adopted his master's

cognomen, but would have retained his own slave name as cognomen,

preceded by the nomen Flavius.

It is somewhat strange, however, that while so many attempts have been

made either to identify the two Clements mentioned above or at least to

connect them in some way with each other, the presence of a third

contemporary Clement, who undoubtedly played a much larger part in

Roman public life than either of the other two, has been overlooked.

Yet I am now going to ask you to fix your attention upon this man and

his family relationships, for I believe that by doing so we shall find

the clue to the solution of many difficulties and shall be able to

clear up a number of doubtful points in the history of Roman

Christianity at the end of the first century. Here in the lecture

itself I can only indicate briefly and in outline the hypothesis which

I am putting forward, and am perforce reserving for a special note in

the Appendix the fuller discussion of details and of the authorities on

which the various statements and suggestions are based. [489]

M. Arrecinus Clemens was the son of M. Arrecinus Tertullus Clemens,

Praetorian Prefect under Caligula. From Josephus we learn that this

Tertullus Clemens was privy to the conspiracy which resulted in the

murder of that Emperor, and connived at it. From the same authority

comes the information that after the assassination Herod Agrippa was

allowed to act as an intermediary between the Praetorian troops and the

soldiery who obeyed the Senate. The result was that Claudius who had

been acclaimed Emperor in the camp became quietly possessed of the

reins of power without bloodshed. He owed thus his peaceful accession

to the throne in no small measure to the authority exercised by the

Praetorian Prefect. How great that authority and influence was may be

gathered from the fact that his son thirty years later was welcomed by

the guards as their Prefect because the memory of his father was still

fresh among them.

It should be noted that it is from the Jewish historian, Josephus, only

that the information comes as to the parts played by Arrecinus

Tertullus Clemens and Herod Agrippa before and after Caligula's death,

and it seems to me a perfectly legitimate inference that the Prefect

was a friend of Agrippa and may indeed like many other well-to-do

Romans have felt the attraction of the synagogue and to a greater or

less extent been a God-fearer.' Be this as it may, it is certain that

Titus Flavius Vespasianus was a relative of Tertullus Clemens.

Vespasian, Suetonius tells us, was brought up from early childhood by

his grandmother Tertulla, a name which suggests not merely the bond of

kinship between the Prefect and the future Emperor but the likelihood

that in their youth they were closely associated. Evidence of the

friendliness of the relations which continued to subsist between the

two men in later life is not wanting. Titus, the son of Vespasian, was

born in 39 A.D. in very poor circumstances, but shortly after the

accession of Claudius both Vespasian himself and his elder brother T.

Flavius Sabinus obtained commands in the expedition to Britain under

Aulus Plautius. In his father's absence we find Titus at Court, as the

companion of Britannicus, the son of Claudius. Can we not see here

signs that Clemens to whom Claudius owed so much had used his influence

with the Emperor on behalf of his kinsmen? As a further mark of the

closeness of the relations between them we find that Titus, while still

little more than a boy, was married to Arrecina Tertulla, daughter of

Clemens. Domitian, the younger son of Vespasian, was not born until 51

A.D., after his father's return from Britain, and he seems to have

found a home with his uncle, T. Flavius Sabinus, during the years 57-69

A.D., when Vespasian was abroad and Sabinus filled the post of Prefect

of the City. This elder brother of Vespasian did not marry till late in

life, probably not until after he settled in Rome in 57 A.D. at the

close of his governorship of Moesia, for, as we have already seen, his

children were still young when he was murdered in December 69 A.D.

Domitian, then aged eighteen, was with his uncle in the Capitol, when

it was stormed by the Vitellian troops, and narrowly escaped with his

life, to be immediately afterwards saluted as Caesar and invested with

consular authority. One of his first acts was the appointment of his

relative, M. Arrecinus Clemens, who is described by Tacitus as being in

very great favour with Domitian, to the post of Praetorian Prefect,

formerly held by his father. This younger Arrecinus Clemens was

afterwards twice consul (suffect) in 73 A.D. and 94 A.D., and from 8z

A.D. onwards a member of the Imperial Council. Shortly after his second

consulship he was suddenly condemned and put to death by Domitian, who,

as Suetonius tells us, treated him with every mark of regard up to the

last. The death of this active and prominent man can therefore have

occurred only about a year before that of Flavius Clemens.

It is not surprising that there should be confusion and mistake on the

part of later Christian writers, who knew nothing of Clemens the consul

of 94 A.D., the man of twenty-five years official experience, but

attributed all references in heathen writers to a consul of that name

to Flavius Clemens, thereby creating entanglements and difficulties.

For instance it has been seen that Eusebius, referring to Bruttius

[490] as his authority, both in his History' and in his Chronicle,'

states that Flavia Domitilla, the niece [the sister's child] of Flavius

Clemens, one of the consuls at that time, had been exiled because of

her profession of the Christian faith to the island of Pontia. There is

no mention in either passage of the death of Flavius Clemens. Further,

Jerome, in one of his epistles giving a description of the visit of a

certain Paula in 385 A.D. to the island of Pontia, declares that she

saw there the cells in which Flavia Domitilla had spent a long exile.

On the other hand Suetonius and Philostratus record the death of

Flavius Clemens without any hint of any punishment falling upon any

Flavia Domitilla. Dion Cassius, however, declares that both Flavius

Clemens and his wife Flavia Domitilla were accused of the crime of

atheism' and that he was executed, while his wife was banished to the

island not of Pontia but of Pandateria.

This is all very puzzling, but there is yet another source of

information available to us--the legendary Acts of Nereus and

Achilles.' These Acts,' though late in date and as regards many details

pure fiction, rest nevertheless on a solid basis of real fact, for a

memorial of Nereus and Achilles (according to the story the martyred

chamberlains of a Flavia Domitilla, whose mother Plautilla was the

sister of Clemens the Consul) has been found in the cemetery of

Domitilla, where the Acts' tell us the bodies were laid. Flavia

Domitilla herself, so runs this narrative, had been banished to the

island of Pontia because as a Christian she wished to live in

virginity, and had refused to marry in accordance with the Emperor's

commands. To say that such an incident is one common to early Christian

hagiography is no argument against its authenticity in this or any

particular instance. It is a simple matter of fact that the precepts of

St. Paul on the subject of virginity had a far-reaching influence, and

that during the age of persecution many Christian women did regard the

state of life commended by the Apostle as the highest ideal of

discipleship. Plautilla's name, I can see no reason to doubt, was found

in the original source which furnished the materials for the

sixth-century Acts of Nereus and Achilles.' I am inclined, however, to

connect the disobedience and banishment of Domitilla the virgin with

the sudden disgrace and execution of Arrecinus Clemens, she being his

niece and Plautilla his sister. Eusebius states that the Domitilla

banished to the island of Pontia was the niece of Flavius Clemens, and

he quotes the contemporary historian Bruttius as his authority. Apart

from other reasons for believing that Eusebius must have made a

mistake, to which I shall refer directly, I think it more than likely

that he never saw the original narrative of Bruttius at all, but only

some Greek extract from it at second hand, in which the mother of

Domitilla was described, just as she is in The Acts of Nereus and

Achilles,' simply as the sister of Clemens the consul. He naturally

would interpret this as a reference to Flavius Clemens. The same error

was committed by the author of the Chronicon Paschale,' who records

that Flavius Clemens was consul both in 93 A.D. and 95 A.D., whereas it

is certain that he was consul for the first time in 95 A.D., the consul

in 94 A.D. being Arrecinus Clemens.

There is every mark (except the duplication of names) that the account

given by Dion Cassius of the execution of Flavius Clemens and the

condemnation of his wife, Domitian's niece, to exile in the island of

Pandateria is quite distinct from that recorded by Eusebius on the

authority of Bruttius, and with fuller detail in The Acts of Nereus and

Achilles.' Eusebius in mentioning the name of Flavius Clemens could

surely not have refrained from speaking of his fate had the passage

from Bruttius that was before his eyes made any allusion to this last

and crowning act of Domitian's cruelty. No, the incidents connected

with the sentences on the two Flavia Domitillas seem to have been

separated by an interval of some twelve months or more from each other.

Circumstantial evidence is in favour of the conclusion I have adopted.

In 95 A.D. Flavius Clemens was, as I have said, still quite a young

man. It is therefore extremely improbable that he should have had a

niece of sufficient age and standing to have aroused the resentment of

Domitian, or that she should have been accompanied into exile by two

soldier-chamberlains, the historical reality of whose martyrdom and

subsequent burial in the cemetery of Domitilla extant memorials

testify. Dr. Lightfoot [491] sees a discrepancy in the representation

of these two men both as soldiers of the guard and as chamberlains of

Domitilla. It is rather an undesigned piece of confirmatory evidence,

if, as I am assuming, this Domitilla were the niece and the

granddaughter of two Pretorian Prefects, one of whom had just served

the office of consul.

But further light may, I think, be thrown upon her personality, which

will reveal still more clearly the causes for the confusion of names to

which I have referred. It never seems to have struck any of the

numerous critics and commentators who have dealt with these questions,

that Clemens' was not a cognomen in use among the Flavian family. If

the second son of T. Flavius Sabinus received the cognomen Clemens, the

inference is that he derived it from his mother.

The name of the wife of Flavius Sabinus, the brother of Vespasian, is

not recorded, but he married late in life, and if that wife were

Plautilla, daughter of the Praetorian Prefect, Tertullus Clemens, and

sister of Arrecinus Clemens the consul of 93 A.D., it seems to me that

not merely the difficulties attaching to the scanty historical

references to the Domitianic persecutions, but also those connected

with the more or less legendary traditions relating to the same period,

will be largely removed. Let us examine some of the consequences of the

hypothesis that I have put forward as to Plautilla having been the wife

of Titus Flavius Sabinus, the Prefect of the City from 57 to 69 A.D.

According to The Acts of Nereus and Achilles' she was a Christian

convert and died the same year that St. Peter was martyred. Sabinus was

murdered in 69 A.D. and as I have already pointed out there are hints

in the narrative of Tacitus that he, too, may in his last years have

imbibed Christian principles. The natural guardian of his orphan

children would be their uncle M. Arrecinus CIemens, the Praetorian

Prefect of 70 A.D. The two sons as they grew up would no doubt pass

under the direct care of Vespasian himself, but the daughter, Flavia

Domitilla, would remain with her uncle, and would thus be rightly

described not as the sister of Flavius Clemens but as the niece of

Arrecinus.

Again, the name Plautilla suggested to De Rossi that her mother's name

was likely to be Plautia.' This suggestion I shall adopt by the further

assumption that the wife of Tertullus Clemens was a sister of Aulus

Plautius the conqueror of Britain, and therefore a relative of Plautia

Urgulanilla the second wife of Claudius and sister-in-law to Pomponia

Graecina, whose conversion through Judaism to Christianity may be dated

as having taken place early in Claudius' reign. That Tertullus Clemens

either personally or through his wife had some special Jewish connexion

has already been suggested as an explanation of the particular

knowledge shown by Josephus about the part played by this Praetorian

Prefect at the time of the assassination of Caligula; and if his wife

were the sister of Aulus Plautius not only is there a possibility that

she may have shared the religious views of Pomponia Graecina, but a

further reason is adduced for the appointment of both Vespasian and his

brother Sabinus to posts in the army of Britain under that general.

Thus a scheme of relationship between the Flavian and Arrecinian

families has been drawn up, which has at least the not inconsiderable

merit of co-ordinating a number of isolated facts and bringing them

into harmony with one another. It will be found that it is able to

answer to a further and still more trying test of its general accuracy.

I have suggested at the close of the last lecture that Clement the

Bishop was a younger brother of M. Arrecinus Clemens the consul. It

will be found, as I then said, that such a suggestion was in no way a

random conjecture. The high position which the famous bishop held,

according to all the traditions that have come down to us, in the

estimation of later generations was due not to his being the author of

the Epistle sent by the Roman Church to the Church at Corinth, but to

his being a personal disciple of St. Peter and at the same time a man

of distinguished birth and family connexion. In the Acts of Nereus and

Achilles' The bishop is described as being the son of a brother of

Clemens the consul.' The relations between him and St. Peter, the

evidence for which is strong and convincing, render it more probable

that he was the younger brother of Arrecinus. This would be in

accordance with what we find in the Clementine Homilies' and

Recognitions.' In their accounts of the early life of the bishop, which

are derived from a common earlier source, Clement is represented as the

youngest of his family. In these romances, the biographical chronology

is hopeless. The names of the parents and brothers of the bishop belong

to the period of Hadrian and the Antonines, while his conversion takes

place in the reign of Tiberius. The statement, however, that the father

of Clement was a near relative and foster-brother of an emperor and

that his mother was likewise a kinswoman of Caesar can scarcely be the

pure invention of a writer of fiction. There could be no object in a

romancer going out of his way to make such an assertion unless it had

behind it a genuine historical tradition. If Clement, however, were the

son of Arrecinus Tertullus Clemens and of Plautia the sister of Aulus

Plautius, his father was a relative and possibly the foster-brother of

Vespasian, his mother a kinswoman of Claudius. It is an interesting

thought that with such parentage he may have gained his early knowledge

of the Jewish scriptures and of the principles of Christianity at the

feet of Pomponia Graecina.

Among the victims of Domitian in 95 A.D. was a member of one of the

most illustrious families in Rome--M' Acilius Glabrio. [492] While he

was consul in 91 A.D. as the colleague of M. Ulpius Trajanus, the

future emperor, he appears to have excited the suspicion and dislike of

Domitian, who in order to humiliate and degrade him compelled Glabrio

to fight with wild beasts in the amphitheatre adjoining the imperial

villa at Albanum. He was victorious but was afterwards exiled. This

punishment did not, however, satisfy the vindictive spirit of the

Emperor. Dion Cassius, after telling of the execution of Flavius

Clemens and the banishment of his wife upon the charge of atheism and

Jewish manners,' says that he also caused Acilius Glabrio to be put to

death for the same crimes. Suetonius likewise states that Acilius

Glabrio in his place of exile and several others of senatorial and

consular rank were executed as instigators of novelties'--molitores

rerum novarum. [493] The character of these charges had for some time

given rise to something more than a suspicion that this M' Acilius

Glabrio may have been a Christian. This suspicion has been converted

almost into certainty by the discovery in 1888 by De Rossi in the

first-century cemetery of Priscilla of a gamma-shaped crypt formerly

richly adorned with frescoes, now in a state of ruin, but containing

many fragments of inscriptions showing that this was a burial place of

the Acilii Glabriones and other members of the Acilian Gens. [494] It

has been a great misfortune that in this catacomb, as in that of

Domitilla, so much wanton destruction should have been wrought by the

searchers for relics (especially at the beginning of the seventeenth

century) in ignorant disregard of the inestimable historical value of

these precious archaeological records of primitive Roman Christianity.

The name Priscilla was not uncommon in the Acilian family, and it is

thought that the particular Priscilla from whom the catacomb derives

its name may have been the mother of M' Acilius Glabrio, the consul of

91 A.D. These two cemeteries of Priscilla and Domitilla even in their

present devastated condition bear witness, which cannot be gainsaid, to

the hold which Christianity had obtained among the upper classes in the

reign of Domitian.

This account of the Church in Rome in the first century has had to be

compressed into eight lectures. Now compression implies that certain

matters have been passed over lightly, others selected for special and

detailed treatment. This is a true description of the method that I

have followed, and it has consisted in choosing for more exhaustive and

careful examination precisely those questions and subjects round which

controversies have arisen and on which there have been and are strong

differences of opinion. It is, for instance, of vital importance to a

right understanding of the growth of Christianity in the centre of the

empire, that the contemporary documents which throw light upon it

should be correctly dated, and to this question of dates much

attention, perhaps some may think a disproportionate amount of

attention, has been given. That, however, depends entirely upon the

results achieved by arguments whose force and validity rest upon the

patient unravelling and disentanglement of a quantity of involved,

obscure, and sometimes apparently contradictory evidence. This I will

venture to say, that while only too deeply conscious of the limitations

of my knowledge, it has been my endeavour in these lectures freely, and

without prejudice, to give expression to the conclusions which close

personal study of the documentary and epigraphic evidence has led me to

form, in the hope if not of convincing or converting those who have

adopted different views, at least of stimulating inquiry and arousing

fresh interest in some questions that have been regarded as choses

jugees, and to remind those who may do me the honour of reading these

pages, that experience has taught that there are very few indeed even

of the so-called accepted results of criticism' which can be received

without the mental reservation of a note of interrogation.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[443] Josephus, Bell. Iud. vii. 6. 6; Dion Cassius, lxvi. 7. This

conciliatory attitude of Vespasian and Titus to the Jewish Diaspora was

due in part to the fact that the non-Palestinian Jews had taken no

share in the revolt and that they were financially useful, in part to

the influence of Agrippa II and his sister, who lived at Rome on terms

of close intimacy with the Imperial family. Vespasian had also special

cause to be grateful to the Jew, Tiberius Alexander, who was the first

to proclaim him emperor at Alexandria and who secured the allegiance to

him of the legions in Egypt, 1 July 69. See Tac. Hist. ii. 79.

[444] Sulp. Severus, Chron. ii. 30. 6: Fertur Titus adhibito consilio

prius deliberasse . . . at contra alii et Titus ipse evertendum templum

in primis censebant quo plenius Iudaeorum et Christianorum religio

tolleretur; quippe has religiones, licet contrarias sibi, iisdem

auctoribus profectas: Christianos ex Iudaeis extitisse: radice sublata,

stirpem facile perituram.'

[445]

. . . ' pastorem uero

nuperrim e temporibus nostris in urbe

roma herma conscripsit sedente cathe

tra urbis romae aeclesiae pio eps fratre

eius et ideo legi eum quide oportet se pu

plicare vero in eclesia populo neque jnter

apostolos in fine temporum potest.'

Zahn, Gesch. N.T. Kanons, p. 8; both Zahn and Lightfoot render

nuperrime by neosti.

[446] Denn aufmerksame and unparteiische Lesung des Hirten w�rde dem

Frg. gezeigt haben dass derselbe geraume Zeit vor dem Episkopat des

Pius geschrieben sein will. Wer das Buch trotz des Namens Clemens (Vis.

ii. 4) and vieler anderer Anzeichen f�r ein Werk aus der Zeit vom 145

hielt, musste es f�r eine pseudepigraphische Fiction halten, was der

Frg. durchaus nicht thut.'--Zahn, Gesch. N.T. Kanons, ii. 113.

[447] Lightfoot, Apost. Fathers, part i. vol. ii. pp. 405-13.

[448] Sub huius episcopatu frater eius Ermes librum scripsit, in quo

mandatum continetur, quod ei praecepit angelus, cum venit ad illum in

habitu pastoris.' Lightfoot, Apost. Fathers, part i. vol. i. p. 254.

Lelong, Le Pasteur d'Hermas, p. xxvi. Duchesne, Lib. Pont. vol. i. p.

4. Harnack, Chronologie, pp. 175 and 258-9.

[449] In 76 A.D. instead of 92 A.D.

[450] Hegesippus visited Rome when Anicetus was bishop and was

acquainted with Soter and Eleutherus. Eus. Hist. Eccl. iv. 22. Irenaeus

also spent some time in Rome, probably in the episcopate of Soter

169-175. In his work on Heresies he gives the order of succession of

the Roman bishops: . . . then Pius, then Anicetus, then Soter; lastly

the twelfth in order from the Apostles, Eleutherus, who now holds the

office of bishop.' Eus. Hist. Eccl. v. 6; Iren. Haer. iii. 3.

[451] The Acts of Pastor and Timothy, though apocryphal, are of great

antiquity. The ecclesia Pudentiana, the foundation of which in the

Baths of Novatus by Pope Pius I is recorded in these Acts, still exists

as the Church of St. Pudentiana--see note in Lib. Pontificalis under

biographical notice of Pius. Hic ex rogatu beatae Praxedis dedicavit

ecclesiam thermas Novati, in vico Patricii, in honore sororis suae

sanctae Potentianae, ubi et multa dona obtulit; ubi saepius sacrificium

domino offerens ministrabat. Immo et fontem baptismi construi fecit.'

According to tradition Pius erected this Church into a titulus, and

appointed as its presbyter his brother Pastor. The provision of a

baptismal font probably means that this church became at this time the

Metropolitan Church of Rome. Inscriptions have been found in which this

church is styled titulus Pudentis.' In the excavations now being

carried out for the building of the new Ministry of the Interior it is

hoped that discoveries may be made throwing further light on these

traditions. Galland, Bibl. Patrum, i. 672; De Rossi, Bullettino, 1867,

pp. 49-58; Marucchi, El�m. d'Arch. Chr�t. ii. pp. 381-3, iii. pp.

364-373; Hefele (Patrum Apost. Op. xcv) quotes from Galland Presbyter

Pastor titulum condidit et digne in Domino obiit.' See Appendix, Note

C, The Legend of Pudens.

[452] Lelong, Le Pasteur d'Hermas (1912), Intr. cv: La Version Vulgate

(L') remontant peut-�tre a la fin du II^e si�cle, en tout cas tr�s

ancienne . . . nous est parvenue dans de nombreux manuscrits.'

[453] Duchesne, Lib. Pont. p. 58. The passage stands thus in the

Felician Abridgement: Pius, natione Italus ex patre Rufino, frater

Pastoris, de civitate Aquileia, sedit ann. xviii, mens. iiii, dies iii.

Fuit temporibus Antonii Pii a consulatu Clari et Severi. Sub huius

episcopatu frater ipsius Hermis librum scripsit in quo mandatum

continetur quod praecepit angelus Domini cum venit ad eum in habitu

pastoris et praecepit ei ut sanctum Paschae die dominica celebraretur.'

The Cononian Abridgement omits frater ipsius. Pius is the first of the

Roman bishops after Clement to bear a Latin name. If he were, as stated

above, an Italian by birth, it is in the last degree unlikely that he

was the brother of a slave who had the Greek name Hermas, and who seems

to hint that he was of foreign origin. There is no reference to the

Easter controversy in The Shepherd.

[454] Irenaeus, Haer. iv. 20. 2: kalos oun eipen he graphe he legousa;

Proton panton p isteuson . . . from Hermas, Mand. i. 1.

[455] Article on Hermas' in Smith and Wace's Dictionary of Christian

Biography. Hilgenfeld in the prolegomena to his edition of Hermae

Pastor 1881, p. v), after giving a list of the passages in which

Clement of A. quotes The Shepherd, concludes: . . . Clemens Alex.

igitur integro Pastore usus de divinis eius revelationibus ne dubitavit

quidem neque Hermam apostolorum temporibus posteriorem existimasse

potest.'

[456] Tertullian, De Oratione, xii.: Quod assignata oratione assidendi

mos est quibusdam, non perspicio rationem, nisi quod pueri volunt. Quid

enim, si Hermas ille cuius scriptura fere Pastor inscribitur, transacta

oratione non super lectum assedisset, verum aliud quid fecisset, id

quoque ad observationem vindicaremus?' The actual words of the Latin

version of the Pastor referred to occur at the beginning of the Fifth

Vision: quum orassem domi, et consedissem supra lectum, intravit et

quidam reverenda facie etc.' See Hefele, Patr. Apost. Op. p. 345.

Hilgenfeld's comment is non vero "scripturae" auctoritatem ipsam sed

solum argumentum inde haustum [Tertullianus] impugnavit.' Proleg. iii.

That Tertullian used the Latin version of Hermas--i.e. the Vulgate

version, and that this Liber Pastoris was read publicly in the Churches

of Provincial Africa at the opening of the third century, is the

opinion of Harnack. Introd. to edition of Hermas' Pastor by Gebhardt

and Harnack, p. xlviii.

[457] Origen, Comm. on Rom. xvi. 14: quae scriptura valde mihi utilis

videtur et ut puto divinitus inspirata.' Hefele, Proleg. xciii. Again

in his Comm. on Hosea Origen refers to the building of the tower in

Hermas, Vis. iii. ii. 16, 17 in a passage beginning with kai en to

Poimeni and ending with semainei he graphe. See Hilgenfeld, p. 15. This

expresses his attitude to The Shepherd throughout his works.

[458] The question of the unity of the work has been set at rest by

Link, Die Einheit des Pastor Hermas, 1888, and Baumgaertner, Die

Einheit des Hermas Buchs, 1889.

[459] ho threpsas me pepraken me Rhode tini eis Rhomen. Vis. i. 1.

threttos = Lat. verna, a slave born and brought up in a house.

Hilgenfeld quotes Pliny, ep. ad Traian. 66: quos vocavit threptous qui

liberi nati expositi, deinde sublati a quibusdam et in servitute

educati sunt.' The preposition is here seems to be used as meaning that

Hermas was brought to Rome from elsewhere to be sold.

[460] Harnack, Chronologie, pp. 262-7.

[461] Harnack, Chronologie, p. 265: Dass diese Worte [the passage about

Clement and Grapte] eine "Fiction" seien, ist eine Annahme, die sich

nicht begr�nden and die sich nicht halten l�sst, wenn man sie

durchdenkt.'

[462] Compare Vis. ii. 2. 7 and iii. 2. 1, with Sim. viii. 3. 6, 7, and

ix. 28.

[463] Vis. i. 3, ii. 2. 2-5, 3.1; iii. 6. 7, with Sim. vii. ton oun

metanoounton euthus [eutheos] dokeis tas hamartias aphiesthai; Numquid

ergo,' ait, protinus putas aboleri delicta eorum, qui agunt

poenitentiam?'

[464] Vis. iii. 2. 1: mastigas, phulakas, thlipseis megalas, staurous,

theria.. See also Vis. ii. 2.

[465] Sim. ix. 28, passim: hosoi ep' exousian achthentes exetasthesan

kai ouk hernesanto all' epathon prothumos . . . hosoi de deiloi kai en

distagmo egenonto kai elogisanto en tais kardiais auton, poteron

arnesontai e homologesouri kai epathon . . . humeis de hoi paschontes

heneken tou onomatos doxazein opheilete ton theon . . . dokeite ergon

mega pepoiekenai ean tis humon dia ton theon pathe. Sim. ix. 19. 1: ek

tou protou orous tou melanos hoi pisteusantes toioutoi eisin; apostatai

kai blasphemoi eis ton Kurion, kai prodotai ton doulon tou theou.

toutois de metanoia ouk esti, thanatos de esti. Sim. viii.: tines de

auton eis telos apestesan; houtoi oun metanoian ouk echousin; dia gar

tas pragmateias auton eblasphemesan ton Kurion kai apernesanto. Compare

1 Pet. iii. 13-17: all' ei paschoite dea dikaiosunen, makarioi. ton de

phobon auton me phobethete, mede tarachthete; . . . etoimoi de aei pros

apologian panti to aitounti humas, and iv. 12-19: ei oneidizesthe en

onomati Christou, makarioi. . . . ei de hos Christianos, me

aischunestho, doxazeto de ton Theon en to merei touto. Heb. vi. 4-8:

Adunaton gar tous hapax photisthentas . . . kai parapesontas, palin

anakainizein eis metanoian . . . to telos eis kausin. x. 32: pollen

athlesin hupemeinate pathematon . . . oneidismois te kai thlipsesi

theatrizomenoi; . . . ten harpagen ton huparchonton humon meta charas

prosedexasthe. Hermas himself appears to have been among those who had

lost their possessions for their faith. Vis. ii. 2 (1, 2); iii. 6 (6,

7). Rev. xii. 11: ouk eg?pesan ten psuchen auton achri thanatou. Also

xiv. 9-13, xx. 4, and 1 Clement v. and vi. Tacitus, Ann. xv. 44: Nero

subdidit reos et quaesitissimis poenis adfecit, quos per flagitia

invisos vulgus Christianos appellabat . . . igitur primum correpti qui

fatebantur, deinde indicio eorum multitudo ingens. . . .

[466] Vis. iii. 5: houtoi eisin hoi apostoloi kai episkopoi kai

didaskaloi kai diakonoi hoi poreuthentes kata ten semnoteta tou theou

kai episkopesantes kai didaxantes kai diakonesantes hagnos kai semnos

tois eklektois tou theou, hoi men kekoimemenoi, hoi de eti ontes.

[467] Vis. ii. 2. 6; 4. 2-3; iii. 8. 11; 9. 7-10; Sim. ix. 31. 6.

[468] Sim. ix. 16. 5: houtoi hoi apostoloi kai hoi didaskaloi hoi

keruxantes to onoma tou huiou tou theou, koimethentes en dunamei kai

pistei tou huiou tou theou ekeruxan kai tois prokekoimemenois kai autoi

edokan autois ten sphragida tou kerugmatos. In this passage the numbers

of these apostles and teachers' is given as forty, and in the previous

paragraph (4) the words he sphragis to hudor estin explain the meaning

of The Seal.' The apostles' throughout The Shepherd is used in the

wider sense of missionaries' except in Sim. ix. 17. 1.

[469] hoi proegoumenoi. Vis. ii. 2. 6; iii. 9, 7. Compare 1 Clem. xxi.

6. hoi hegoumenoi is found 1 Clem. i. 3 and Heb. xiii. 7, 17, 24.

[470] Vis. ii. 4. 2: hoi proistamenoi; see 1 Thess. v. 12; Rom. xii. 8;

1 Tim. v. 17.

[471] Vis. iii. 7, 9: nun oun himin lego tois proegoumenois tes

ekklesias k9ai tois protokathedritais; me ginesthe homoioi tois

pharmakois . . . blepete oun, tekna, mepote hautai hai dichostasiai

humon aposteresousin ten zoen humon . . .

[472] Sim. viii. 7. 4: echontes zelon tina en allelois peri proteion

kai peri doxes tinos. Harnack (Gesch. d. Altchrist. Lit. 1,

Chronologie,' p. 175) after quoting these passages writes: die zuletzt

angef�hrten Stellen m�gen darauf hinweisen, dass der monarchische

Episkopat damals in Anzug war; aber von diesem selbst ist in dem Buche

keine Spur zu finden.' It is curious that a critic of the calibre of

Harnack should not see that the statement in the last clause does not

and cannot weaken in the very least the force of the admission

previously made. Hermas felt it was his duty to rebuke the rivalries

and dissensions to which the growing power of the bishop gave rise, but

why should he, writing for Roman Christians of his own day, and not for

the enlightenment of far distant posterity, inform his contemporaries

of a fact which was a matter of common knowledge?

[473] St. Matt. xxiv. 21, 29; St. Mark, xiii. 24; compare 2 Thess.

4-10.

[474] Suet. Domitian, 12: Praeter caeteros Iudaicus fiscus acerbissime

actus est; ad quem deferebantur qui vel improfessi Iudaicam viverent

vitam, vel, dissimulata origine, imposita genti tributa non

pependissent.' See Martial, vii. 55. 7.

[475] Suet. Domitian, 3: Virtutes quoque in vitia deflexit; quantum

coniectare licet, super ingenii naturam inopia rapax, metu saevus.'

Orosius, vii. 10: Nobilissimos e senatu, invidiae sirnul et praedae

causa . . . interfecit.'

[476] Ibid. 10: molitores novarum rerum.'

[477] According to the Latin Hieronymian version (ed. Sch�ne, ii. p.

163): 'Scribit Bruttius plurimos Christianorum sub Domiciano fecisse

martyrium, inter quos et Flaviam Domitillam Flavii Clementis consulis

ex sorore neptem in insulam Pontianam relegatam quia se Christianam

esse testata sit.' See Lightfoot, Apost. Fathers, part i. vol. i. p.

108.

[478] In the Latin translation of the Armenian version of the Chronicle

(ed. Sch�ne, ii. p. 160) we find: refert autem Brettius, multos

Christianorum sub Dometiano subiisse martyrium; Flavia vero Dometila et

Flavus Clementis consulis sororis filius in insulam Pontiam fugit quia

se Christianum esse professus est.' Lightfoot, ibid. p. 105. In the

Syrian Epit. (ed. Sch�ne, p. 214): Flaviam Domitillam, filiam sororis

Clementis consulis.'

[479] Eus. Hist. Eccl. iii. 18.

[480] Dion Cassius, lxvii. 14: kan to auto etei allous te pollous kai

ton Phlaouion Klementa hupateuonta, kaiper anepsion onta kai genaika

kai auten sungene heautou Phlaouian Domitillan echonta, katesphaxen ho

Dometianos; epenechthe de amphoin enklema atheotetos, huph' hes kai

alloi es ta ton Ioudaion ethe exokellontes polloi katedikasthesan, kai

hoi men apethanon, hoi de ton goun ousion esterethesan; he de Domitilla

huperoristhe monon es Pandaterian.

[481] Quint. Inst. Orat. iv. prooem.: Cum mihi Domitianus Augustus

sororis suae nepotum delegavit curam.'

[482] See Appendix, Note F, The Cemeteries of Priscilla and Domitilla.

C.I.L. vi. 948, 949, 8942, 16246.

[483] Suetonius, Domitian, 15-17: repente ex tenuissima suspicione

tantum non in ipso eius consulatu interemit.'

[484] Suetonius, Domitian, 10.

[485] Contemptissimae inertiae.' Compare Tacitus' words in reference to

his father, Hist. iii. 65: mitem virum abhorrere a sanguine et

caedibus'; 73: Flavium Sabinum inermem neque fugam coeptantem

circumsistunt'; 75: after stating that Flavius Sabinus had served the

state in thirty-five campaigns and with distinction at home and abroad,

Tacitus proceeds: in fine vitae alii segnem, multi moderatum et civium

sanguinis parcum credidere.' It was a change of disposition that was

observed at the close of the life of this tried servant of the State.

See Allard, Hist. d. Pers�cutions, i. pp. 81-115 (ed. 1892).

[486] Lipsius, Volkmar, Hilgenfeld, Erbes, at one time Harnack.

[487] Lightfoot, Apost. Fathers, part i. vol. i, pp. 59-61.

[488] Tac. Hist. iii. 69: eoque, concubia nocte, suos liberos Sabinus,

et Domitianum, fratris filium in capitolium accivit.' The children of

Sabinus were quite young in 70 A.D., and Clemens was younger than

Sabinus. His own sons were children under a tutor in 95 A.D. The fact

that he did not become consul till that date is of itself a proof of

his youth. The Flavian emperors as a rule reserved the consulships for

members of their own family.

[489] Appendix, Note D, The Family of Clement the Bishop.

[490] At Torre Marancia, on the Via Ardeatina, on a plot of land

adjoining the entrance to the cemetery of Domitilla, a burial place of

the Bruttian gens has been discovered. The historian was probably

Bruttius Praesens, the friend of Pliny the Younger. De Rossi, Bull.

Arch. crist. 1865, p. 24; 1875, p. 74. Marucchi, Roma Sotterranea

Cristiana, N.S. tone. i. 22-23, 29-30. See also App. Note F, Cemeteries

of Priscilla and Domitilla.

[491] Lightfoot, Apost. Fathers, part i. vol. i. p. 51.

[492] Gsell, Le R�gne de l'Empereur Domitien, pp. 294-6; Allard, Hist.

des Pers�cutions, pp. 111-115.

[493] Dion Cassius, lxvii. 12, 14; Suet. Domitian, 10, 19; Juvenal, iv.

93-103; Fronto, Ep. ad M. Caesarem, v. 23.

[494] De Rossi, Bull. di Arch. Crist. 1888-89, pp. 15-66, 103-133; Roma

Sotterranea, p. 319; Lanciani, Pagan and Christian Rome, pp. 4-8; Wahl,

R�mische Quartalschrift, 1890, iv. pp. 305 ff; Marucchi, Arch.

Chr�tienne, ii. pp. 422-7. See App. Note F, Cemeteries of Priscilla and

Domitilla.
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APPENDICES
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NOTE A.

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE OF EVENTS MENTIONED IN THE LECTURES.

The Crucifixion Passover, 29 A.D.

Martyrdom of St. Stephen 33 A.D.

Accession of Claudius January 24, 41 A.D.

Imprisonment of St. Peter Passover, 42 A.D.

St. Peter's 1st visit to Rome Summer, 42 A.D.

Death of Herod Agrippa Spring, 44 A.D.

Prophecy of Agabus 44 A.D.

Famine in Judaea 45-46 A.D.

Queen Helena in Jerusalem 45 A.D.

St. Mark's Gospel written at Rome 44-45 A.D.

St. Peter with St. Mark leaves Rome 45 A.D.

St. Peter at Jerusalem Spring, 46 A.D.

Barnabas and Saul bring alms from Antioch to Jerusalem (visit of Gal.

ii. 1-10)

Pentecost, 46 A.D.

Barnabas and Saul with Mark sail from Antioch to Cyprus

Spring, 47 A.D.

St. Peter makes Antioch the centre of his missionary work

47-54 A.D.

Barnabas and Saul return from their missionary journey

Autumn, 49 A.D.

Encounter of St. Peter and St. Paul at Antioch (Gal. ii. 11-14)

49 A.D.

Council at Jerusalem late 49 A.D.

Jews expelled from Rome by Claudius St. Paul starts from Antioch on his

2nd Missionary Journey with Silas

after Passover, 50 A.D.

St. Barnabas and St. Mark go to Cyprus ? " ? ? " ? 50 A.D.

St. Paul at Corinth

Summer, 51 A.D.-Spring, 53 A.D.

Gallio arrives in Achaia April or May, 52 A.D.

St. Paul at Jerusalem Passover, 53 A.D.

Accession of Nero October 13, 54 A.D.

St. Peter and St. Barnabas at Corinth late 54 A.D.

St. Peter and St. Barnabas in Rome and Italy early 55 A.D.-56 A.D.

St. Paul at Ephesus Autumn 53 A.D.-Spring A.D.

1st Epistle to the Corinthians from Ephesus Autumn 55 A.D.

St. Paul in Greece

early summer, 56 A.D.-Passover, 57 A.D.

Epistle to the Romans from Corinth early in 57 A.D.

St. Paul at Jerusalem Pentecost, 57 A.D.

St. Paul's imprisonment at Caesarea 57 A.D.-59 A.D.

St. Luke's Gospel 58 A.D.-59 A.D.

St. Paul arrives in Rome February, 60 A.D.

St. Paul's captivity in Rome 60 A.D.-62 A.D.

The Acts of the Apostles before 62 A.D.

Death of Festus Summer of 62 A.D.

St. Peter in Rome (3rd visit) 63 A.D.-65 A.D.

The Great Fire of Rome July, 64 A.D.

Persecution of the Christians by Nero Spring, 65 A.D.

The Vatican f�te May, 65 A.D.

1st Epistle of St. Peter June, 65 A.D.

Martyrdom of St. Peter Summer, 65 A.D.

Apollonius of Tyana in Rome 66 A.D.

Epistle to the Hebrews late in 66 A.D.

Martyrdom of St. Paul 67 A.D.

Death of Nero June 9, 68 A.D.

Burning of the Capitol and storming of Rome Dec. 19-21, 69 A.D.

Domitian in power at Rome January-June, 70 A.D.

Clement's Epistle to the Corinthians February, 70 A.D.

St. John exiled by Domitian to Patmos, where he writes the Apocalypse

Spring, 70 A.D.

Destruction of the Temple by Titus September 7, 70 A.D.

Nerva consul January to April, 71 A.D.

St. John released from Patmos Spring, 71 A.D.

Anencletus succeeds Linus as 2nd bishop of Rome 80 A.D.

Domitian becomes emperor September 13, 81 A.D..

"The Shepherd" of Hermas about 90 A.D.

Clement becomes 3rd bishop of Rome 92 A.D.-101 A.D.

M' Acilius Glabrio consul 91 A.D.

M. Arrecinus Clemens consul suffect 94 A.D.

T. Flavius Clemens consul 95 A.D.

Domitianic persecution 94 A.D.-96 A.D.

Assassination of Domitian September 18, 96 A.D.
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NOTE B

AQUILA AND PRISCA OR PRISCILLA

In 1888 G. B. de Rossi discovered in the Coemeterium Priscillae a crypt

belonging to the Acilian gens dating from the first century, but in a

very ruinous condition. Among the broken inscriptions of many members

of this noble family one finds the names of Acilius Glabrio and of

Priscilla. Both Priscus and Priscilla or Prisca are cognomina used by

this family, as may be seen by a reference to Pauly's

Real-Encyclop�die' under Acilius. The existence of this elaborately

decorated burial-place containing a large number of sarcophagi seems to

point to M' Acilius Glabrio, the Consul of 91 A.D. who was accused of

atheism and Jewish manners' and put to death by Domitian, having been a

Christian. It has been conjectured therefore that the Priscilla after

whom the cemetery is named, and who must have been the owner of the

property beneath which the excavations were made (property which was

part of the extensive possessions of the Acilii Glabriones) was a near

relative--aunt or sister--of the victim of Domitian. In this cemetery,

according to the witness of the Liberian Calendar,' of the Itineraries'

and of the Liber Pontificalis,' reposed the bodies of Aquila and Prisca

(Marucchi, El�ments d'Arch�ol. Chr�t.' ii. p. 385) with many other

saints and martyrs. The biographical notice of Leo IV (847-55 A.D.) in

the Liber Pontificalis' states that that Pope removed many bodies

within the walls to save them from possible desecration by the Saracens

(Duchesne, ii. p. 115), among these the bodies of Aquila and Prisca.

The supposition that these two companions of St. Paul were freedmen of

the family of the Acilii Glabriones or connected with them by ties of

clientship is highly probable. Prisca or Priscilla appears to have been

a Roman and by the precedence of her name over that of her husband, as

already stated, it has been assumed that she was of higher position and

that the house at Rome was her property. This suggests that she may

have been a daughter of a freedman of the Acilian Priscilla who was the

founder of the cemetery. The Priscilla of the Acts was so named after

her. Aquila was a Jew and a native of Pontus. Of his Jewish name we are

ignorant. He may have been taken to Rome as a slave and been a freedman

of one of the Acilii. Quite possibly, however, he may have settled in

Rome, like so many others, as a craftsman and trader, and his connexion

with the powerful family, perhaps through the influence of Priscilla,

have been one of clientship. As to the name Aquila, the following

quotation from a poem of Ausonius with the title Acilio Glabrioni,

grammatico Jun. Burdigalensi' [214. 3. 4] may explain its origin:

Stemmate nobilium deductum nomen avorum

Glabrio Aquilini Dardana progenies.

The contention of De Rossi, Marucchi and others that the ancient church

of St. Prisca on the Aventine covers the site of the church in the

house of Prisca and Aquila will not bear serious investigation. Of the

St. Prisca, virgin and martyr, who gave her name to the church nothing

is really known, but she was a different person from the Prisca of the

Acts and the Pauline epistles. From the fourth to the eighth century

the church is always described as titulus Priscae (Duchesne, Lib.

Pont.' i. 501, 517). It was not until the Pontificate of Leo III

(795-816 A.D.) that the name titulus Aquilae et Priscae first appears

(Duchesne, ii. p. 20): fecit in titulo beatis Aquile et Priscae coronam

ex argento pens. lib. VI.,' but in this same notice of Leo III occur

the words basilica beate Priscae' and Duchesne remarks that Prisca was

still ordinary at this time (p. 42).

In a MS. preserved in the Biblioth�que Nationale at Paris (Cod. lat.

9697 p. 78) an account is given of the discovery in 1776 of the ruins

of a Roman house and Christian oratory close to St. Prisca with

frescoes of the fourth century, but this ruin was unfortunately

destroyed and no trace of it remains. In Bianchini's edition of the

Liber Pontificalis' (P.L. cxxvii. col. 1315) mention is made in the

notice of Pope Zephyrinus (198-217) of a Christian glass' [495] found

intra antiquae ecclesiae rudera prope S. Priscam' (de Rossi in Bull. di

Arch. Crist.' 1867, p. 48). These things prove the existence on this

spot of a very ancient Christian place of worship, but nothing more.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[495] The words of the Lib. Pont. itself Et fecit constitutum in

ecclesia et patenas vitreas ante sacerdotes in ecclesia, et ministros

supportantes, donec episcopus missas celebraret, ante se sacerdotes

adstantes, sic missae celebrarentur,' are an interesting reference to

the rites attending the celebration of the Mass at Rome in early times:

Duchesne, L.P. i. p. 140, makes the comment la mention de pat�nes de

verre est � remarquer; elles n'�taient certainemeut plus en usage � la

fin du V^e si�cle,'

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

NOTE C

THE PUDENS LEGEND

The name of a certain Pudens occurs in St. Paul's Second Epistle to

Timothy (iv. 21): Eubulus greeteth thee, and Pudens and Linus and

Claudia.' He is not mentioned elsewhere in the New Testament, but a

large number of traditions have grown up about him, which connect him

with St. Peter rather than with St. Paul; and in these traditions there

is in all probability a basis of historical fact. In modern times the

theory met with strong support, especially among English writers, that

Pudens was the husband of Claudia. They were identified with the Pudens

and Claudia of Martial's Epigrams' (iv. 13, xi. 53), and Claudia was

held to be a British maiden and a daughter of a British chief named

Cogidubnus (Martial, xi. 53, CIL.' vii. 11). But it is needless to

discuss this hypothesis, for it has been conclusively shown that the

Epigrams' were not written until many years after the death of St.

Paul. The name Claudia moreover was then not uncommon, and the fact

that the names Pudens and Claudia in the salutation are not coupled

together, but separated by the name Linus, is a strong objection prima

facie to their being husband and wife. [496]

The ground document for the Pudens Legend is the very ancient Acts of

SS. Pudentiana and Praxedis,' or as it is sometimes called the Acts of

Pastor and Timothy.' [497] These Acts' consist of a letter from a

presbyter named Pastor (this Pastor appears in the Liber Pontificalis'

as brother of Pope Pius I) to another presbyter named Timothy and the

reply of the latter. The letters are followed by a short appended

narrative. The date of these Acts' is uncertain, and the letters in

their present form are undoubtedly fictitious, but they embody, as can

be proved by existing memorials, a genuine tradition treated as to its

details with the usual inventive freedom and chronological

inexactitude.

The story as told in these Acts' is as follows: a certain Pudens, whose

mother was named Priscilla, a Christian of property, who had shown

great zeal in entertaining Apostles and strangers, after the death of

his wife consecrated his house as a church of Christ. This church in

the house of Pudens in the Vicus Patricius was erected into a Roman

parish under the name of titulus Pastoris (the Pastor who wrote the

letter being the presbyter placed in charge of this parish). Here with

his two daughters Praxedis and Pudentiana, who as chaste virgins spent

their lives in prayer, fasting, and charitable deeds, Pudens passed his

remaining days. The daughters after his death not only obtained the

consent of Pope Pius to the building of a baptistery adjoining the

church, but the bishop drew the plan with his own hand, and frequently

visited the church and offered there the sacrifices to God. On the

decease of Potentiana the letter of Pastor informs us that he and the

surviving sister Praxedis placed the body by the side of that of her

father in the Cemetery of Priscilla [498] on the Via Salaria.

Here begins what in some MSS. is called the Acts of Praxedis.' Many

noble Christians including Pope Pius came to console Praxedis on her

loss, among them a certain Novatus, described as the brother of

Timothy, but nowhere in these Acts' as the brother of Praxedis and

Pudentiana. This is an important point to remember, for most modern

writers following later Martyrologies describe Novatus and Timothy as

sons of Pudens. [499] Novatus having fallen ill, Praxedis and Pastor

visited him in his sickness, and the issue was that he left to them the

whole of his property. The letter containing all this information was

sent to Timothy to know what he would wish that they should do in the

matter of his brother's estate. Timothy replies that he is rejoiced at

what his brother has done, and leaves the entire disposition in the

hands of Praxedis and Pastor. The contents of these letters in fact

make it absolutely clear that there was no relationship between the

sisters Praxedis and Potentiana and the brothers Novatus and Timothy.

After the letters comes a narrative by the hand of Pastor of what

followed, Praxedis asked Bishop Pius that the Baths of Novatus, which

at that time were not in use, should be consecrated as a church. Pius

consented and dedicated in the name of Praxedis the Baths, as a church,

within the city in the Vicus Lateranus and he erected it into a Roman

parish, titulus, and consecrated a baptistery to it. That this is the

true meaning of the original and that the words in brackets are a later

gloss interpolated by the writer to explain the existence in his days

of a church of St. Pudentiana in the Vicus Patricius as well as a

church of St. Praxedis in the Vicus Lateranus is almost self-evident.

It runs thus: Quod et placuit Sancto Pio Episcopo; thermasque Novati

dedicavit ecclesiam sub nomine beatae Virginis [Potentianae in vico

Patricio. Dedicavit autem et aliam sub nomine sanctae Virginis]

Praxedis infra urbem Romam, in vico qui appellatur Lateranus.' The

Acts' had already given an account of the dedication of the church in

the Vicus Patricius at a much earlier period before the death of

Novatus. The Acts' conclude with an account of the burial of Praxedis

by Pastor in the cemetery of Priscilla by the side of her father and

sister.

The mistake, which led to the interpolation above mentioned caused the

following note to he appended to the biography of Pope Pius in two MSS.

(and their derivatives) of the Liber Pontificalis': Hic [Pius] ex

rogatu beate Praxedis dedicavit aecclesiam thermas Novati in vico

Patricii, in honore Sororis suae sanctae Potentianae, ubi et multa dona

obtulit; ubi saepius sacrificium Domino offerens ministrabat'; Duchesne

commenting on this writes: L'auteur de la note para�t avoir mal compris

le texte des Acta, car il ne parle que de l'une des deux �glises,

rapportant � celle du Vicus Patricius ce qui est dit de l'intervention

de Prax�de et des thermes de Novatus' (Duchesne, Lib. Pont.' i. 133).

This note has also misled most modern writers on the subject. [500] The

two Churches of St. Pudentiana and St. Praxedis are at this day two of

the most interesting churches in Rome, and undoubtedly stand on the

sites of those mentioned in the Acts,' and there is a record of St.

Pudentiana having been restored by Pope Siricius (384-398 A.D.). It is

quite certain, however, that this church was not named after a daughter

of Pudens but after Pudens himself. An inscription Hic requiescit in

pace Hilarus Lector tituli Pudentis' bears the date 528 A.D. and shows

that this was the correct style. Another inscription of 384 A.D. is

Leopardus Lector de Pudentiana and in the mosaic of the apse (the

oldest mosaic in a Roman church) the Saviour holds an open volume with

the words Dominus conservator ecclesiae Pudentianae.' As Lanciani

remarks (Pagan and Christian Rome,' p, 112): In course of time the

ignorant people changed the word Pudentiana, a possessive adjective,

into the name of a Saint; and the name Sancta Pudentiana usurped the

place of the genuine one. It appears for the first time in a document

of the year 745.' An inscription of 491 A.D. speaks of certain

presbyters Tituli Praxedis.'

The existence, however, of both sisters receives substantiation from

the fact that their tombs and that of Pudens are mentioned in the

Liberian Calendar' and in the Pilgrim Itineraries' as existing in the

fourth and fifth centuries in the Cemetery of Priscilla, where

according to the Acta' they were buried. Paschal I in his great

translation of the remains of saints from the catacombs into the city

in 817 A.D. brought the sarcophagi of SS. Pudentiana and Praxedis from

the catacomb to the Church of St. Praxedis, and the names of both are

recorded on a catalogue inscribed on a marble slab to the right of the

altar and their portraits appear in the mosaics of this date, which

adorn the Church (Marucchi, El�m. d'Arch. Chr�t.' iii. 325-332).

It is thought that Justin Martyr, when on his trial in 160 A.D. he

declared, being interrogated by the Judge as to his dwelling place,

that he lived close to the baths called the Timotine,' may have been

referring to the baths of Novatus as the place where he was accustomed

to worship. As Timothy was the brother of Novatus it is a possible

supposition.

The question now arises, was this Pudens of the Acta' identical with

the Pudens of the 2nd Epistle to Timothy. The Bollandists say No. De

Rossi, Marucchi, and many others say Yes, and they get over the

chronological difficulty by urging that Pudentiana and Praxedis may

have lived to a very advanced age. But the probabilities against such a

view are almost insuperable. It is much more likely that the Pudens of

the Epistle and the Pudens of the Acta' were father and son. At one

time it was the opinion of De Rossi and his school that the

first-century cemetery of Priscilla was the property of the family of

Pudens. He and his daughters were buried in the cemetery and his

mother's name is given in the Acta' as Priscilla. But the discovery of

the crypt of the Acilian gens in this catacomb seemed to render it

almost certain that the cemetery must have belonged to the family of

Acilius Glabrio, the Consul of 91 A.D., in which the names of Priscus,

Priscilla and Prisca are found. De Rossi therefore suggested that

Pudens may have himself been an Acilius. I have however already made

another suggestion, i.e. that Priscilla the mother of Pudens according

to the Acta' was an Acilia, and perhaps the aunt or sister of M'

Acilius Glabrio.

The traditions which connect the name of Pudens with the early history

of the Church in Rome are persistent and numerous quite apart from what

is recorded in the Acta' that we have been considering. It is said that

the house of Pudens (the elder Pudens mentioned by St. Paul) was during

his stay in Rome the home of St. Peter. The sella gestatoria, or St.

Peter's chair, the oak framework of which is of great antiquity, is

said to have been originally the senatorial chair of Pudens. The wooden

altar at the St. John Lateran again has been in continuous use there

since the fourth century, when it was removed from St. Pudentiana, and

that despite the fact that Pope Sylvester in 312 A.D. ordered that all

altars should henceforth be of stone. Many indeed had been so before,

for the word titulus which signifies a consecrated parish church

implies its possession of a stone altar. In the Church of St.

Pudentiana at the present time there is preserved within the altar a

single wood plank reputed to have been left at that church as a

memorial when the altar itself was removed. When Cardinal Wiseman was

titular cardinal of St. Pudentiana he had the plank examined and found

that the wood was identical with that of the altar at the Lateran

Church. The reason of its preservation was the tradition that this

altar had been used by St. Peter when he celebrated the Eucharist in

the oratory in Pudens' house. When St. John Lateran replaced St.

Pudentiana as the Cathedral Church of Rome the bishop and the altar

moved there together. [501] These traditions have historically small

value in themselves, but it may safely be said that they could never

have arisen and obtained the vogue which we find them to have had in

comparatively early times, had not the Pudens of Apostolic times and

his family after him been active and leading members of the primitive

Christian community in Rome. [502]

THE FAMILY CONNEXION OF CLEMENT THE BISHOP.

A Tabular Statment of the Scheme of Relationship (set forth in Lecture

VIII) between the

Arrecinian and Imperial Flavian Families.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[496] See Lightfoot, Apost. Fathers, part i. vol. i. pp. 76-79.

[497] Bollandist Acta SS. Maii, iv. 297-301.

[498] It is evidently intended that the Priscilla who gave her name to

the cemetery was the mother of Pudens.

[499] A note in the Bollandist Acta SS. Maii, iv, p. 301, states for

instance: Colitur S. Novatus 20 Iunii etiam Martyrologio Romano

adscriptus et dicitur filius S. Pudentis Senatoris et frater Sancti

Timothei Presbyteri et Sanctarum Virginum Praxedis et Potentianae, qui

ab Apostolis eruditi sunt in fide,' quorum nihil probamus.

[500] See De Rossi, Bullettino di Arch. Crist. 1867, pp. 49-65;

Marucchi, El�ments d'Arch. Chr�t. ii. 364 ff.; Mem. degli Apost. Pietro

e Paolo, pp. 110-116; Lanciani, Pagan and Christian Rome, pp. 110-115;

Barnes, St. Peter in Rome, pp. 72-78; Spence-Jones, Early Christians in

Rome, pp. 263-7, &c.

[501] Concerning the term titulus, Barnes (St. Peter in Rome, p. 75)

writes: A great deal has been written on the origin and use of this

word, but it is probable that it is really derived from its occurrence

in the Old Latin version, in the account of the setting up by Jacob of

the altar at Bethel after his wonderful dream: an account which to this

day is read in the service for the consecration of an altar in a

church. "And Jacob said: How terrible is this place; this is no other

but the house of God and the gate of heaven. And Jacob arising in the

morning took the stone which he had laid under his head and set it up

for a title (erexit in titulum), pouring oil upon the top of it." A

"title' therefore, in early Christian usage, came to be nothing else

but a stone altar duly consecrated, and, in a wider sense, the church

that contained that altar and drew its own sanctity from it.' In the

Liber Pontificalis (Duchesne, torn. i. p. 126) of Evaristus, the

successor of Clement as bishop in 101 A.D., it is recorded hic titulos

in urbe Romae dividit presbyteris.'

[502] Bianchini in his Anastasius Bibliothecarius (edn. of Liber

Pontificalis in 1718) made the suggestion that Pudens was a member of

the Gens Cornelia. In 1778 in the primitive Christian oratory

discovered in immediate proximity to the Church of St. Prisca (supra,

p. 243) a bronze tablet was found to one Caius Marius Pudens

Cornelianus offered to this man by a town in Spain expressing gratitude

for services rendered during the time when he filled the office of

legate, and stating that he (Pudens) had been chosen as patron' by the

citizens. The date of this tabula patronatus is 222 A.D:, and its

presence gives strong grounds for assuming that the house containing

the Christian place of worship was his property. The following

inscription is of great interest as it belongs to the reign of

Vespasian and contains the names of an Amaranthus, a T. Flavius, a Q.

Cornelius Pudens, and a Chrestus. Marucchi (Rom. Sott. N.S. i. p. 30)

states that immediately adjoining the Cemetery of Domitilla excavated

beneath Flavian property lies a property known as Tor Marancia from a

certain Amaranthus; on this are a number of pagan sepulchres belonging

to the Bruttian family; while Eusebius tells us that he derived his

information about the Flavian Christians from an historian named

Bruttius [see Note D, p. 256, and Note F, p. 279).

HILARITATI PVPLIC � ? � ? �

IMP � CAES � VESPASIANI � ? � ? �

SACRVM

TRIBVL � SVCC � CORP � IVN \*

� ? � ? � ? � ? � ?

T : COMINIVS AMARANTH : : : �

T : FLAVIVS � T : F : LVSCV : : : �

Q : CORNELIVS � Q : F : PVDENT : : �

CVRATORES : LIBEROR : TRIB : SVC : COR : IVNIOR : : � �

On the other face occur the words:

PONEN � CVR �

C � NYMPHIDIVS � CHRESTVS �

� ? � ? � ? � ? � ? �

DEDIC � XVII K � DEC �

L � ANNIO � BASSO �

C CAECINA � PAETO � ? ? ^COS � (i.e. 70 A.D.)

\* Tribules succussani. Corpus juniorum.--Muratori, tom. i. p. cccviii.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

(1) M. Arrecinus Tertullus Clemens, Prefect of the Praetorian Guard in

41 A.D. (Josephus, Ant.' xix. 1. 6, 7, and Tac. Hist.' iv. 68.) It is

from Josephus that we learn that Clemens was privy to the conspiracy of

Chaerea and others against Caligula and connived at his assassination.

It appears from Josephus that Herod Agrippa came to the Praetorian

camp, where troops had acknowledged Claudius as emperor, and

successfully acted as mediator between them and that portion of the

army that obeyed the Senate (Josephus, Ant.' xix. 3. 1, 3; 4. 1, 2,

ff.). This information exclusively reported by Josephus may be taken to

imply that Clemens had some connexion, possibly as a God-fearer,' with

the Jewish community at Rome, and that he was a friend of Herod

Agrippa.

From Tac. Hist.' iv. 68 it appears that this Prefect was so much

beloved by his troops that his son's appointment as Prefect in 70 A.D.

was hailed with joy in the camp, because the father's memory after so

long an interval of time was still held in regard. Suetonius (Titus' 4)

tells us that his name was Tertullus, that he belonged to the

Equestrian order, and that his daughter Arrecina Tertulla was the first

wife of the Emperor Titus. An inscription CIL.' vi. 12355 gives his

praenomen as Marcus.

(2) Plautia. The name of the wife of (1) is actually unknown. The

reasons for assigning to him, as his wife, a sister of Aulus Plautius,

the conqueror of Britain, are stated in Lecture VIII. Plautia would be

the sister-in-law of Julia Pomponia Graecina, and a relative of Plautia

Urgulanilla, the second wife of Claudius.

(3) M. Arrecinus Clemens, son of (1), described by Tacitus Hist.' iv.

68 as domui Vespasiani per adfinitatem innexum et gratissimum

Domitiano, Praetorianis [Domitianus] praeposuit, patrem eius, sub Caio

Caesare, egregie functum ea cura, dictitans, laetum militibus idem

nomen.' The relationship with the Imperial Flavian House may be traced

back to (8) Tertulla, the grandmother of Vespasian, by whom from

childhood he was brought up. Tertullus Clemens (1) the Prefect was

probably Vespasian's cousin and the companion of his boyhood. Arrecina

Tertulla (5), daughter of (1) and sister of (3), married Titus (19).

She died while Titus was quite young.

M. Arrecinus Clemens (3) was Consul Suffectus in 73 A.D. (CIL.' vi.

2016 and xiv. 2242) and a second time with L. Baebius Honoratus (CIL.'

xii. 3637). This second consulship appears to have been most probably

in 94 A.D. The Fasti Consulares are admittedly imperfect with regard to

the names of the consuls suffect. But the names of both the ordinary

Consuls Collega and Priscus and of the three suffects for 93 A.D. have

been preserved. In 94 A.D. Asprenas and Lateranus were ordinary

consuls. [503] In some lists Arrecinus Clemens appears, however, as the

colleague of Asprenas (see Dion Cassius, ed. Lipsiae, 1829, iv. p. 84).

The Chronicon Paschale' (extract given in Lightfoot, Clement of Rome,'

i. p. 110) has the following entries: 93 A.D. Domitian Augustus XIII

and Flavius Clemens, 94 A.D. Asprenatus [Asprenas] and Lateranus, 95

A.D. Domitian Augustus XIV and Flavius Clemens II. This is an instance

of that confusion of Arrecinus Clemens with Flavius Clemens which has

been the fruitful source of difficulties. Flavius Clemens was consul

only once and in 95 A.D., Arrecinus Clemens for the second time in 94

A.D. He was a member of the Imperial Council from 82 A.D. and also

Curator Aquarum. His name appears CIL.' vi. 199 xi. 428 and xv. 7278.

He was put to death by Domitian 94 A.D. or 95 A.D. (Suet. Domitian,'

11.)

(4) Plautilla. The Acts of Nereus and Achilles' represent these martyrs

as at first servants of Plautilla, the sister of Clement the Consul,

and afterwards of her daughter Domitilla the virgin. The Acts of

Petronilla,' which are incorporated with those of Nereus and Achilles,

state that these three saints were all buried in the crypt of

Domitilla. That they were real historical persons has been proved in

recent years by the discovery by De Rossi [504] of their memorials in

the cemetery of Domitilla. It is at least possible, therefore, that

Plautilla is likewise an historical person, and the presumption is

increased by the fact that she is definitely in these Acts represented

as the sister of Clement the Consul. De Rossi himself believed in her

real existence, and many others have followed him in the assumption,

which I have adopted, as also his suggestion that her mother's name was

Plautia. I differ, however, in my interpretation of the words sister of

Clement the Consul' in making her the sister not of Flavius but of

Arrecinus Clemens. If the historicity of the statement of the Acts of

Nereus and Achilles about Plautilla be accepted, it should be accepted

as a whole. Now stress is laid on the fact that the Plautilla of these

Acts died in the same year as St. Peter suffered martyrdom. The words

are explicit: eodem anno dominus Petrus apostolus ad coronam martyrii

properavit ad Christum et Plautilla corpus terrenum deseruit.'

Plautilla therefore could not well be the sister of Flavius Clemens,

the younger of the two sons of Flavius Sabinus, as these sons are

described as children at the time of their father's murder in December

69 A.D. The hypothesis that she was the daughter of M. Arrecinus

Tertullus Clemens the Praetorian Prefect of 41 A.D., and therefore

sister of M. Arrecinus Clemens the Consul of 73 A.D. and 94 A.D., and

that she was the wife and not the daughter of her cousin Flavius

Sabinus, the brother of Vespasian, and that, through her, T. Flavius

Clemens, her son, Consul in 95 A.D., obtained his cognomen, has about

it impress of verisimilitude.

(5) Arrecina Tertulla.--The first wife of the Emperor Titus. She died

quite young. See CIL.' vi. 12355, 12357.

(6) Clement the Bishop.--In the Clementine Homilies' and Clementine

Recognitions,' which are in reality Petrine romances derived from a

common original and dating from the beginning of the third century,

Clement is represented as a Roman by birth and of the kindred of

Caesar. His father is a relative and foster-brother of an emperor, and

his mother likewise connected with Caesar's family. The name of the

father is Faustus (Homilies'), Faustinianus (Recognitions'), Faustinus

(Liber Pontificalis'), of two elder brothers Faustinus and Faustinianus

(Homilies'), Faustinus and Faustus (Recognitions'), of the mother

Mattidia. Now these names belong to the period of Hadrian and the

Antonines. Faustina (died 141 A.D.) was the wife of the Emperor

Antoninus Pius, and her daughter of the same name (died 175 A.D.) was

the wife of his adopted son and successor, Marcus Aurelius. Mattidia

was the niece of Trajan, and her daughter Sabina the wife of the

Emperor Hadrian. As the romances throughout make Clement to have been

the disciple and companion of St. Peter and he is spoken of as being

already grown up at the time of the Crucifixion, it will be at once

perceived that the compilers of this Clementine literature were, in the

use that they made of tradition, absolutely indifferent to

chronological considerations. That they gave voice to a genuine

tradition both as regards Clement's discipleship to St. Peter and his

relationship to the family of the reigning Caesars is rendered in the

highest degree probable from the fact that the Clementine story is

merely a framework for the Ebionite or Helchasaite version of Peter's

travels, preaching and controversies with Simon Magus, which forms the

real subject-matter of this literature. [Hort, Clementine

Recognitions.'] M. Arrecinus Tertullus Clemens was the kinsman of

Vespasian, and as that emperor was brought up not in his paternal home

but by his grandmother Tertulla, it is quite possible that they were

actually foster-brothers. Tertullus was one of the Flavian cognomina.

Q. Flavius Tertullus was consul suffect. in 133 A.D. (CIL.' vi. 858).

Plautia was a relative of Plautia Urgulanilla, the second wife of

Claudius, her daughter Arrecina Tertulla the wife of Titus.

In the Acts of Nereus and Achilles' Clement the Bishop is addressed as

the nephew of Clement the Consul: patris tui fuisse germanum.' In the

Clementines he is represented as considerably the youngest of his

family. It is for various reasons more probable that he was the younger

brother than the nephew of M. Arrecinus Clemens, and such I have

assumed him to be.

(7) T. Flavius Petro.--The name of the famous saint, Petronilla, who

was buried in the Flavian cemetery of Domitilla, was probably derived

from this Flavian cognomen. A crop of legends grew up around her name,

as being a daughter of St. Peter. It is possible that she may have been

a spiritual daughter of the Apostle, as having been converted and

baptized by him.

(8), (9), (10). Titus Flavius Sabinus and his wife, according to

Suetonius, left Italy to live among the Helvetii; their son Vespasian

was educated by his grandmother Tertulla upon a family estate at Cosa

in the Volscian territory. (Suet. Vespasian,' 2, 3.)

(11) T. Flavius Sabinus, the elder son of (9) and (10). After serving

the State in thirty-five campaigns with distinction (Tac. Hist.' iii.

75) and having been Governor of Moesia for seven years, Sabinus was

appointed in 57 A.D. Prefect of the City. He held this important office

for twelve years continuously save for a brief interval in the short

reign of Galba. As Prefect of the City he must have taken part (perhaps

passively) in the persecution of the Christians in 65 A.D. and been the

witness of the courage with which so many martyrs faced torture and a

horrible death. Some have supposed that in his latter years he may to a

greater or less extent have fallen under the influence of the Christian

Faith. His whole career proclaims him to have been during the greater

part of his life a man of action. Tacitus speaks of his being invalidus

senecta' and describes him at this stage as mitem virum abhorrere a

sanguine et caedibus' (Hist.' iii. 65). When the Vitellians stormed the

Capitol, Flavium Sabinum inermem neque fugam coeptantem circumsistunt'

(Hist.' iii. 73). And again after his murder, in fine vitae alii

segnem, multi moderatum et civium sanguinis parcum credidere' (Hist.'

iii. 75). All these traits do not prove much in themselves, but the

fact that several of his descendants and relatives were undoubtedly

Christians lends a certain probability to the supposition that this

mildness, sluggishness, and unwillingness to resist arms in hand may

have been due to the acceptance of Christian principles. Sabinus

apparently did not marry till late in life, possibly not till after he

settled at Rome in 57 A.D., as his children were quite young at the

time of his murder in December 69 A.D. If Plautilla were his wife, she

died four years before her husband, leaving two sons and a daughter,

the younger son receiving his grandfather's cognomen Clemens.

(12) The Emperor Vespasian appears to have been in considerable poverty

at two periods of his life. His eldest son, Titus (19), was born

December 30, 39 A.D.: prope Septizonium sordidis aedibus cubiculo vero

perparvo et obscuro.' (Suet. Tit.' 1.) Yet a few years later we find

him being educated in the palace with Britannicus. It is suggested that

this change may have been partly brought about by the influence on

behalf of his kinsman of the Praetorian Prefect Arrecinus Tertullus

Clemens. At a later period, before he went as Proconsul to Africa in 61

or 62 A.D., he was in such bad circumstances that he had to mortgage

his entire property to his brother in order to raise money. (Tac.

Hist.' iii. 73.) His wife (13) and his daughter (22), both named Flavia

Domitilla, predeceased him. His younger son Domitian (25) seems when

Vespasian was abroad in Africa and Judaea to have lived with his uncle

Sabinus and to have been under his care. Titus (19) was, while still a

youth, married to his relative Arrecina Tertulla (5). Domitian (25),

born October 25, 51 A.D., was twelve years younger than his brother.

From the end of December 69 A.D. to the following June as Praetor with

full consular power he with Mucianus exercised in the absence of

Vespasian in Egypt and Titus in Judaea the imperial authority at Rome.

(15) Flavia Domitilla, spoken of by Eusebius, Chronicon' (Jerome's Lat.

vers. ed. Sch�ne ii. p. 163), thus:--Scribit Bruttius . . . Flaviam

Domitillam Flavii Clementis consulis ex sorore neptem in insulam

Pontianam relegatam, quia se Christianam esse testata est.' A similar

reference derived no doubt from the same source is found in Hist.

Eccl.' iii. 18, where the meaning of the word neptem is made clear:

Phlauian Dometillan . . . ex adelphes gegonuian Phlauiou Klementos,

henos ton tenikade epi Rhomes hupaton. Eusebius states that this took

place in the fifteenth year of Domitian, but, as I have pointed out in

Lecture VIII, it is almost certain that Eusebius has here misread his

authority and that the Consul to whom Flavia Domitilla was niece was

Arrecinus Clemens the Consul of 94 A.D., and not Flavius Clemens the

Consul of 95 A.D. The family of Flavius Sabinus (11) were children in

70 A.D.; it is scarcely possible therefore that this Flavia Domitilla

should have been old enough to occupy such a position of importance as

is here assigned to her, and still more so in the Acts of Nereus and

Achilles.' In those Acts' she appears as the daughter of Plautilla,

sister of Clement the Consul, and is clearly a woman of property with

chamberlains of her own. In the Chronicon Paschale' the same passage of

Bruttius, about the persecution of the Christians by Domitian, as

Eusebius quotes is referred to, but the notice of it appears under the

fourteenth year of Domitian, which began in September 94 A.D. The

banishment of this Domitilla to the island of Pontia I believe to have

taken place at the end of 94 A.D., after Arrecinus Clemens was Consul

and before Flavius Clemens entered on his consulship. The fact that

Eusebius neither in the Chronicle' nor Ecclesiastical History' makes

any mention of the execution of Flavius Clemens or the banishment of

his wife seems to me inferential evidence that his authority Bruttius

did not here record an event which Eusebius could scarcely have

overlooked in one or other of his two historical works. In my Table of

the Flavian Family I have made Flavia Domitilla [the virgin] the

daughter of FIavius Sabinus (15) and of Plautilla (4), the sister of

Arrecinus Clemens (3). I have further suggested in Lecture VIII that

after the murder of Sabinus, Plautilla being already dead, the maternal

uncle (3) undertook the charge of the orphan children. The two sons as

they grew up would in due course be cared for by the Emperor Vespasian,

as being the nearest male representatives of his family, his own two

sons having no male heirs, the daughter remaining still in the wardship

of the maternal uncle who had brought her up. It would be only natural

therefore in such circumstances for Bruttius to speak of her as the

niece of Arrecinus, rather than as the sister of Flavius.

The sudden condemnation to death of Arrecinus Clemens by Domitian, as

recorded by Suetonius (Domit.' 11), may well have been connected with

the same causes which led to his niece Domitilla's banishment, i.e. her

profession of the Christian faith and her contumacy in refusing to

marry at the Emperor's bidding.

(22), (23), (24) Dion Cassius (lxvii. 14) relates that Domitian put to

death his cousin Flavius Clemens while consul [Suet., Domit.' 15, says

almost before his consulship had ended] and that he sent his wife

Flavia Domitilla, also a relative, into exile on the island of

Pandateria. Suetonius does not mention the wife's banishment, but

remarks that this violent act--i.e. the execution--very much hastened

his own destruction' and then tells us of the tyrant's assassination by

Stephanus the steward of Domitilla. Philostratus (Apollonius,' viii.

25) in his account says that Stephanus was the freedman of Flavius

Clemens' wife. Quintilian, who was the tutor of Flavius Clemens' young

sons (of very tender age, Suet. Domit.' 15), makes it clear that their

mother was the daughter of Domitian's sister: cum vero mihi Domitianus

Augustus sororis suae nepotum delegaverit curam' (Inst. Orat.' Prooem.

2). This sister of Domitian died before her father Vespasian became

Emperor in 70 A. D. For epigraphic evidence of the existence of this

Flavia Domitilla, wife of Flavius Clemens, see CIL.' vi. 948, 8942 and

16246. The first of these as restored by Mommsen stands:

Flavia Domitilla FILIA.FLAVIAE.DOM.ITILLAE.

Imp. Caes. VespasiANI.NEPTIS.FECIT.GLYCERAE.L.ET.

� ? ? � ? ? � ? ? � ? ? � ? ? � ? ? �

The name of the NEPTIS is given in CIL.' vi. 8942:

FLAVIAE.DOMITIL

VESPASIANI.NEPTIS

There were thus four Flavia Domitillas: the wife of Vespasian (13), her

daughter (22), her granddaughter (24), and her niece (15).

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[503] The most complete Fasti Consulares for the Flavian Period are

found in a contribution by Asbach in Jahrb�cher des Vereins von

Altertumsfreunden im Rheinlande [Bonn] vol. 79, p. 6o ff. Asbach has

only discovered the name of one Suffectus in 94 A.D., but he quotes

Prosper as making Clement the colleague of Asprenas. It is almost

certain that in a year when the Emperor did not assume the consulship

there would be several Suffecti. In Muratori, Nov. Thes. Vet. Inscr.

tom. i. p. cccxlv, the full list for 93 A.D. is preserved. Consules 93.

Pompeius Collega, Cornelius Priscus, quibus suffecti fuerunt. M.

Lollius Paullinus, Valerius Asiaticus Saturninus. Horum uni suffectus

erat, C. Antistius Iulius Quadratus. So in 94 A.D. M. Arrecinus Clemens

and L. Baebius Honoratus were suffecti to Asprenas and Lateranus. The

suffect mentioned by Asbach--Silius Italicus--may have taken the place

of Clemens in the last months of 94 A.D.

[504] De Rossi, Bull. di Arch. Crist. 1874, pp. 5 ff., 68 ff., 122 ff.

&c. Roma Sotterranea, tom. i. pp. 130 ff. See also Lipsius, Apokryphen

Apost. Geschicht. II. i. p. 205.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

NOTE E

THE TOMBS OF THE APOSTLES ST. PETER AND ST. PAUL

If thou wilt go to the Vatican or to the Ostian road thou wilt find the

trophies of the Apostles who founded this Church.' These words of the

Roman presbyter Gaius (identified by Dr. Lightfoot [505] with the

well-known Hippolytus bishop of Portus) in his treatise against the

heretic Proclus are a positive testimony to the existence at the end of

the Second Century of trophies or memoriae--i.e. small oratories--over

the graves of the Apostles Peter and Paul. It further indicates in what

localities these visible monuments were to be found. Eusebius, to whom

we are indebted for the preservation of this piece of valuable

evidence, makes the further statement that the names of the Apostles

were to be seen in the cemeteries of Rome in his day. [506]

The Liber Pontificalis' contains what appears to be an authentic record

of the construction of one of these memoriae. Of bishop Anacletus

(Anencletus) it is said Hic memoriam Beati Petri construxit et

composuit.' The erection of these monuments may therefore be placed in

the early years of Domitian's reign.

The evidence from traditional sources as to the exact position of the

spots where the two Apostles were martyred and afterwards buried is

very detailed and complete, and, as is usual in topographical

references, is accurate, even though the narratives, in which these

references occur, are in the main apocryphal fictions of a late date.

The principal authorities in the case of St. Peter are as follows:

Liber Pontificalis': [Petrus] sepultus est via Aurelia in templum

Apollinis, iuxta locum ubi crucifixus est, iuxta palatium Neronianum,

in Vaticanum, iuxta territorium Triumphale.'

Jerome, De Viris Illustribus': Sepultus est in Vaticano iuxta viam

triumphalem totius orbis veneratione celebratur.'

Martyrium Beati Petri Apostoli': Ad locum qui vocatur Naumachiae iuxta

obeliscum Neronis in montem.'

Acta Petri': Apud palatium neronianum iuxta obeliscum inter duas

metas.'

Liber Pontificalis': [Cornelius] posuit iuxta locum ubi crucifixus est,

inter corpora sanctorum episcoporum, in templum Apollinis, in monte

aureo, in vaticanum palatii neroniani.'

De locis S.S. Martyrum': Petrus in parte occidentali civitatis iuxta

viam Corneliam ad milliarium primum in corpore quiescit.'

From these notices it will be seen that three roads are mentioned--the

Via Aurelia (Nova), the Via Triumphalis, and the Via Cornelia. These

three roads met at a point close to the Pons Neronianus or Triumphalis.

Between the Via Aurelia Nova and the Via Cornelia stood the Circus of

Nero, between the Via Cornelia and the Via Triumphalis the Vatican

hill. The Circus of Nero was the scene of the Games at which a

multitude of Christians perished by horrible tortures in the spring of

65 A.D., and here according to the Acta Petri' suffered St. Peter iuxta

obeliscum inter duas metas'--that is on the spina at a point

equidistant from the two goals, where the obelisk stood, the same

obelisk removed in 1586 to the front of the Basilica. The palatium

Neronianum and the Naumachia were appellations given in later days to

the remains of the Circus, which was destroyed when Constantine built

the first Basilica above St. Peter's tomb. The Mons Aureus (a

corruption of Aurelius) was so called from its proximity to the Via

Aurelia Nova, later the name was extended to the Janiculum also, the

southern part of which is still called Montorio. [507]

Templum Apollinis. Duchesne writes (Lib. Pont.' i. 120): Quant au

temple d'Apollon, il y a, clans cette d�signation, un souvenir du

c�l�bre sanctuaire de Cyb�le, qui s'�l�vait tout pr�s du cirque et de

la basilique, et qui fut, jusqu'aux derni�res ann�es du iv^e si�cle, le

th��tre des c�r�monies sanglantes du taurobolium et du criobolium . . .

Le Coll�ge des xv. viri sacris faciundis, qui �tait charg� du culte de

cette d�esse, �taient aussi directeurs du culte d'Apollon.' In any case

there was a building on this spot popularly known as the templum

Apollinis, witness the notice in the Liber Pontificalis' of Pope

Silvester (314-335 A.D.): eodem tempore Augustus Constantinus fecit

basilicam beato Petro apostolo in templum Apollinis.' (Duchesne, Lib.

Pont.' i. 176.)

The body of St. Peter then was buried in a small cemetery on the

Vatican hill close to the place where he was crucified. Over this tomb

Anencletus erected his memoria, and in the immediate vicinity the first

twelve bishops of Rome, with the exception of Clement and Alexander,

were according to the Liber Pontificalis' laid to rest--in each case

the phrase recurs sepultus est iuxta corpus beati Petri in Vaticanum.'

In time the entire space available was filled up. Zephyrinus was the

first to be buried in 217 A.D. on the Appian Way, and his successor

Calixtus created the crypt in the great subterranean cemetery called

after his name, where he himself and a number of his successors were

interred. The crypt of the Popes was discovered in 1854 by De Rossi,

and the inscriptions on the broken coverings of the Sarcophagi of

several of the bishops may still be seen. Excavations made near the

Great Altar of St. Peter's in the early seventeenth century by Paul V

and Urban VIII revealed many interesting facts. A large coffin was

found made of great slabs of marble containing a mass of half-charred

bones and ashes, pointing to the probability that Peter was interred

close by the remains of the martyrs who had perished as living torches

at the Neronian Vatican f�te. All round the Confessio' in which the

Apostle's relics were supposed to rest were placed coffins side by side

against the ancient walls, containing bodies swathed in Jewish fashion.

On the slabs that covered them were no inscriptions, save in one case

where the name Linus could be deciphered. [508] Whether these were the

bodies of the earliest bishops of Rome it is impossible to say, but the

discovery, taken in conjunction with the statements of the Liber

Pontificalis' which topographically are so often correct, makes the

supposition credible. The evidence is far from complete, but it is

weighty. The historical character of the notices relating to the

Vatican interments in the Liber Pontificalis' is borne out by the

remarkable omission of Clement and also of Alexander. The legend of

Clement's martyrdom in the Chersonese is fictitious. It may be taken as

certain that he did not die in Rome. In the Liber Pontificalis' we read

concerning Alexander--sepultus est via Numentana, ubi decollatus est,

ab urbe Roma non longe, miliario VII.' In the Itinerary or Pilgrim

Guide of William of Malmesbury: In septimo miliario eiusdem viae

[Nomentanae] s. papa Alexander cum Eventio et Theodulo pausant' (De

Rossi, Rom. Sott.' i. 179). [509] Again the later notices as to the

burials of Zephyrinus, of Callistus and their successors not on the

Vatican but upon the Appian Way have been verified by De Rossi and

other modern archaeologists. The statements as to the discoveries made

in the excavations of 1615 and 1626 rest on contemporary authorities.

Francesco Maria Torrigio, who was with Cardinal Evangelista Pallotta an

eye-witness of the exhumations of 1615, has given an account of them in

his work Le sacre Grotte vaticane,' 1639, and Giovanni Severano also

relates what he had heard in his Memorie sacre delle sette chiese di

Roma,' 1629. The master mason Benedetto Drei, who was likewise an

eye-witness of the discoveries made in 1615, has left an engraved plan

originally intended for Torrigio's book; one copy of this, in the

British Museum, is of exceptional interest, for it is covered with

autograph MS. notes in the handwriting of Drei himself. [510] In this

one can see how the tombs are so arranged round the central shrine that

the bodies seem to surround that of St. Peter like bishops assisting at

a council.' An account quite as circumstantial and authentic is given

by a certain R. Ubaldi, canon of the basilica, of the excavations made

in 1626. The MS. containing this narrative lay forgotten in the Vatican

Archives until it was discovered by Professor Gregorio Palmieri in

recent years and was transcribed and published by Cavalicre Mariano

Armellini in his work Le Chiese di Roma,' 1891. An English version may

be found in A. S. Barnes, St. Peter in Rome,' pp. 315-338, a work full

of interesting material and valuable research.

Let us now turn to the tomb of St. Paul on the Ostian Way. The

Apocryphal Acts all declare that St. Paul as became his status as a

Roman citizen suffered martyrdom by decapitation--honestiores capite

puniantur, and that he was led out to a place known as Aquae Salviae,

near the third mile-stone on the Ostian Way. This tradition has not

been seriously disputed. In the Greek Acts the addition is made that

the Apostle suffered under a pine-tree--eis massan kaloumenen Akkouai

Salbias plesi tou dendrou tou strobilou. An extant inscription of

Gregory the Great, 604 A.D., records the gift by him of a piece of land

at the Aquae Salviae to the basilica of St. Paul--Valde incongruum ac

esse durissimum videretur ut illa ei specialiter possessio non serviret

in qua palmam sumens martyrii capite est truncatus ut viveret, utile

iudicavimus eandem massam quae Aquas Salvias nuncupatur . . . cum

Christi Gratia luminaribus deputare.' [511] A memorial chapel was built

here in the fifth century, whose remains were discovered in 1867 under

the present Church of S. Paolo alle Tre Fontane, and in 1875 in the

course of some excavations for a water tank behind this church a number

of coins of Nero were found together with several pine-cones fossilised

by age.

The body of St. Paul according to tradition was buried by a Christian

matron of the name of Lucina in a plot of ground, which was her

property, about a mile nearer to Rome. It was not a subterranean

cemetery but one on the surface, and the piece of land was confined,

being hemmed in between the Ostian Road and another road, which has

since disappeared, known as the Via Valentiniana. [512] This spot in

the time of the presbyter Gaius, about 200 A.D., was marked like that

of St. Peter on the Vatican by a memorial oratory (trophy) probably

erected by Anencletus at the same time as the Petrine memoria already

referred to.

That the bodies of the Apostles did not continuously remain undisturbed

in their first resting places is one of those traditions which can be

supported by a body of evidence, leaving indeed some points doubtful

and obscure, but as regards the main fact almost conclusive. In that

Kalendar of the Church known as the Feriale Philocalianum' (about 354

A.D.) under the heading Depositio Martyrum' occurs the following entry:

III. Kal. Iul. Petri in Catacumbas et Pauli Ostense--Tusco et Basso

cons.'

The names of the Consuls fix the date as 258 A.D. and show that this

entry is taken from some official source. It is clearly unintelligible

as it stands. De Rossi however discovered at Berne a Codex of the

Martirologium Hieronymianum' which exhibits the same entry in a fuller

form:

III. Kal. Iul. Romae natale apostolorum sanctorum Petri et Pauli--Petri

in Vaticano via Aurelia Pauli vero in Via Ostensi, utrumque in

Catacumbis, passi sub Nerone, Basso et Tusco consulibus.' [513]

This can only mean that on June 29 the Feast of the Apostles was kept

in three places or stations--at the Vatican, on the Ostian Road, and in

a place known as the Catacombs in memory of some event which took place

in the consulate of Tuscus and Bassus, 258 A.D. The words bassi sub

Nerone must be regarded as a parenthesis. The existence of these three

stations is proved by a hymn of pseudo-Ambrose for June 29, as these

lines show:

Tantae per urbis ambitum

Stipata tendunt agmina;

Trinis celebrator viis

Festum sacrorum Martyrum.

Now it can be proved that these consular dates in the Kalendar signify

in other cases a translation of remains, and the conclusion is that a

translation of the bodies of St. Peter and St. Paul to the Catacombs

took place in 258 A.D.

There are many testimonies to the fact that the bodies of the two

Apostles did actually rest in the cemetery ad Catacumbas, but the

authorities differ as to the period at which the translation took place

and also as to the duration of time during which the relics remained in

their temporary tomb. The story contained in the Apocryphal Acta Petri

et Pauli' speaks of certain unknown people from the East who after the

Apostles' martyrdom attempted to carry off the bodies to their own

country, but being overtaken by an earthquake the people of Rome took

the bodies from them at the third milestone on the Appian Way at the

place called ad Catacumbas. Here the remains were deposited for one

year and seven months until tombs were built for them on the Vatican

and the Ostian Way. Now this story, of which there are several slightly

differing versions, is almost certainly based upon a real historical

event, the translation which took place in 258. The late writers of the

Acta' were utterly indifferent to chronology, and the deposition in the

cemetery on the Appian Way when Tuscus and Bassus were consuls was

associated with the martyrdoms and relegated with the accompaniment of

many confused and legendary details to the time of Nero. All

probability is against the story of the Acta.' Even if the Apostles

were put to death at the same time, and I have shown that there is a

very strong presumption that St. Peter's death preceded that of St.

Paul by two years, nothing could be more unlikely than the bringing

back of their bodies to be interred in the vicinity of their places of

execution when once they had been laid safely to rest in the cemetery

on the Appian Way. There were as yet no sacred associations connected

with the Vatican Hill and the Ostian Way to move the Roman Christians

to act in the manner described in these apocryphal narratives. [514]

The cause of the translation of 258 A.D. is not difficult to divine,

for this was the year of the outbreak of the persecution of Valerian.

An Edict had been issued against the Christians, forbidding their

meetings in the cemeteries. It might well be that fears were aroused

lest the sacred tombs of the Apostles should be desecrated, and so the

bodies were removed to a place of greater safety. The researches of

archaeologists have shown that the cemetery ad Catacumbas must in those

days have been admirably adapted for the purpose. It was ancient

already, it lay apart from other cemeteries, and it resembled rather a

pagan than a Christian place of burial (Duchesne, Lib. Pont.' cvii). It

has been in recent years most carefully examined and studied and in the

chamber known as the Platonia or Platoma a double tomb may still be

seen, said to be that in which the bodies were placed. [515] Here

Damasus (366-387 A.D.) built a basilica, which until the eighth century

was known as the Basilica of the Apostles, and on the walls of the

Chamber he placed an inscription in verse. In the Liber Pontificalis'

we read--Hic fecit basilicas duas: una beato Laurentio iuxta theatrum

. . . et in Catacumbas ubi iacuerunt corpora sanctorum apostolorum

Petri et Pauli, in quo loco platomam ipsam, ubi iacuerunt corpora

sancta, versibus exornavit.' This poem of Damasus has fortunately been

preserved. The text runs thus:

Hic habitare prius sanctos cognoscere debes

Nomina quisque Petri pariter Paulique requiris

Discipulos oriens misit quod sponte fatemur

Sanguinis ob meritum Christum qui per astra secuti

Aetherios petiere sinus regnaque piorum

Roma suos potius meruit defendere cives

Haec Damasus vestras referat nova sidera laudes. [516]

Those words discipulos oriens misit may possibly have given rise to the

later apocryphal fictions about the unknown men from the East, who

tried to carry off the bodies of the Apostles. Damasus however here

clearly means by these words the Apostles themselves, the word

discipulos being used instead of Apostolos through the exigencies of

the metre. He says in effect that though the East had sent the

Apostles, Rome, which had been the scene of their labours and their

deaths, had the best claim to retain them.

But even if it be granted that the notices in the Feriale

Philocalianum' and the Hieronymian Martyrology' contain an official

authentic statement that a translation of the relics to the cemetery ad

Catacumbas took place in 258 A.D., as such authorities as the Abb�

Duchesne, Monsignor de Waal, Professor Marucchi, and Father A. S.

Barnes admit, there are other difficulties to be overcome, and they

differ from one another in their interpretation of documentary

evidence, and in their views as to whether there were two translations

or one only, and as to the duration of the sojourn of the relics in the

Platonia. The Apocryphal Acta' say that the bodies were taken to the

Catacombs immediately after the martyrdom of the Apostles and were

removed to the tombs that had been prepared on the Vatican and on the

Ostian Way one year and seven months afterwards. The Itineraries or

Pilgrim Guides of the fifth and sixth centuries make the sojourn to be

forty years: Et iuxta eandem viam (Appiam) ecclesia est S. Sebastiani

martyris, ubi ipse dormit, et ibi aunt sepulchra Apostolorum Petri et

Pauli; in quibus xl annos requiescebant (De locis S.S. Martyrum');

Postea pervenies via Appia ad S. Sebastianum martyrem, cuius corpus

iacet in inferiori loco, et ibi sunt sepulchra Apostolorum Petri et

Pauli in quibus xl annos requiescebant' (Salzburg Notitia'). As

Duchesne and Barnes say, the term forty years is here undoubtedly

intended as a round number, though the former is inclined, it seems to

me, to extend it too widely. [517] The exact number of forty years

would bring us to an impossible date, the height of the fiercest

persecution which the Christian Church had to endure--that of

Diocletian. The period of one year and seven months mentioned in the

Apocryphal Acta' has, I have little doubt, some historical basis, which

now it is impossible to discover, [518] but that the relics of the

Apostles remained in the Platonia at least until the year 284 the Acta'

of St. Sebastian testify. According to these Acta ' the Saint was

buried in the Catacomb which still bears his name close to the Platonia

because he had in a vision expressed the wish that his body might lie

near the vestigia of the holy Apostles. [519] There is another

difficulty to be surmounted. In the biography of Pope Cornelius,

251-253 A.D., in the Liber Pontificalis' the statement is made that at

the request of a certain matron Lucina by name the bodies of the

blessed Apostles Peter and Paul were taken up by night; and that Lucina

first buried the blessed Paul in her own ground (in praedio suo) on the

Ostian Road and then that Cornelius placed the body of Peter close to

the spot where he was crucified among the bodies of the holy

bishops--in templum Apollinis, in Monte Aureo in Vaticanum palatii

Neroniani iii Kai. Iul.' Now it is clear that if the bodies of the

Apostles were only brought to the cemetery ad Calacumbas in 258 A.D.,

they cannot have been restored to their former tombs some years

earlier. Duchesne, Marucchi, and Barnes are all of opinion that this

paragraph in the notice of Cornelius has been somehow misplaced. [520]

Further it is stated that after the martyrdom of this Pope this same

Lucina gathered together his remains (cuius corpus noctu collegit) and

buried it in her own ground (praedio suo) in a crypt close to the

Cemetery of Callistus. Apparently therefore Lucina had property, which

she converted into a cemetery, both on the Ostian and the Appian Way.

Now Barnes has proposed a solution of this difficulty which is both

ingenious and well worthy of consideration. [521] He suggests that in

some worn MS. the name Marcellus has been read as Cornelius and that

the passage relating to the restoration of the bodies of the Apostles

to their original tombs belongs to the biography of Marcellus. The

Pontificate of Marcellus is separated from that of his predecessor

Marcellinus by an interregnum due to the persecution of Diocletian, and

its date was probably 306-309 A.D. In the biography of this Pope there

is again mention of a certain matron, Lucina, the widow of a man named

Marcus. On the martyrdom of Marcellus she gathered together his remains

(cuius corpus collegit) and buried it in the Cemetery of Priscilla.

Lucina, it is said, gave all her property to the Church, and a

comparison of the various documents seems to point to that portion of

the cemetery of Priscilla on the Via Salaria Nova, where Marcellus and

his successors were buried, having been the property of this Lucina. By

the time of the accession of Marcellus the bodies of the Apostles had

been in the Platonia nearly 50 years. The abdication of Diocletian in

305 A.D. led to peace [522] being restored to the Christian Church in

Rome by the advent of Maxentius to power. This then would be a very

fitting time for a new pope to prepare the removal of the Apostolic

relics from the catacomb to their original tombs. There is extant an

inscription of Damasus [523] which tells us that the severity of

Marcellus to those who had lapsed in the persecution stirred up violent

strife and discord leading to sedition and the shedding of blood.

Veridicus rector, lapsos quia crimina fiere

Praedixit, miseris fuit omnibus hostis amarus;

Hinc furor, hinc odium sequitur, discordia, lites,

Seditio, caedes; solvuntur foedera pacis.

Crimea ob alterius, Christum qui in pace negavit,

Finibus expulsus patriae est feritate tyranni.

Haec breviter Damasus voluit comperta referre

Marcelli ut populus meritum cognoscere posset.

This inscription contains no reference to Marcellus having brought back

the bodies of St. Peter and St. Paul to the Vatican and the Ostian Way,

but the brevity of the poetical encomium of Damasus, as he himself

states, made him confine himself to praising those actions of the

bishop which were the cause of the suffering and exile that befell him.

[524] I would suggest, however, that in these discords and tumults, to

which the inscription refers, may be found perhaps an explanation of

the delay of one year and seven months in the entombment of the

Apostles of which the Apocryphal Acta' (Passio Petri el Pauli) speak.

The strange passage, which tells of how while the bodies of the

Apostles were being carried off by the Greeks to be taken to the East,

there was a great earthquake and the Roman people ran out and seized

them in the place which is called Catacumba at the third milestone on

the Via Appia, and the bodies were kept there for one year and seven

months, until the places were built in which their bodies were placed,

and then they were brought back with glory of hymns and were deposited

that of St. Peter in the Vatican and that of St. Paul on the Ostian Way

at the second milestone,' may well be a distorted and misdated version

of events that really took place in the days of Marcellus. Let us

suppose that on the first anniversary day of the Apostles, June 29,

after the accession of Maxentius an attempt was made to remove the

relics from the Catacombs, but that it was frustrated by the sudden

attack of a hostile crowd, from whose hands the bodies were with

difficulty rescued and taken back to the Platonia. Then about a year

and a half later after all preparations had been carefully made the

translation was successfully carried out. Now in the Liberian

Catalogue' under the heading depositio martyrum the entry occurs viii.

kl. Martias fatale Petri de Cathedra,' and this commemoration Professor

Marucchi states was according to ancient documents observed from the

Fourth century with such feasting that it gained the popular name of

dies sancti Petri epularum.' [525] Further in the Laterculum of

Silvias, 448 A.D., it is said that in earlier times this commemoration,

held on February 22, was a joint festival of SS. Peter and Paul. [526]

Was it not then on this date that after a year and seven months the

actual translation took place?

What may be called the Marcellus hypothesis remains however little more

than a plausible conjecture, for no positive evidence can be brought

forward to establish its truth.

Nevertheless an examination of the Apocryphal Acta' reveals the fact

that a certain Marcellus was supposed to be the writer of the Passio

Petri et Pauli' from which the extract quoted above about the attempt

to carry off the Apostles' bodies, and about their lying for a year and

seven months in the Catacombs, is taken. Marcellus it is who after the

martyrdom takes the lead in burying St. Peter near the Naumachia in the

place called the Vatican.' Lipsius in his work on the Apostolic legends

devotes a whole section to what he styles der sogenannte

Marcellustext.' [527] Nor is this all. On late authority St. Paul was

said to have been buried by a certain matron Lucina in her own property

(in praedio suo) on the Ostian Way, [528] In the Liber Pontificalis'

the Lucina of the Cornelius biography buries St. Paul on the return

from the Catacombs on the Ostian Way in praedio suo.' The Lucina of the

Marcellus biography is the widow of Marcus, in the Passio Petri et

Pauli' Marcus is the father of Marcellus. In all probability the three

Lucinas are one and the same person, whose activity was connected with

the life of Pope Marcellus. If this should be so, it will at once

appear that a strong case is made for placing the return of the relics

from the Platonia in the pontificate of Marcellus, about 307 A.D.

That the bodies of the Apostles were believed to lie in the tombs on

the Vatican and on the Ostian Way when Constantine determined to erect

basilicas over their remains is certain. The exact year in which these

were built is unknown, except that it was in the Pontificate of Pope

Silvester, 314-335. The words of the Liber Pontificalis' (Duchesne, 176

and 178) tell us that the object of the Emperor was to do honour to the

sacred tombs of the Apostles. The sarcophagus which contained the body

of St. Peter he enclosed in bronze from Cyprus and fixed it at the

central point of a cubical chamber of masonry--cuius loculum undique

aere Cypro conclusit, quod est immobile; ad caput, pedes V; ad pedes,

pedes V; ad latus dextrum, pedes V; ad latus sinistrum, pedes V;

subter, pedes V; supra, pedes V; sic inclusit corpus beati Petri et

recondit.' He then placed on the coffin a cross of gold (with an

inscription)--super corpus Petri, supra aera quod conclusit, fecit

crucem ex auro purissimo, pens. lib. cl. in mensuram loci, ubi scriptum

est hoc CONSTANTINVS AVGVSTVS ET HELENA AVGVSTA HANC DOMVM REGALEM

SIMILI FVLGORE CORVSCANS AVLA CIRCVMDAT, scriptum ex litteris nigellis

in cruce ipsa.'

Constantine likewise built a basilica on the Ostian Way to the memory

of St. Paul, whose sarcophagus was, like St. Peter's, enclosed in

bronze and a cross of gold placed over it cuius corpus ita recondit in

aere et conclusit sicut beati Petri . . . et crucem auream super locum

beati Pauli apostoli posuit pens. lib. cl.' The scrupulous care that

was taken not to disturb the tombs in any way was conspicuously shown

in the instance of the Constantinian basilica of St. Paul. It was the

custom in the early basilicas that the altar upon the tomb of the saint

or martyr to whom the church was dedicated should be placed at the west

end at the central point of the chord of an apse round which the clergy

sat on either side of the bishop or other dignitary. The Celebrant

stood with his back to this apse facing eastward with the congregation

before him in the nave. Now the tomb of St. Paul lay so near to the

Ostian Way, one of the main roads from Rome, that this first basilica

was of diminutive proportions. Before however many years were past it

was felt that so small a church was unworthy of St. Paul, and another

basilica on the same scale as that of St. Peter was erected in 386 A.D.

To effect this without touching the tomb and altar led to a completely

new departure in the internal arrangements of the basilica, a new

departure that was to have permanent results by being generally

adopted. [529] The church was reversed, the apse was now placed at the

east end, but the celebrant still stood on the west side of the altar

facing eastwards, with result that he looked towards the clergy in the

apse and had his back to the congregation in the nave: a custom which

has since become universal. Another innovation arose from the desire to

cover all the consecrated ground, where the first basilica had stood,

and a transverse nave at right angles to the main nave was built, and

thus came into existence in 386 A.D. the earliest known example of a

cruciform church. No stronger evidence could be brought forward to show

the scrupulous and reverential care with which the early Christians

cherished and guarded the burial places of their dead. In this they

were aided by the laws of the State, which declared every tomb to be

locus sacer, locus religiosus,' and there is seen to be no

impossibility in the assumption that the sarcophagi which Constantine

enclosed in bronze really contained the bodies of the Apostles.

Whatever care was bestowed on other tombs, those of St. Peter and of

St. Paul would from the first be regarded with exceptional veneration,

and be watched over and tended with peculiar devotion, so that it would

be most unlikely that those who translated the relics to the catacombs

in 258 A.D. should have made any mistake.

The question whether these sarcophagi encased in bronze by Constantine

are still in existence, or whether they were destroyed by the Saracens

in 846 A.D. or by the soldiery of Bourbon in 1527, can only be answered

positively by excavations which it may safely be said will never be

undertaken. Probability on the whole seems to be that, though the

shrines were plundered and destroyed, the tombs themselves were

untouched. If the story told by Bonanni, [530] who professes to be

giving from the MS. of a contemporary of the event (Torrigio) the

evidence of eyewitnesses, be true, then in some alterations that were

being made in 1594 by the orders of Pope Clement VIII to the altar of

the Confession an aperture was opened through which the sarcophagus of

St. Peter with the gold cross gleaming upon it was seen by the Pope

himself, and Cardinals Bellarmine, Antoniano and Sfondrato. By

Clement's command the aperture was filled up with cement and has not

been opened since. Further in the excavations by Paul V in 1615 and by

Urban VIIl in 1626, in the immediate vicinity of the shrine, conclusive

evidence was obtained that the early Christian sepulchres which

clustered round the sacred resting place of the Apostle had never been

disturbed.

In the case of St. Paul's shrine a very interesting discovery made in

1835, when the basilica was being rebuilt after the great fire of 1823,

points to the conclusion that the tomb had not been interfered with

since the fourth century. A slab of marble measuring seven feet by four

feet was uncovered with the simple inscription

PAVLO

APOSTOLO MART.

The opinion of archaeologists who have examined the slab is unanimous

that the character of the inscription and the form of the letters fix

the date as belonging to the age of Constantine. Under the name [531]

is a round aperture, the ancient billicum confessionis, sometimes

called the fenestrella or little window, through which handkerchiefs or

other objects were lowered so as to be hallowed by contact with the

sarcophagus.
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[505] Apost. Fathers, part i. vol. ii. pp. 318, 377-83.

[506] Hist. Eccl. ii. 25.

[507] For the tradition connected with S. Pietro in Montorio and its

origin see Lanciani, Pagan and Christian Rome, p. 128; Barnes, S. Peter

in Rome, p. 98.

[508] The evidence of Torrigio (but see below Drei's plan) is not

clear, whether the name Linus was a separate word, or the termination

of such a name as Marcellinus. The tomb of Linus appears however to

have been known in the ninth century according to the poet Rhabanus

Maurus. Acta Sanct. 6 Sept. p. 543.

[509] There is some doubt about Alexander. Marucchi, El�m. d'Arch.

Chr�t. i. p. 28.

[510] An excellent reproduction of this will be found in Barnes's St.

Peter in Rome, facing p. 304. Drei's MS. notes confirm the reading

Linus.

[511] Marucchi, El�m. d'Arch. Chr�t. ii. p. 74; De Rossi, Roma

Sotterranea, i. p. 182; Bullet. di Arch. Crist. 1869, pp. 81 ff.;

Lanciani, Pagan and Christian Rome, pp. 156-7.

[512] Stevenson, L'area di Lucina sulla Via Ostiense' in Nuovo Bullet:.

di Arch. Crist. 1898, pp. 68 ff.

[513] Duchesne, Lib. Pont. i. p. cv.

[514] A letter of Gregory the Great to the Empress Constantina about

600 A.D. shows that the legend of the early translation was current in

his time and accepted by him. Opp. St. Greg. ii. ep. 30.

[515] Dr. A. De Waal, Die Apostelgruft ad Catacumbas an der Via Appia;

Marucchi, Le Merorie degli Apostoli Pietro e Paolo in Roma, 1903, pp.

75-92.

[516] De Rossi, Inscr. Crist. ii. p. 52.

[517] Duchesne (Lib. Pont. cv and cvii) suggests a date after 313 A.D.,

Barnes (St. Peter in Rome) 308 or 309 A.D.

[518] See suggestion infra, p. 269.

[519] Acta Sanctorum, Jan. 2, p. 622.

[520] Duchesne, Liber Pont. i. p. 151; Marucchi, Le Memorie degli

Apostoli Pietro e Paolo, p. 56; Barnes, St. Peter in Rome, pp. 116 ff.

[521] St. Peter in Rome, pp. 119-127.

[522] Gibbon, Decline and Fall, vol. ii. p. 161: The revolt of

Maxentius immediately restored peace to the Churches of Italy and

Africa, and the same tyrant who oppressed every other class of his

subjects showed himself just, humane, and even partial towards the

afflicted Christians.'

[523] De Rossi, Inscr. Crist. ii. pp. 62, 103, 138.

[524] That there is confusion in the traditions relating to Cornelius

and Marcellus is evident from the fact that in the Liber Pontificalis

Cornelius is beheaded in Rome, in the Liberian Catalogue in exile at

Centumcellis, cum gloria dormitionem accepit. Damasus makes Marcellus

apparently die in exile. In the Liber Pontificalis he is condemned to

tend horses in stables at Rome and dies of ill-usage. The inscription

of Damasus is however authentic, as is the extant slab containing the

words Cornelius Martyr, in the crypt where this Pope was buried.

[525] Marucchi, El�m. d'Arch. Chr�t. ii. pp. 453-6; De Rossi, Bullett.

d. Arch. Crist. 1890, p. 72 ff.

[526] Blunt, Annot. Book of Common Prayer (The Conversion of St. Paul')

[527] Lipsius, Die Apokryphen Apostelgeschichten und Apostellegenden,

2er Band 1e H�lfte, pp. 284-386. One MS. Cod. Urbin. is headed--III.

Kl. Iulii Passio beatorum Petri et Pauli a Marcello discipulo Petri

edita quique idem interfuit passioni.'

[528] De Rossi, Roma Sotterranea, ii. p. 262; Stevenson, L'area di

Lucina sulla Via Ostiense,' Nuovo Bullett. 1898, p. 60 ff.

[529] Barnes, St. Peter in Rome, p. 215 ff.; Belloni, Della grandezza

et la disposizione della primitiva Basilica Ostiense.

[530] Bonanni, Temp. Vatic. Historia, published in 1696, p. 149.

[531] There are also two square apertures of later date, purpose

unknown.
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NOTE F.

The Roman Catacombs.

The Cemeteries of Priscilla and Domitilla.

During the first century of our era the Romans almost universally

practised cremation for the disposal of their dead. The law of the XII

Tables supposes inhumation as well as cremation to be in use; but

cremation gradually became the vogue and it was not until the age of

the Antonines that, largely through the influence of Christianity and

other Oriental cults, a reversion to the practice of inhumation began

to take place. The early Christians from the first adopted the Jewish

custom of burial, and their tombs were, whenever circumstances

permitted, fashioned after the likeness of those in Palestine,

sepulchres like that of the Lord Jesus Christ. No burials were

permitted within the city of Rome; but the beds of soft volcanic tufa

which lay beneath the soil of the suburban area afforded easy

facilities for the excavation of subterranean galleries, vaults, and

crypts in which to lay the dead. Hence gradually in the course of the

first four centuries came into existence that vast underground city of

the dead, often incorrectly spoken of as the Roman Catacombs. The word

Catacombs strictly applies to one small cemetery only, the locus ad

catacumbas [532] where the bodies of St. Peter and St. Paul in 258 A.D.

found a temporary resting-place. The first Christian cemeteries

differed in no way from those of the Jewish community, three of which

have been discovered and explored. [533] There has been much written on

the subject of the Roman Catacombs which does not need consideration

here. The cemeteries of the first century, whatever may have been the

case later, were the property of private persons of rank and wealth,

and were intended in the first place for the use of the family to which

the owners belonged, also for that of their clients, freedmen and

slaves, and by permission for other poor persons belonging to the

Christian brotherhood. As yet there was no question of the formation of

Collegia funeratica or Burial Guilds, though it is regarded as highly

probable that such organisations with their collective ownership and

special privileges did exist in the third century; indeed it is known

that the several cemeteries were each attached to a titulus--or parish

church. But this was not the case in the period with which we are

dealing, when the places of assembly for congregational worship were

still private houses--ecclesiae domesticae. The most ancient parts of

the cemeteries of Priscilla and DomitilIa and the crypt of Lucina,

which date from Apostolic times, were family vaults constructed beneath

the property of the person after whose name they are called, and

granted by that person, as a locus sacer' placed under the protection

of the Roman Law (lex monumenti). Henceforward the tomb was held

inviolable, whatever might be the religion of those interred in it. The

plot of ground (area) was often enclosed by walls, or its dimensions

were engraved on boundary stones. Sometimes the inscription is found

Sibi suisque, libertis libertabusque posterisque eorum,' sometimes the

letters H.M.H.N.S.--hoc monumentum haeredem non sequitur.' The

administration of the leges monumentorum lay within the jurisdiction of

the pontifices, who were thus the legal guardians of the inviolability

of the burial-places thus granted, and their leave was required for the

deposition of the bodies in the tombs or their translation, or indeed

for the holding of anniversary festivals or rites or for any changes in

the construction or character of the monuments. These powers do not

seem to have been arbitrarily or vexatiously used, but it must always

be remembered that they did exist and that the catacombs were in no

sense secret and unknown hiding-places of the early Christians, but,

with the exception perhaps of a few small subterranean crypts carefully

concealed, like the Platonic chamber in which the bodies of the

Apostles for awhile were laid, were registered and thus known to the

magistrates.

The Roman Catacombs are one of the wonders of the world. It has been

calculated that the length of the galleries in the cemeteries excavated

within three miles of the Gates of Servius amounts to 540 miles, the

quantity of material removed by excavation 96,000,000 cubic feet, and

the number of bodies interred at the very least 1,700,000. [534] Of

this vast network of subterranean galleries only a comparatively small

portion has been explored, though progress is being made year by year,

and unfortunately all the cemeteries as they have been opened out have

been found to be in a miserable state of ruin and devastation.

Nevertheless, the Catacombs even in their present condition contain in

the inscriptions and frescoes that still cover the walls, and in the

remains of the shrines of saints and martyrs, a most precious record

not merely of the names of the Christians who in the ages of

persecution found their last resting-place in the loculi arranged along

the walls of these crypts and galleries, but of their beliefs, prayers,

rites, worship, and modes of thought. Historically we are here in the

presence of a crowd of witnesses who though dead yet speak to us, of a

mass of evidence that is incontrovertibly authentic.

By far the larger part of the tombs in the Catacombs belong to the

century and a half which preceded the peace of the Church under

Constantine, 313 A.D. But after the middle of the fourth century,

although by the care of Pope Damasus (366-384 A.D.) and others

basilicas were erected over the most venerated remains of famous

martyrs, and the chapel-crypts in which the bodies actually lay were

adorned with rich shrines and mural decorations, subterranean interment

gradually ceased [535] and in the fifth century the Catacombs had

become simply sanctuaries, whither pilgrims resorted to pray before the

tombs of the martyrs. For three centuries a continual stream of

pilgrims made their way, to Rome for this purpose, and some of the

Itineraries or guide-books that they used still exist. Meanwhile the

cemeteries were already in the seventh century beginning to be robbed

of their precious contents, as in 645 A.D. and in 652 A.D. a number of

the bodies of martyrs were removed from the Catacombs into Rome in

order to save them from pillage and desecration at the hands of

barbarian invaders. Finally in the time of Paschal I (817-824 A.D.)

this translation to churches within the city walls was carried out on

an extraordinary scale. It is said that the remains of no fewer than

2300 martyrs were deposited in one single church, that of St. Praxedis.

Henceforward the pilgrimages came to an end, the Catacombs were

deserted, and in time their very existence was forgotten. The

accidental re-opening of a Christian cemetery by some workmen in the

Vigna Sanchez on the Via Salaria in 1578 led to a revival of interest.

It was part of what is now known as the Catacomb of the Jordani, but a

landslip, owing to the rough carelessness of those who first examined

these crypts, completely destroyed them and no trace of them now

remains. It was fortunate that at the beginning of the seventeenth

century a really intelligent and scientific exploration of the

Catacombs was undertaken by Antonio Bosio, died 1629 A.D., who devoted

thirty years to the study of the subject and was the real founder of

Christian archaeology. He had great difficulties in his way owing to

lack of resources for the purposes of excavation, but his Roma

Sotterranea,' published after his death in 1632, is of very great value

owing to the wanton destruction during the next two centuries of

monuments and works of art, which had survived as memorials of early

Christianity in Rome. The one object of the exploration of the

Catacombs, even on the part of those who did seriously study Christian

archaeology and whose writings are a proof of the interest they felt in

their subject--Aringhi, Boldetti, Bottari [536] and others--was the

discovery of the relics of saints. To effect this purpose the

cemeteries were pillaged and ravaged, the loculi broken open, their

contents carried away, the inscriptions broken to pieces or removed

wholesale, the precious works of art found in the tombs--gold and

silver vessels, lamps, medallions, engraved seals, precious stones, and

personal ornaments--stolen and scattered far and wide. Some of these

are to be seen to-day in museums and private collections, but the

greater part have disappeared. Not until the middle of the nineteenth

century was a successor found who approached the study of the Catacombs

in. the scientific spirit of Bosio, and with far greater genius.

Giovanni Battista de Rossi (1822-94), whose early interest in the

subject of Christian archaeology had been aroused by the labours of P.

Marchi, [537] whose pupil indeed he was, gave his whole life with a

thoroughness and industry which could not be surpassed to the

investigation of all known sources which threw light upon the

topography and history of subterranean Rome. He possessed in a peculiar

manner a special combination of gifts--patience, imagination and

insight, and the results of his labours have been not merely fruitful

in discovery and in additions to our knowledge of early Christianity,

but they have proved that the so-called legends of the Acta Sanctorum,'

though late in date, are never to be regarded as simply fictitious

romances, the efforts of imaginative invention. On the contrary,

however great the accretion of legendary details, largely thaumaturgic,

these stories deal with real historical persons and have been built up

on a basis of genuine fact. Of De Rossi's method of working and the

materials that he used in his researches--i.e. the Pilgrim Itineraries

of the seventh century, five of which are still preserved in monastic

libraries, the ancient topographies, the Sillogae Epigraphicae' drawn

up in the eighth and ninth centuries, the famous Monza papyrus

containing a list of the sacred oils from the various shrines sent by

Gregory the Great to the Lombard Queen Theodelinda, the notices in the

Liber Pontificalis,' the Hieronymian Martyrology, the lists in the

Liberian Catalogue entitled Depositio Episcoporum' and Depositio

Martirum,' and the Acta Sanctorum' themselves--a full account is given

by himself in his published works, [538] which should be consulted.

References have already been made to the most important of the

discoveries which have in recent years rewarded the explorers of the

first century cemeteries of Priscilla and Domitilla under De Rossi's

inspiring guidance, and it is unnecessary to restate at length what has

been written. The bearing however of these and other discoveries in the

same localities on the history of the Christian Church in Rome during

the second half of the twelfth century is of such an interesting

character that a brief recapitulation of results may be of service.

The vast cemetery of Priscilla lies on the Via Salaria Nova on the

north side of the city. It consists of two stories, in each of which is

found a network of galleries and crypts. The present entrance is modern

(1865), the ancient door stands on the opposite side of the road, above

which can be still read the inscription in the red letters which denote

great antiquity, COEM. PRISCILLAE. It was in 1888 that De Rossi in the

course of excavations discovered the crypt and chapel of the Acilian

gens. The explorers first came across a broken marble slab containing

the words ACILIO GLABRIONI FILIO, and afterwards the ruined crypt was

unearthed and other fragments of inscriptions to members of various

branches of the Acilian family. Formerly the walls had been encrusted

with marble or coated with fine plaster and covered with frescos and

mosaics, but everything had been smashed to pieces by the hands of

relic and treasure hunters in the middle of the seventeenth century.

Nevertheless the historical value of this signal find is great. It may

be held to establish the fact that M' Acilius Glabrio, the consul of 91

A.D., who was put to death by Domitian accused of following Jewish

manners and strange superstitions' and of being an inciter of

innovations,' was a Christian, and not merely so but that in the second

century many members of this distinguished family belonging to the high

aristocracy of Rome had embraced the Christian faith. It seems to

follow that this cemetery was excavated under property belonging to the

Acilian House. The names of Priscilla and Prisca are found on

inscriptions as in use among members of this family, and the Priscilla

who was the donor of the ground and founder of the cemetery was

doubtless a near relative of the Consul. In the preceding Note on the

Legend of Pudens' it has been pointed out that there is no necessary

inconsistency in the two statements that Priscilla was mother of Pudens

and sister or aunt of M' Acilius Glabrio. Indeed there are signs that

the Acilian crypt and the primitive cemetery of Priscilla, though

closely adjoining, were originally separated, the crypt being

approached by a distinct staircase. If so, it is quite possible, as the

Acta' seem to indicate, that the cemetery may have been through his

mother the property of Pudens, the crypt at its side constructed

beneath land belonging to Glabrio. Above the cemetery of Priscilla,

after the peace of the Church, was built a basilica, afterwards known

as St. Sylvester, [539] into which the bodies of many martyrs and

saints were translated from the crypts below in the fourth century. The

bodies however of Pudens and his daughters and of Aquila and Prisca

were left undisturbed until the time of Leo IV in the middle of the

ninth century. Leo IV appears to have made a careful exploration of the

cemetery, but after his days it fell into disuse and complete

abandonment. Beneath the story where these bodies lay is a second

story, consisting of a long gallery out of which open some twenty

transversal galleries as yet very imperfectly explored. Of this second

story deep down below the surface and approached by two or more

staircases from the upper galleries Marucchi writes: On peut dire sans

exagg�ration que c'est la region cimet�riale la plus vaste et la plus

r�guli�re de toute la Rome souterraine. Ses inscriptions grav�es sur

marbre, ou peintes en rouges sur des tuiles comme au premier �tage,

attestent qu'au moins en partie elle remonte � la plus haute antiquit�.

A mon avis, il y eut l� un noyau cimet�rial d�s le Il^e si�cle.' [540]

One of the most remarkable features of the cemetery of Priscilla is the

existence of two large tanks, one on each floor, besides several

smaller ones. These two large tanks were almost certainly ancient

baptisteries. Marucchi has written learnedly, and with a considerable

measure of success, to identify the cemetery of Priscilla with the

Cymiterium Ostrianum, ubi Petrits apostolus baptizavit' of the

apocryphal Acta Liberii.' This cemetery also was called ad Nymphas or

ad Fontes S. Petri, names which might well be derived from the tanks

just mentioned. One of the principal pieces of evidence adduced by

Marucchi is found in the Catalogue of Monza containing a list of the

phials of sacred oil taken from the different shrines and sent to Queen

Theodelinda by the direction of Gregory the Great. Under the heading

Salaria Nova' follows: Sedes ubi sedit Scs Petrus ex oleo Sci Vitalis

Scs Alexander Scs Martialis Scs Marcellus Sci Silvestri Sc Felicis Sci

Filippi et aliorum multorum Scorum. . . .' All these saints mentioned

were buried either in the Cemetery of Priscilla or its immediate

vicinity. [541] In any case we are in the presence here of the most

ancient of Roman baptisteries.

The Cemetery of Domitilla lies to the west of the Via Ardeatina (a road

which ran parallel to the Via Appia) close to the point where it is

crossed by the modern Via delle Sette Chiese. The cemetery extends

under a property known as the Tor Marancia, a name doubtless derived

from a certain Amaranthus. [542] In excavations made on this property a

number of pagan tombs were found, which gave the clue to De Rossi that

he was seeking in order to locate the cemetery of Domitilla mentioned

in the Acts of Nereus and Achilles.' One of these discovered in 1772

contains the words

FLAVIAE � DOMITILLAE

VESPASIANI � NEPTIS

EIVS � BENEFICIO � HOC � SEPVLCRVm

MEIS � LIBERTIS � LIBERTABVS � POsuit.

Another found in 1817 records how a certain Calvisius Philotas made

this tomb for his brother Sergius Cornelius Julianus, for his wife

Calvisia, and for himself

EX INDVLGENTIA FLAVIAE DOMITILL.

In close vicinity to these were discovered four inscriptions to members

of the Bruttian gens. One of these makes mention of a Bruttius

Praesens.

D M.

BRVTIO � VENVSINO

C � BRVTTIVS � PRAESENS

PATRONVS � LIBERTO

BENE � MERENTI � FECIT.

Now Eusebius in his Chronicle' tells us that he derived his information

about the Domitianic persecution and the banishment of Flavia Domitilla

to the island of Pontia from an historian named Bruttius, who may

possibly be identified with C. Bruttius Praesens, who was consul for

the second time in 139 A.D. This group of indications led Dc Rossi to

suspect that the cemetery which lay beneath the Tor Marancia was none

other than the Cemetery of Domitilla, in which, according to the Acts

of Nereus and Achilles,' those martyrs were buried.

Acting on this hypothesis the Commission of Sacred Archaeology under

the direction of De Rossi began a systematic exploration of the

cemetery in 1852. At first progress was but slow, owing to the

difficulties placed in the way of research by the then proprietor of

the property. Tor Marancia was however in 1873 purchased by Monsgr.

Francesco de Merode, with the aim of forwarding the work by every means

in his power. Already in 1865 De Rossi had re-discovered the original

entrance to the Catacomb hewn out of the side of a low cliff. It must

always have been a conspicuous object to the passer-by, and is a proof

of the great security which was felt in the protection and immunity

from disturbance afforded by the law to all places of burial. This

entrance opened into a vestibule adorned with biblical frescoes, which

were plainly visible from outside through the door. To this vestibule

De Rossi gave the name of Il vestibule dei Flavi; its construction is

assigned to the first century. The inscription above the entrance was

missing, but in 1874 in the ruins of the basilica of St. Petronilla

only a very short distance from the entrance was a fragment of marble

containing a portion of a title, which De Rossi has restored thus:

SepulcRVM

FlaviORVM

Below this is the Christian symbol, an anchor. In 1873 De Rossi was

rewarded by the discovery of the basilica of Nereus and Achilles, which

had been one of the special objects of his search. There could be no

doubt on the matter, for a portion of an inscription of Pope Damasus

was found, the contents of which are known, for a copy exists in the

Pilgrim Itinerary of Einsiedeln, and a small column was unearthed on

which is represented a scene of martyrdom and above it the word

ACILLEVS. According to the Itineraries' the tomb of the famous martyr

Petronilla lay behind the altar which covered the remains of Nereus and

Achilles. The explorers were able to verify this indication. In a

cubiculum behind the apse of the basilica, and approached by a short

passage, a fresco was discovered on the wall filling the front of the

arcisolium where the sarcophagus had lain; the painting showed two

female figures standing, art elder and a younger woman with their names

inscribed

VENERANDA � DEP � VII � IDVS � IANVARIAS �

PETRONELLA MARTYR.

In or close by this cubiculum was therefore, it may be safely inferred,

the burial place of PETRONILLA. Her sarcophagus was actually removed to

the Vatican at the request of the King of France at a time when many

such translations were made by Pope Paul I (755-756).

The inscription on the sarcophagus.

AVRELIAE � PETRONILLAE � FIL � DVLCISSIMAE �

may be taken as indicating that she belonged to the Aurelian gens,

several of whose members are buried in this cemetery, and that she was

related to the Flavian imperial family, one of whose cognomina was

Petro.

The legend that she was the daughter of St. Peter has no foundation

other than the name.

One of the most ancient portions of the cemetery situated in the

immediate vicinity, and to the south of the remains of the basilica of

Nereus and Achilles (or as it is sometimes called of Petronilla), is

that styled the Region of the Flavii Aurelii. It contains the

inscription PhL. SABEINOS � KAI TITIANE ADELPhE not improbably the

grandchildren of Flavius Clemens and of Flavia Domitilla the founder of

the crypt.

Another of the earliest and most interesting crypts in this Catacomb

was discovered in 1881. The decorations of this sepulchral chamber are

elaborate and rich, resembling those of a room in a Pompeian house, and

belonging to the same period. Above the arcisolium inscribed on marble

is the single word AMPLIATI. Les lettres de cette courte �pitaphe,'

remarks Marucchi, sont tr�s soign�es et d'une forme pal�ographique

certainement ant�rieure � la seconde moiti� du II^e si�cle; on peut la

juger sans t�m�rit� de la fin du premier.' [543] It is remarkable too

that such prominence should be given to a single name bespeaking

probably a man of servile origin. A further mark of the regard in which

this tomb was held is the existence of a staircase of later date, cut

through the rock to provide a direct way of approach from the Via

Ardeatina to the pilgrims. That the man thus honoured was the Ampliatus

mentioned by St. Paul in the salutation in chapter xvi. of the Epistle

to the Romans is therefore not an unreasonable supposition. A later

inscription in the same crypt records that a certain Aurelius Ampliatus

with Gordianus his son have erected a memorial to Aurelia Bonifatia,

his incomparable wife. This Aurelius Ampliatus may have been a

descendant of the Ampliatus who was a contemporary of the Apostles, and

very probably a freedman of the Aurelian family, many members of which

family, as this Catacomb bears witness, had been among the early

converts to Christianity.

The precious medallion in bronze, containing the earliest

representation in existence of the heads of the two Apostles Peter and

Paul, now in the Sacred Museum of the Vatican Library, was found by

Boldetti in the Cemetery of Domitilla. [544]
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[532] The meaning of the term is uncertain. De Rossi gives it a hybrid

derivation from kata and cubitorium, but this is very doubtful.

[533] Raffaele Garrucci, Cimeteri degli antichi Ebrei; Orazio Marucchi,

El�m. d'Arch. Chr�t. ii. 208-226, 259-276.

[534] Lanciani, Pagan and Christian Rome, pp. 320-1. The estimate is

that of Michele Stefano de Rossi made in 1860.

[535] No inscription has been found of a later date than 410 A.D.

[536] Aringhi, Roma Sotterranea, 1651; Boldetti, Osservazioni sopra i

cimeteri di santi martiri ed antichi cristiani di Roma, 1720; Bottari,

Sculture e pitture sacre extratte dai cimeteri di Roma, 1757.

[537] I monumenti delle anti cristiane primitive ne11a metropoli di

Cristianesimo, 1844.

[538] Roma Solterranea Cristiana, 1864-77. Inscriptiones Christianae

urbis Romae VII� saeculo antiquiores, 1861-88. Il museo epigrafico

cristiano pro-laterense, 1878. Musaici delle chiese di Roma anteriori

at seculo XV, 1872. Especially Bullettino di Archeologia cristiana,

1863-94. The Bullettino has been continued with the title Nuovo

Bullettino under the editorship of Professor O. Marucchi, the pupil and

fellow-worker cf De Rossi.

[539] The basilica of St. Sylvester suffered complete destruction

during the period of the Barbarian invasions. Its very existence had

for long centuries been forgotten, until De Rossi unearthed its ruins

in 1889.

[540] Marucchi, El�m. d'Arch. Chr�t. ii. 459.

[541] Marucchi, Di un antico battistero recentemente scoperto nel

cimetero apostolico di Priscilla a delta sue importanza storica, 1901.

Le Memorie degli Apostoli Pietro e Paolo in Roma, 1903, pp. 93-108. In

Roma Sotterranea Cristiana, nuova serie, tom. i. p. 10, Marucchi writes

Spero di pubblicare un nuovo lavoro su questo stesso argumento.'

[542] Supra, p. 249.

[543] El�m. d'Arch. Chr�t. ii. 118.

[544] Osservationi sui cimeteri, 1720, p. 192.
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\* [545]Tigellinos gar, huph' ho to xiphos en tou Neronos, apelaunen

auton tes Rhomes . . . apangelthentos de to Tigellino ton logon

touton pempei tous axontas auton es to dikasterion hos apologesaito

me apebein es Nerona

\* [546]Timotheo gnesio tekno en pistei.

\* [547]PhE

\* [548]PhL.

\* [549]Pheuxetai ek Babulonos

\* [550]Pheuxetai ek Babulonos anax phoberos kai anaides.

\* [551]Phlauian Dometillan . . . ex adelphes gegonuian Phlauiou

Klementos, henos ton tenikade epi Rhomes hupaton

\* [552]banausos

\* [553]gegraptai

\* [554]gnesie sunzuge

\* [555]grapseis oun duo biblaridia kai pempseis hen Klementi kai hen

Grapte. pempsei oun Klemes eis tas exo poleis, ekeino gar

epitetraptai; Grapte de nouthetese i tas cheras kai tous

horphanous; su de anagnose eis tauten ten polen meta ton

presbuteron ton proisamenon tos ekklesias

\* [556]doxes tinos

\* [557]dei gar ton episkoton anenkleton einai, hos Theou oikonomon.

\* [558]dia Silouanou humin egrapsa

\* [559]dia Silouanou humin tou pistou adelphou, hos logizomai, di

oligon egrapsa.

\* [560]dia zelon kai phthonon

\* [561]dia zelos kai erin

\* [562]dia zelos kai phthonon

\* [563]dia puros dokimazomenou

\* [564]dia tas aiphnidious kai epallelous genomenas hemin sumphoras

kai teriptoseis, adelphoi, bradion nomizomen epistophen pepoiesthai

peri ton epizetoumenon par humin pragmaton.

\* [565]dia phthonon kai erin

\* [566]diegesis

\* [567]dio kai enekoptomen ta polla tou elthein pros humas. ta polla

\* [568]ei oneidizesthe en onomati Christou, makarioi. . . . ei de hos

Christianos, me aischunestho, doxazeto de ton Theon en to merei

touto.

\* [569]eis massan kaloumenen Akkouai Salbias plesi tou dendrou tou

strobilou.

\* [570]eucharisteito

\* [571]heuromen ploion Aiguption kai anelthontes eis auto

katechthemen en Alexandreia kakei emeina ego didaskon tous

echomenous adelphous . . . . .

\* [572]epinomen

\* [573]etoimos

\* [574]zetemata tina peri tes idias deisidaimonias.

\* [575]euchomen gar anathema einai autos ego apo tou christou huper

ton adelphon mou, ton sungenon mou kata sarka, hoitines eisin

Israelitai

\* [576]th i a s o i

\* [577]threptous

\* [578]threttos

\* [579]kan to auto etei allous te pollous kai ton Phlaouion Klementa

hupateuonta, kaiper anepsion onta kai genaika kai auten sungene

heautou Phlaouian Domitillan echonta, katesphaxen ho Dometianos;

epenechthe de amphoin enklema atheotetos, huph' hes kai alloi es ta

ton Ioudaion ethe exokellontes polloi katedikasthesan, kai hoi men

apethanon, hoi de ton goun ousion esterethesan; he de Domitilla

huperoristhe monon es Pandaterian.

\* [580]kerugma

\* [581]kai anephereto eis ton ouranon

\* [582]kai en to Poimeni

\* [583]kai autos ego

\* [584]kai marturesasm epi ton hegoumenon houtos apellage tou kosmou

\* [585]kai (t)on dodeka (heis) tais chersin autou p(arad)othesetai

\* [586]kath' holes tes Ioudaias kai Galileias kai Samareias

\* [587]kakourgos

\* [588]kalos oun eipen he graphe he legousa; Proton panton p isteuson

\* [589]kata sarka

\* [590]kata

\* [591]katakurieuontes

\* [592]katasteso tous episkopous auton en dikaiosune kai tous

diakonous auton en pistei.

\* [593]katepseusanto hemon Thuesteia deipna kai Oidipedeious mixeis

\* [594]kleron

\* [595]kletos apostolos, aphorismenos eis euangelion theou

\* [596]logos parakleseos

\* [597]leitourgia

\* [598]mastigas, phulakas, thlipseis megalas, staurous, theria.

\* [599]men oun

\* [600]marturesas

\* [601]marturesas epi ton hegoumenon

\* [602]marturounton auton ekeinon ton kat' upsin Ioannen heorakoton.

. . .

\* [603]megale, thaumasia, anomologemene para pasin

\* [604]memarturemenous pollois chronois hupo panton

\* [605]med' hos katakurieuontes ton kleron

\* [606]nun oun himin lego tois proegoumenois tes ekklesias k9ai tois

protokathedritais; me ginesthe homoioi tois pharmakois . . .

blepete oun, tekna, mepote hautai hai dichostasiai humon

aposteresousin ten zoen humon . . .

\* [607]neosti

\* [608]xenia

\* [609]hoi ap' arches autoptai

\* [610]hoi hegoumenoi

\* [611]hoi proegoumenoi

\* [612]hoi proistamenoi

\* [613]ou thelo de humus agnoein, adelphoi, hoti pollakis proethemen

elthein pros humas kai ekoluthen achri tou deuro.

\* [614]ou men eis makron auto tauta prouchorei. Para podas goun epi

tes autes Klaudiou basileias, he panagathos kai philanthropotate

ton holon pronoia ton karteron kai megan ton apostolon, ton aretes

heneka ton loipon hapanton proegoron, Petron, epi ten Rhomen hos

epi telikouton lumeona biou cheiragogei, hos hoia tis gennaios

Theou strategos tois theiois hoplois phraxamenos, ten polutimeton

emporian tou noetou photos ex anatolon tois kata dusin ekomizen,

phos auto kai logon psuchon soterion, to kerugma tes ton ouranon

basileias euangelizomenos

\* [615]oudena gar echo isopsuchon, hostis gnesios ta peri humon

merimnesei

\* [616]ouk eg?pesan ten psuchen auton achri thanatou.

\* [617]ouch hos Petros kai Paulos diatassomai humin; ekeinoi

apostoloi, ego katakritos.

\* [618]ohus idon ho Paulos eucharistesas to theo elaben tharsos;

\* [619]houto men de tote he ton Rhomaion arche duo autokratorsin hama

edouleuse, Neroni kai Helio; oude echo eipein hopoteros auton

cheiron en

\* [620]houtoi eisin hoi apostoloi kai episkopoi kai didaskaloi kai

diakonoi hoi poreuthentes kata ten semnoteta tou theou kai

episkopesantes kai didaxantes kai diakonesantes hagnos kai semnos

tois eklektois tou theou, hoi men kekoimemenoi, hoi de eti ontes.

\* [621]houtoi hoi apostoloi kai hoi didaskaloi hoi keruxantes to

onoma tou huiou tou theou, koimethentes en dunamei kai pistei tou

huiou tou theou ekeruxan kai tois prokekoimemenois kai autoi edokan

autois ten sphragida tou kerugmatos.

\* [622]pantes de diesparesan kata tas choras tes Ioudaias kai

Samareias plen ton apostolon

\* [623]paredroi

\* [624]pais Theou

\* [625]par hois kai xenizomai

\* [626]par hois kai psenizomaa

\* [627]parakletos

\* [628]parakalei pantas.

\* [629]paraklesesi de pantoiais Markou, hou to Euangelion pheretai,

akolouthon onta Petrou liparesai, hos an kai dia graphes hupomnema

tes dia logou paradotheises autois kataleipsoi didaskalias, me

proteron te aneinai, e katergasasthai ton andra, kai taute aitious

genesthai tes tou legomenou kata Markon euangeliou graphes. Gnonta

de to prachthen phasi ton apostolon, apokalupsantos auto tou

pneumatos, hesthenai te ton andron prothumia, kurosai te ten

graphen eis enteuxin tais ekklesiais.

\* [630]poimenes kai episkopoi

\* [631]poimainein

\* [632]pollakis

\* [633]pollen athlesin hupemeinate pathematon . . . oneidismois te

kai thlipsesi theatrizomenoi; . . . ten harpagen ton huparchonton

humon meta charas prosedexasthe.

\* [634]proteron

\* [635]proton

\* [636]presbuteroi

\* [637]proeballonto allous Simona men kai Menandron apo Samareias ohi

kai magikas dunameis poiesantes pollous exepatesan kai eti

apatomenous echousi. kai gar par humin, hos proephemen, en te

basilidi Rhome epi Klaudiou Kaisaros genomenos ho Simon kai ten

hieran sunkleton kai ton demon Rhomaion eis posouto kateplexato hos

theos nomisthenai, kai andrianti, hos tous allous par humin

timomenous theous, timethenai.

\* [638]proegoumenoi

\* [639]sun kai

\* [640]sunergos

\* [641]sebomeeoi

\* [642]sebomenoi

\* [643]sebomenoi ton Theon

\* [644]semainei he graphe

\* [645]speira Sebaste

\* [646]sungeneis

\* [647]sullalesas meta tou sumbouliou

\* [648]sunachthenai en te ekklesia.

\* [649]ten apo Petrou kai Paulou phuteian genetheisan Rhomaion te kai

Korinthion

\* [650]ten phuteian en phuteusousin hoi dodeka apostoloi

\* [651]ten phuteian hen phuteusousin hoi apostoloi tou agapetou

dioxei kai ton dodeka heis tais chersin autou paradothesetai

\* [652]teresis meta aneseos.

\* [653]tis de hograpsas ten epistolen to men alethes theos oiden

\* [654]to misthoma

\* [655]ton Theon

\* [656]ton de Paulon eiasen en teresei dia Drusillan

\* [657]tes geneas hemon

\* [658]te en humin purosei pros peirasmon humin ginomene.

\* [659]te gunaiki Poppaia, theosebes gar en, huper ton Ioudaion

deetheise charizomenos, he tois men deka prosetaxen apienai.

\* [660]ton oun metanoounton euthus [eutheos] dokeis tas hamartias

aphiesthai

\* [661]tauta kai humeis dia tes tosautes nouthesias ten apo Petrou

kai Paulou phuteian genetheisan Rhomaion te kai Korinthion

sunekerasate.

\* [662]tauta kai humeis dia tes tosautes nouthesias ten apo Petrou

kai Paulou phuteian genetheisan Rhomaion tekai Korinthion

sunekerasate. Kai gar ampho kai eis ten hemeteran Korinthon

phuteusantes hemas, homoios edidaxan; homoios de kai eis ten

Italian homose didaxantes, emarturesan kata ton auton kairon

\* [663]tines de auton eis telos apestesan; houtoi oun metanoian ouk

echousin; dia gar tas pragmateias auton eblasphemesan ton Kurion

kai apernesanto.

\* [664]tounoma autou di ekeinou an errethe, tou kai ten apokalupsin

heorakotos; oude gar pro pollou chronou heorathe, alla schedon epi

tes hemeteras geneas, pros to teleites Dometianou arches

\* [665]tous engista genomenous athletas

\* [666]tous de apestalmenous aph' hemon Klaudion Ephebon kai

Oualerion Bitona sun kai Phortounato

\* [667]tous te Ioudaious, pleonasantas authis chalepos an aneu

taraches hupo tou ochlou sphon tes poleos eirchthenai, ouk exelase

men, to de de patrio nomo bio chromenous, ekeleuse me

sunathroizesthai. tas te hetaireias epanachtheisas hupo tou Gaiou

dieluse.

\* [668]toutois tois andrasin hosios politeusamenois sunethroisthe

polu plethos eklekton, hoitines pollakis aikiais kai basanois dia

zelos pathontes hupodeigma kalliston egenonto en hemin. Dia zelos

gunaikes Danaides kai Dirkai aikismata deina kai anosia pathousai

epi ton tes pisteos dromon katentesan

\* [669]touto de estin sunparaklethenai en humin dia tes en allelois

pisteos humon te kai emou.

\* [670]huios parakleseos

\* [671]huios

\* [672]phasi ton apostolon

\* [673]pheuxetai ek Babulonos anax phoberos kai anaides.

\* [674]philotimoumenon

\* [675]phoboumenoi
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\* [676]Prima Petrum rapuit sententia legibus Neronis,

\* [677]Tantae per urbis ambitum

\* [678]. . . ' pastorem uero

\* [679]Hic habitare prius sanctos cognoscere debes

\* [680]Pone Tigellinum: taeda lucebis in illa,

\* [681]Stemmate nobilium deductum nomen avorum

\* [682]Tantae per urbis ambitum

\* [683]Ut teres orbis iter flexi rota percucurrit anni

\* [684]Veridicus rector, lapsos quia crimina fiere

\* [685]. . . Linus fuit temporibus Neronis, a consulatu Saturnini et

Scipionis

\* [686]AMPLIATI

\* [687]Ab Appii Foro hora quarta: dederam aliam paullo ante Tribus

Tabernis.

\* [688]Ad hanc enim Ecclesiam propter potiorem principalitatem

necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam, hoc est, eos qui sunt

undique fideles, in qua semper ab his, qui sunt undique, conservata

est ea, quae est ab apostolis traditio.

\* [689]Ad locum qui vocatur Naumachiae iuxta obeliscum Neronis in

montem.

\* [690]Afflicti suppliciis Christiani, genus hominum superstitionis

novae et maleficae

\* [691]Afflicti suppliciis christiani, genus hominum superstitionis

novae et maleficae.

\* [692]Antonius Felix per omnem saevitiam et libidinem ius regium

servili ingenio exercuit

\* [693]Apostolos

\* [694]Apud palatium neronianum iuxta obeliscum inter duas metas.

\* [695]Atque ubi dicendam ad causam introissent . . . pro crimine

accipi cum super Neronis ac Tigellini saevas percontationes,

Faenius quoque Rufus violenter urgeret.

\* [696]Auxit hanc molem facinorum eius temeritas impietatis in Deum,

nam primus Romae Christianos suppliciis et mortibus affecit ac per

omnes provincias pari persecutione excruciari imperavit ipsumque

nomen exstirpare conatus beatissimos Christi apostolos Petrum

cruse, Paulum gladio occidit. . . . Mox acervatim miseram civitatem

obortae undique oppressere clades, nam subsequente autumno tanta

Urbi pestilentia incubuit, ut triginta milia funera in rationem

Libitinae venirent.

\* [697]Castra Peregrinorum

\* [698]Clemens Alex. igitur integro Pastore usus de divinis eius

revelationibus ne dubitavit quidem neque Hermam apostolorum

temporibus posteriorem existimasse potest.

\* [699]Coemeterium ad Nymphas Beati Petri ubi baptizaverat

\* [700]Cohors militum Italicorum voluntaria, quae est in Syria.

\* [701]Colitur S. Novatus

\* [702]Collegia funeratica

\* [703]Coniuncti

\* [704]Consul suffectus

\* [705]Contemptissimae inertiae.

\* [706]Cum mihi Domitianus Augustus sororis suae nepotum delegavit

curam.

\* [707]Cuncta malefacta sibi impune ratus tanta potentia subnixo.

\* [708]Cymiterium Ostrianum, ubi Petrits apostolus baptizavit

\* [709]Dicit ei Simon Petrus: Domine, quo vadis? Respondit Iesus: Quo

ego vado, non potes me mode sequi: sequeris autem postea. Dicit ei

Petrus: Quare non possum te sequi modo? animam meam pro te ponam.

\* [710]Dominus conservator ecclesiae Pudentianae.

\* [711]Domus Aurea

\* [712]Dum essem puer et liberalibus studiis erudirer, solebam cum

caeteris eiusdem aetatis et propositi, diebus dominicis sepulchra

Apostolorum et martyrum circuire, crebroque cryptas ingredi, quae

in terrarum profunda defossae, ex utraque parte ingredientium per

parietes habent corpora sepultorum, et ita obscura sunt omnia, ut

propemodum illud propheticum compleatur: Descendant ad infernum

viventes

\* [713]Duraveruntque, quoniam et de longissimo aevo arborum diximus,

ad Neronis principis incendia quibus cremavit Urbem, annis CLXXX

. . . postea cultu virides iuvenesque ni Princeps ille accelerasset

etiam arborum mortem

\* [714]Ergo abolendo rumori Nero subdidit reos et quaesitissimis

poenis adfecit, quos per flagitia invisos vulgus Christianos

appellabat

\* [715]Et fecit constitutum in ecclesia et patenas vitreas ante

sacerdotes in ecclesia, et ministros supportantes, donec episcopus

missas celebraret, ante se sacerdotes adstantes, sic missae

celebrarentur

\* [716]Et iuxta eandem viam (Appiam) ecclesia est S. Sebastiani

martyris, ubi ipse dormit, et ibi aunt sepulchra Apostolorum Petri

et Pauli; in quibus xl annos requiescebant (De locis S.S.

Martyrum'); Postea pervenies via Appia ad S. Sebastianum martyrem,

cuius corpus iacet in inferiori loco, et ibi sunt sepulchra

Apostolorum Petri et Pauli in quibus xl annos requiescebant

\* [717]Fasti Consulares

\* [718]Fatebantur

\* [719]Fertur Titus adhibito consilio prius deliberasse . . . at

contra alii et Titus ipse evertendum templum in primis censebant

quo plenius Iudaeorum et Christianorum religio tolleretur; quippe

has religiones, licet contrarias sibi, iisdem auctoribus profectas:

Christianos ex Iudaeis extitisse: radice sublata, stirpem facile

perituram.

\* [720]Flagitia cohaerentia nomini

\* [721]Flaviam Domitillam, filiam sororis Clementis consulis.

\* [722]Flavium Sabinum inermem neque fugam coeptantem circumsistunt

\* [723]Hic [Lucius Annaeus Seneca] ante biennium quam Petrus et

Paulus martyrio coronarentur, a Nerone interfectus est

\* [724]Hic [Petrus] ordinavit duos episcopos, Linum et Cletum, qui

praesentaliter omne ministerium sacerdotale in urbe Roma populo vel

supervenientium exhiberent; beatus autem Petrus ad orationem et

praedicationem, populum erudiens, vacabat. . . . Hic beatum

Clementem episcopum conservavit, eique cathedram vel ecclesiam

omnem disponendam commisit.

\* [725]Hic [Pius] ex rogatu beate Praxedis dedicavit aecclesiam

thermas Novati in vico Patricii, in honore Sororis suae sanctae

Potentianae, ubi et multa dona obtulit; ubi saepius sacrificium

Domino offerens ministrabat

\* [726]Hic ex rogatu beatae Praxedis dedicavit ecclesiam thermas

Novati, in vico Patricii, in honore sororis suae sanctae

Potentianae, ubi et multa dona obtulit; ubi saepius sacrificium

domino offerens ministrabat. Immo et fontem baptismi construi

fecit.

\* [727]Hic fecit basilicas duas: una beato Laurentio iuxta theatrum

. . . et in Catacumbas ubi iacuerunt corpora sanctorum apostolorum

Petri et Pauli, in quo loco platomam ipsam, ubi iacuerunt corpora

sancta, versibus exornavit.

\* [728]Hic memoriam Beati Petri construxit et composuit.

\* [729]Hic requiescit in pace Hilarus Lector tituli Pudentis

\* [730]III Kal. iul. Romae, natale sanctorum Petri et Pauli: Petri in

Vaticano, via Aurelia; Pauli vero in via Ostensi; utriusque in

Catacumbas; passi sub Nerone, Basso et Tusco Consulibus.

\* [731]III. Kal. Iul. Petri in Catacumbas et Pauli Ostense--Tusco et

Basso cons.

\* [732]III. Kal. Iul. Romae natale apostolorum sanctorum Petri et

Pauli--Petri in Vaticano via Aurelia Pauli vero in Via Ostensi,

\* [733]III. Kal. iul. Petri in Catacumbas et Pauli Ostense Basso et

Tusco Consulibus.

\* [734]III. Kl. Iulii Passio beatorum Petri et Pauli a Marcello

discipulo Petri edita quique idem interfuit passioni.

\* [735]Igitur primo correpti qui fatebantur, deinde indicio eorum

multitudo ingens. . . .

\* [736]Igitur primum correpti qui fatebantur, deinde indicio eorum

multitudo ingens haud proinde in crimine incendii quam odio humani

generis coniuncti sunt. Et pereuntibus addita ludibria, ut ferarum

tergis contecti laniatu canum interirent, aut crucibus adfixi aut

flammandi, atque, ubi defecisset dies, in usum nocturni luminis

urerentur. Hortos suos ei spectaculo Nero obtulerat et circense

ludicrum edebat, habitu aurigae permixtus plebi vel curriculo

insistens. Unde quamquam adversus sontes et novissima exampla

meritos miseratio oriebatur, tamquam non utilitate publica sed in

saevitiam unius absumerentur

\* [737]In munere Neronis arserunt vivi de quibus ille iusserat cereos

fieri, qui lucerent spectatoribus. . . . Maleficos homines taeda,

papyro, cera super vestiebat, sicque ad ignem admoveri iubebat ut

arderent.

\* [738]In septimo miliario eiusdem viae [Nomentanae] s. papa

Alexander cum Eventio et Theodulo pausant

\* [739]Indicio eorum

\* [740]Ineunt deinde consulatum Silius Nerva et Atticus Vestinus,

coepta simul et aucta coniuratione, in quam certatim nomina

dederant senatores eques miles, feminae etiam, cum odio Neronis tum

favore in C. Pisonem

\* [741]Ipsa rettuli verba

\* [742]Ipsum nomen, si flagitiis careat, an flagitia cohaerentia

nomini puniantur

\* [743]Ista quam felix ecclesia . . . ubi Petrus passioni dominicae

adaequatur

\* [744]Iudaeorum iuventutes per speciem sacramenti in provincias

gravioris caeli distribuit, reliquos gentis eiusdem vel similia

sectantes urbe summovit, sub poena perpetuae servitutis nisi

obtemperassent.

\* [745]Iudaeos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantes Roma expulit.

\* [746]Jam pridem Syrus in Tiberim defluxit Orontes.

\* [747]Laterculum

\* [748]Laureolum Schol. In ipso mimo Laureolo figitur crux unde vera

cruce dignus est Lentulus, qui tanto detestabilior est quanto

melius gestum imitatus est scenicum. . . . Hic Lentulus nobilis

fuit et suscepit servi personam in agendo mimo.

\* [749]Linus

\* [750]Magi estis quia novum nescio quod genus religionis inducitis.

\* [751]Marcus, Petri sectator, praedicante Petro evangelium palam

Romae coram quibusdam Caesareanis equitibus et multa Christi

testimonia proferente, petitus ab eis, ut possent quae dicebantur

memoriae commendare, scripsit ex his, quae a Petro dicta sunt,

evangelium quod secundum Marcum vocitatur.

\* [752]Mundus ipse concutitur . . . consternatio omnium

\* [753]Naumachia

\* [754]Neque enim in universum aliquid quod quasi certam formam

\* [755]Nero subdidit reos et quaesitissimis poenis adfecit, quos per

flagitia invisos vulgus Christianos appellabat . . . igitur primum

correpti qui fatebantur, deinde indicio eorum multitudo ingens.

. . .

\* [756]Nobilissimos e senatu, invidiae sirnul et praedae causa . . .

interfecit.

\* [757]Non possum ferre, Quirites, Graecam urbem

\* [758]Non regibus haec adulatio, non Caesaribus honor.

\* [759]Numquid ergo,' ait, protinus putas aboleri delicta eorum, qui

agunt poenitentiam?

\* [760]P. �lius Chrestus et Cornelia Paula hoc scalare adplicitum

huic sepulchro quod emerunt a fisco agente Agathonico proc

[-uratore] Augustorum nostrorum quod habet scriptura infra scripta.

Gentiano et Basso cons. vii Kal. April.

\* [761]Paulus Apostolus . . . quarto decimo anno Neronis eodem die

quo Petrus, Romae pro Christo capite truncatur . . . anno post

passionem Domini XXXVII

\* [762]Petrus

\* [763]Petrus Apostolus . . . cum primum Antiochenam Ecclesiam

fundasset, Romam proficiscitur, ubi Evangelium praedicans xxv annis

eiusdem urbis Episcopus perseverat. Post Petrum primus Romanam

ecclesiam tenuit Linus annis xi.

\* [764]Petrus in parte occidentali civitatis iuxta viam Corneliam ad

milliarium primum in corpore quiescit.

\* [765]Pius, natione Italus ex patre Rufino, frater Pastoris, de

civitate Aquileia, sedit ann. xviii, mens. iiii, dies iii. Fuit

temporibus Antonii Pii a consulatu Clari et Severi. Sub huius

episcopatu frater ipsius Hermis librum scripsit in quo mandatum

continetur quod praecepit angelus Domini cum venit ad eum in habitu

pastoris et praecepit ei ut sanctum Paschae die dominica

celebraretur.

\* [766]Pomponia Graecina, insignis femina, Plautio qui ovans se de

Britanniis rettulit nupta ac superstitionis externae rea,

mariti�iudicio permissa; isque prisco instituto, propinquis coram,

de capite famaque coniugis cognovit et insontem nuntiavit. Longa

huic Pomponiae aetas et continua tristis fuit; nam post Iuliam

Drusi filiam dolo Messalinae interfectam per quadraginta annos non

cultu nisi lugubri, non animo nisi maesto egit; idque illi

imperitante Claudio impune, mox ad gloriam vertit.

\* [767]Post ascensum eius beatissimus Petrus episcopatum suscepit

\* [768]Praeter caeteros Iudaicus fiscus acerbissime actus est; ad

quem deferebantur qui vel improfessi Iudaicam viverent vitam, vel,

dissimulata origine, imposita genti tributa non pependissent.

\* [769]Presbyter Pastor titulum

\* [770]Princeps Peregrinorum

\* [771]Principe Augusta nomen hoc ortum est, Tiberio disciplina eius

inluxit, sub Nerone damnatio invaluit. . . . Et tamen permansit

erasis omnibus hoc solum "institutum Neronianum" iustum denique ut

dissimile sui auctoris.

\* [772]Profectione Pauli ab urbe ad Spania proficiscentis.

\* [773]Propositus est libellus sine auctore, multorum nomina

continens. Qui negabant esse Christianos. . . . Alii ab indice

nominati, esse se Christianos dixerunt.

\* [774]Qui sacra impia nocturnave ut quem obtruncarent, defigerent,

obligarent, fecerint faciendave curaverint, aut crucibus

suffiguntur aut bestiis obiiciuntur. . . . Magicae artis conscios

summo supplicio adfici placuit, id est bestiis obiici aut crucibus

suffigi; ipsi autem magi vivi exuruntur.

\* [775]Quod assignata oratione assidendi mos est quibusdam, non

perspicio rationem, nisi quod pueri volunt. Quid enim, si Hermas

\* [776]Quod et placuit Sancto Pio Episcopo; thermasque Novati

dedicavit ecclesiam sub nomine beatae Virginis [Potentianae in vico

Patricio. Dedicavit autem et aliam sub nomine sanctae Virginis]

Praxedis infra urbem Romam, in vico qui appellatur Lateranus.

\* [777]Relegatio

\* [778]Romanus secretis criminationibus incusaverat Senecam ut C.

Pisonis socium. . . . Unde Pisoni timor, et orta insidiarum in

Neronem magna moles sed inprospera.

\* [779]Salaria Nova

\* [780]Scribit Bruttius . . . Flaviam Domitillam Flavii Clementis

consulis ex sorore neptem in insulam Pontianam relegatam, quia se

Christianam esse testata est.

\* [781]Scribit Bruttius plurimos Christianorum sub Domiciano fecisse

martyrium, inter quos et Flaviam Domitillam Flavii Clementis

consulis ex sorore neptem in insulam Pontianam relegatam quia se

Christianam esse testata sit.

\* [782]Sed exponenda huius nominis [Christi] ratio est propter

ignorantium errorem, qui eum immutata litera Chrestum solent

dicere.

\* [783]Sed profectione Pauli ab urbe ad Spaniam proficiscentis.

\* [784]Sed quoniam valde longum est in hoc tali volumine omnium

Ecclesiarum numerare successiones, maximae et antiquissimae et

omnibus cognitae, a gloriosissimis duobus apostolis Petro et Paulo

Romae fundatae et constitutae Ecclesiae

\* [785]Sed res utraque, Iosephi et Clementis, longe dissimilis est.

Iosephus, sacros populi sui ritus describens, per figuram,

historicis non inusitatam, praesenti, quod dicimus, historico

utitur. Clemens, autem, ut Corinthos ad ordinem servandum adducat,

lectoribus ordinem Iudaici cultus ante oculos ponit. Quodsi autem

templum iam fuisset destructum, tota S. Patris argumentatio fuisset

infirma, ipsaque adversarios invitasset, ut dicerent: En, eversione

templi Hierosolymitani Deus ipse testatus est, talem ordinem sibi

non esse exoptatum.

\* [786]Sed ut cum perperam Chrestianos pronuntiatur a vobis, nam nec

nominis certa est notitia penes vos

\* [787]Sedes ubi sedit Sc

\* [788]Sepultus est in Vaticano iuxta viam triumphalem totius orbis

veneratione celebratur.

\* [789]Sibi suisque, libertis libertabusque posterisque eorum

\* [790]Simon Petrus . . . Romam pergit, ibique viginti quinque annis

cathedram sacerdotalem tenuit usque ad ultimum Neronis annum, id

est, quartum decimum

\* [791]Simon Petrus . . . princeps Apostolorum, post episcopatum

Antiochensis ecclesiae et praedicationem dispersionis eorum qui de

circumcisione crediderant, in Ponto, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia et

Bithynia, secundo Claudii anno ad expugnandum Simonem Magum Romam

pergit, ibique viginti quinque annis cathedram sacerdotalem tenuit,

usque ad ultimum annum Neronis, id est decimum quartum.

\* [792]Sub huius episcopatu frater eius Ermes librum scripsit, in quo

mandatum continetur, quod ei praecepit angelus, cum venit ad illum

in habitu pastoris.

\* [793]Subdidit reos

\* [794]Suffecti

\* [795]Suffectus

\* [796]Tot facinoribus foedum annum etiam di tempestatibus et morbis

insignivere, vastata Campania turbine ventorum qui . . .

pertulitque violentiam ad vicina urbi; in qua omne mortalium genus

vis pestilentiae depopulabatur. . . .

\* [797]Ubi haec a tribuno relata Bunt Poppaea et Tigellino coram,

quod erat saevienti principi intimum consiliorum. . . .

\* [798]Ut autem portam civitatis voluit egredi, vidit sibi Christum

occurrere. Et adorans eum ait: "Domine, quo vadis?" Respondit ei

Christus: "Romam venio iterum crucifigi." Et ait ad eum Petrus:

"Domine, iterum crucifigeris?" Et dixit ad eum dominus: "Etiam,

iterum crucifigar." Petrus autem dixit: "Domine, revertar et sequar

te." Et his dictis dominus ascendit in coelum . . . Et [Petrus]

post haec rediens in se ipsum, intellexit de sua dictum passione.

\* [799]Valde incongruum ac esse durissimum videretur ut illa ei

specialiter possessio non serviret in qua palmam sumens martyrii

capite est truncatus ut viveret, utile iudicavimus eandem massam

quae Aquas Salvias nuncupatur . . . cum Christi Gratia luminaribus

deputare.

\* [800]Video istic cruces non unius quidem generis, sed aliter ab

aliis fabricatas; capite quidem conversos in terrain suspendere.

\* [801]Virtutes quoque in vitia deflexit; quantum coniectare licet,

super ingenii naturam inopia rapax, metu saevus.

\* [802]Volo tamen ex redundantia alicuius etiam comitis apostolorum

testimonium superinducere, idoneum confirmandi de proximo iure

disciplinam magistrorum. Extat enim et Barnabae titulus ad

Hebraeos, adeo satis auctoritatis viri, utquem Paulus iuxta se

constituerit in abstinentiae tenore (1 Cor. ix. 6

\* [803]ad Caesarem appello.

\* [804]ad Catacumbas

\* [805]addito maiestatis crimine, quod tunc omnium accusationum

complementum erat

\* [806]affiicti suppliciis Christiani, genus hominum superstitionis

novae ac maleficae

\* [807]apologia

\* [808]apostoli

\* [809]arcisolium

\* [810]area

\* [811]argumentum ex silentio

\* [812]assessores

\* [813]assiduae sterilitates

\* [814]atrocia

\* [815]auctor, initiator

\* [816]basilica beate Priscae

\* [817]bassi sub Nerone

\* [818]beato Petro apostolo in templum Apollinis.

\* [819]bene esse

\* [820]billicum confessionis

\* [821]brachia patibulo explicuerunt.

\* [822]coercitio

\* [823]cognitio

\* [824]cognitiones

\* [825]cognitionibus de Christianis interfui nunquam; ideo nescio

quid et quatenus aut puniri soleat aut quaeri

\* [826]cognomen

\* [827]cognomina

\* [828]collegia, sodalitates

\* [829]commentarios

\* [830]consiliarii

\* [831]consul suffectus

\* [832]continua et vincta agmina

\* [833]continua hinc et vincta agmina trahi ac foribus hortorum

adiacere.

\* [834]continua hinc et vincta agmina trahi ac foribus hortorum

adiacere. Atque ubi dicendam ad causam introissent

\* [835]convicti

\* [836]cubiculum

\* [837]cubitorium

\* [838]cuius corpus collegit

\* [839]cuius corpus ita recondit in aere et conclusit sicut beati

Petri . . . et crucem auream super locum beati Pauli apostoli

posuit pens. lib. cl.

\* [840]cuius corpus noctu collegit

\* [841]cuius loculum undique aere Cypro conclusit, quod est immobile;

ad caput, pedes V; ad pedes, pedes V; ad latus dextrum, pedes V; ad

latus sinistrum, pedes V; subter, pedes V; supra, pedes V; sic

inclusit corpus beati Petri et recondit.

\* [842]cum gloria dormitionem accepit

\* [843]cum vero mihi Domitianus Augustus sororis suae nepotum

delegaverit curam

\* [844]custodia militaris

\* [845]custodia publica,

\* [846]de maleficis et mathematicis

\* [847]dedicator

\* [848]delatores

\* [849]denique urbis Romae incendium voluptatis suae spectaculum

fecit

\* [850]deportatio

\* [851]depositio

\* [852]depositio martyrum

\* [853]dies sancti Petri epularum.

\* [854]discipulos

\* [855]discipulos oriens misit

\* [856]domui Vespasiani per adfinitatem innexum et gratissimum

Domitiano, Praetorianis [Domitianus] praeposuit, patrem eius, sub

Caio Caesare, egregie functum ea cura, dictitans, laetum militibus

idem nomen.

\* [857]ecclesiae domesticae

\* [858]edicta quasi viventis et brevi magno inimicorum malo

reversuri.

\* [859]eodem anno dominus Petrus apostolus ad coronam martyrii

properavit ad Christum et Plautilla corpus terrenum deseruit.

\* [860]eodem die quo Romae Cornelius sed non eodem anno

\* [861]eodem tempore Augustus Constantinus fecit basilicam

\* [862]eoque, concubia nocte, suos liberos Sabinus, et Domitianum,

fratris filium in capitolium accivit.

\* [863]episcopi

\* [864]episcopus

\* [865]erexit in titulum

\* [866]ergo abolendo rumori Nero subdidit reos

\* [867]esse

\* [868]etenim crebro vulgi rumore lacerabatur, tamquam viros claros

et insontes ob invidiam aut metum extinxisset.

\* [869]exitiabilis superstitio

\* [870]fecit in titulo beatis Aquile et Priscae coronam ex argento

pens. lib. VI.

\* [871]fenestrella

\* [872]flagitia

\* [873]frater ipsius

\* [874]frumentarii

\* [875]gens

\* [876]haud proinde in crimine incendii quam odio humani generis.

\* [877]hic titulos in urbe Romae dividit presbyteris.

\* [878]hoc monumentum haeredem non sequitur

\* [879]honestiores capite puniantur

\* [880]hortos suos ei spectaculo Nero obtulerat

\* [881]hostis generis humani

\* [882]imperator

\* [883]imperio consulari

\* [884]in fine vitae alii segnem, multi moderatum et civium sanguinis

parcum credidere

\* [885]in fine vitae alii segnem, multi moderatum et civium sanguinis

parcum credidere.

\* [886]in praedio suo

\* [887]in saevitiam unius

\* [888]in templum Apollinis, in Monte Aureo in Vaticanum palatii

Neroniani iii Kai. Iul.

\* [889]ingens multitudo

\* [890]institutum

\* [891]interim in iis, qui ad me tanquam Christiani deferebantur,

hunc sum secutus modum. Interrogavi ipsos, an essent Christiani;

confitentes iterum ac tertio interrogavi, supplicium minatus;

perseverantes duci iussi.

\* [892]intra antiquae ecclesiae rudera prope S. Priscam

\* [893]invalidus senecta

\* [894]isque (Aulus Plautius) prisco instituto propinquis coram de

capita famaque coniugis cognovit et insontem pronuntiavit.

\* [895]iuxta obeliscum inter duas metas

\* [896]leges monumentorum

\* [897]lex de maiestate

\* [898]lex monumenti

\* [899]literae dimissoriae

\* [900]loculi

\* [901]locus ad catacumbas

\* [902]locus sacer

\* [903]locus sacer, locus religiosus

\* [904]maiestas

\* [905]majestas

\* [906]maleficae

\* [907]maleficus

\* [908]memoria

\* [909]memoriae

\* [910]mitem virum abhorrere a sanguine et caedibus

\* [911]molitores novarum rerum.

\* [912]molitores rerum novarum

\* [913]more Iudaico

\* [914]mota prope etiam Parthorum arma falsi Neronis ludibrio.

\* [915]multitudinem Iudaeorum flagrantium nonnunquam in concionibus

\* [916]neptem

\* [917]nomen

\* [918]nomen ipsum, si flagitiis careat, an flagitia cohaerentia

nomini puniantur' . . . nihil aliud inveni quam superstitionem

pravam et immodicam.

\* [919]non longe, miliario VII.

\* [920]non vero "scripturae" auctoritatem ipsam sed solum argumentum

inde haustum [Tertullianus] impugnavit.

\* [921]nundinum

\* [922]palatium Neronianum

\* [923]paratus

\* [924]passi sub Nerone

\* [925]pastor

\* [926]pastores

\* [927]patris tui fuisse germanum.

\* [928]peregrini

\* [929]pontifices

\* [930]posuit iuxta locum ubi crucifixus est, inter corpora sanctorum

episcoporum, in templum Apollinis, in monte aureo, in vaticanum

palatii neroniani.

\* [931]praedio suo

\* [932]praenomen

\* [933]praeterea quod non esset Romae Paulus neque Timotheus neque

Barnabas, quoniam in Macedoniam missi erant a Paulo.

\* [934]primus inter pares

\* [935]prope Septizonium sordidis aedibus cubiculo vero perparvo et

obscuro.

\* [936]pudenda

\* [937]quae scriptura valde mihi utilis videtur et ut puto divinitus

inspirata.

\* [938]quasi sub umbraculo religionis insignissimae certe licitae.

\* [939]quinquennium Neronis

\* [940]quod postquam Sallustius Crispus . . . comperit metuens ne

reus subderetur

\* [941]quos vocavit threptous

\* [942]quum orassem domi, et consedissem supra lectum, intravit et

quidam reverenda facie etc.

\* [943]refert autem Brettius, multos Christianorum sub Dometiano

subiisse martyrium; Flavia vero Dometila et Flavus Clementis

consulis sororis filius in insulam Pontiam fugit quia se

Christianum esse professus est.

\* [944]relatio

\* [945]religio licita

\* [946]repente ex tenuissima suspicione tantum non in ipso eius

consulatu interemit.

\* [947]rescissio actorum

\* [948]sarcophagi

\* [949]sed non ope humana, non largitionibus principis aut deum

placamentis decedebat infamia, quin iussum incendium crederetur.

Ergo abolendo rumori Nero subdidit reos et quaesitissimis poenis

adfecit, quos per flagitia invisos vulgus Christianos appellabat.

Auctor nominis eius Christus Tiberio imperitante per procuratorem

Pontium Pilatum supplicio adfectus erat; repressaque in praesens

exitiabilis superstitio rursum erumpebat, non modo per Iudaeam,

originem eius mali, sed per urbem etiam, quo cuncta undique atrocia

aut pudenda confluunt celebranturque.

\* [950]sed tali dedicatore damnationis nostrae etiam gloriamur.

\* [951]sella gestatoria

\* [952]sepultus est iuxta corpus beati Petri in Vaticanum.

\* [953]sepultus est via Aurelia in templum Apollinis, iuxta locum ubi

crucifixus est, iuxta palatium Neronianum, in Vaticanum, iuxta

territorium Triumphale.

\* [954]sepultus est via Numentana, ubi decollatus est, ab urbe Roma

\* [955]sequitur clades forte an dolo principis incertum, nam utrumque

auctores prodidere.

\* [956]seriatim

\* [957]si fidem commentarii voluerit haereticus, instrumenta Imperii

loquentur.

\* [958]si ob gravitatem caeli interiissent; vile damnum.

\* [959]spina

\* [960]sub idem tempus inter lacum Fucinum amnemque Lirim perrupto

monte, quo magnificentia operis a pluribus viseretur etc.

\* [961]suffect

\* [962]suffecti

\* [963]super corpus Petri, supra aera quod conclusit, fecit crucem ex

auro purissimo, pens. lib. cl. in mensuram loci, ubi scriptum est

hoc CONSTANTINVS AVGVSTVS ET HELENA AVGVSTA HANC DOMVM REGALEM

SIMILI FVLGORE CORVSCANS AVLA CIRCVMDAT, scriptum ex litteris

nigellis in cruce ipsa.

\* [964]superstitio nova ac malefica

\* [965]synagogas Iudaeorum fontes persecutionum

\* [966]tabula patronatus

\* [967]titulus

\* [968]titulus Pudentis

\* [969]tota haec quaestio facillime posset dissolvi si tempus

Clementis episcopatus plane constaret.

\* [970]trinis viis

\* [971]urbs libera

\* [972]utrumque in Catacumbis, passi sub Nerone, Basso et Tusco

consulibus.

\* [973]vario super exitu eius rumore eoque pluribus vivere eum

fingentibus credentibusque.

\* [974]velut totius orbis dominam visere cupiens

\* [975]verna

\* [976]vestigia

\* [977]via Nomentana ad nymphas Beati Petri ubi baptizabat
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\* [978]Dass diese Worte [the passage about Clement and Grapte] eine

"Fiction" seien, ist eine Annahme, die sich nicht begr�nden and die

sich nicht halten l�sst, wenn man sie durchdenkt.

\* [979]Denn aufmerksame and unparteiische Lesung des Hirten w�rde dem

Frg. gezeigt haben dass derselbe geraume Zeit vor dem Episkopat des

Pius geschrieben sein will. Wer das Buch trotz des Namens Clemens

(Vis

\* [980]Der Grosse Abschnitt--c. 9-11--ist aus der Feder eines Juden

geflossen der mit allen Fasern seiner Seele an seinem Volke h�ngt

\* [981]Die Himmelfahrt des Isaia, ein �ltestes Zeugnis f�r das

r�mische Martyrium des Petrus

\* [982]Man beachte wohl, das (gl�ubige) Israel kata sarka

\* [983]Nicht auffallend aber konnte es nur sein, dass andere sich

durch die starken Argumente f�r die fr�he Abfassung der lukanischen

Schriften als vollkommen �berzeugt erkl�rten. Nicht nur Delbr�ck

hielt mir sofort vor, ich h�tte mich in einer von mir selbst sicher

entschiedenen Frage mit unn�tiger Zur�ckhaltung ausgedr�ckt,

sondern auch Maurenbrecher erkannte in meinen Beweisf�hrungen die

L�sung des chronologischen Problems. In seinem Werk "Von Nazareth

nach Golgatha" (1909) S. 22-30, gibt er die wichtigsten der von mir

geltend gemachten Beobachtungen f�r eine fr�he Abfassungszeit der

Acta zutreffend und eindrucksvoll wieder and beschliesst seine

Darlegung also: "Die Annahme (eines sp�teren Ursprungs and

geschichtlichen Wertlosigkeit der Lukasschriften) ist neuerdings

immermehr gefallen and schliesslich durch eine gr�ndliche

Untersuchung von Prof. Harnack in allen Teilen g�nzlich widerlegt

and beseitigt worden. Viel mehr hat sich nach jeder Richtung hin,

wenn auch nicht die unbedingte Glaubw�rdigkeit, so doch das hohe

Alter der Apostelgeschichte ergeben. Und wenn Prof. H. selbst nur

z�gernd und erst nur in letzten Moment seiner Arbeit die Konsequenz

seiner Ergebnisse auch f�r die Datierung zog, so muss man doch

sagen, dass nur in jener von ihm vorgeschlagenen Weise so wohl der

Schlusssatz der Acta wie die ganze Tenor des Buchs verst�ndlich

wird, und dass daher schon um dieses �usseren Zeugnisses willen die

Datierung auf d. J. 62 als bewiesen und nicht nur als m�glich zu

gelten hat.

\* [984]Widersetzte er (Claudius) sich energisch, wiewohl erfolglos

der mystischen Richtung der Zeit, welche sich namentlich in der

Vorliebe f�r Superstitions peregrinae

\* [985]der sogenannte Marcellustext

\* [986]die zuletzt angef�hrten Stellen m�gen darauf hinweisen, dass

der monarchische Episkopat damals in Anzug war; aber von diesem

selbst ist in dem Buche keine Spur zu finden.

\* [987]musste dem r�mischen Bischofe h�chst unbequem werden: denn sie

drohte die einzigartige Bedeutung des Petrus f�r das Abendland and

die einzigartige Stellung Roms im Abendlande zu gef�rhrden.

\* [988]zwar nicht sicher, aber sehr wahrscheinlich
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\* [989]Ann. XX dans le texte arm�nien, �videmment fautif.

\* [990]Ce d'but, de m�me que plusieurs autres parties de la notice,

�tant emprunt� au De Viris

\* [991]Ces interpolations, � mon avis, ne doivent donc ni d�concerter

ni r�buter la critique. Sous la couche des inventions, les traits

originaux existent, et un grand nombre d'entre eux apparaissent

come � fleur de sol. Il les faut d�gager patiemment

\* [992]En ce qui regarde Saint Pierre le chiffre de ses vingt-cinq

ann�es est aussi bien attest� que les chiffres d'ann�es de ses

successeurs depuis Xystus Ier

\* [993]I1 (l'auteur) n'en tenait pas moins un rang �lev� dans

l'Eglise; il parle avec autorit�; il est tr�s-respect� des fr�tres

auxquels il �cit; Timoth�e para�t lui �tre subordonn�. Le seul fait

d'adresser une �pitre � une grande Eglise indique un homme

important, un des personnages qui figurent dans 1'histoire

apostolique et dont le nom est c�l�bre . . . L'attribution �

Barnab� est la plus vraisemblable.

\* [994]L'auteur de la note para�t avoir mal compris le texte des Acta

\* [995]La I Petri

\* [996]La Version Vulgate (L') remontant peut-�tre a la fin du IIe

\* [997]Les gentils, aux temps de Diocl�tien, avaient recherch�, pour

les an�antir, les livres, les �crits religieux des fid�les. Cette

destruction, qui nous est attest�e par des proc�s-verbaux

contemporains, fut rigoureusement poursuivi, et l'Eglise, apr�s la

tourmente, dut pourvoir � la r�fection de ses archives d�vast�es.

Ce fut souvent � l';aide de souvenirs de traditions orales, que

l'on dut r�constituer alors nombre d'Acta

\* [998]Les lettres de cette courte �pitaphe,' remarks Marucchi, sont

tr�s soign�es et d'une forme pal�ographique certainement ant�rieure

� la seconde moiti� du IIe

\* [999]Malheureusement les Actes [des Martyrs] authentiques ont

presque tous disparu. . . . L'Eglise romaine non poss�de aucun. Les

actes de ces martyrs ont d� �tre d�truits pendant la grande

pers�cution de Diocl�tien; il est certain qu'� cette �poque on a

br�l� les Archives de de 1'Eglise romaine; on a d'ailleurs agi de

m�me en Afrique, ainsi que nous 1'apprend S. Augustin.

\* [1000]On peut dire sans exagg�ration que c'est la region

cimet�riale la plus vaste et la plus r�guli�re de toute la Rome

souterraine. Ses inscriptions grav�es sur marbre, ou peintes en

rouges sur des tuiles comme au premier �tage, attestent qu'au moins

en partie elle remonte � la plus haute antiquit�. A mon avis, il y

eut l� un noyau cimet�rial d�s le Ile

\* [1001]Quant au temple d'Apollon, il y a, clans cette d�signation,

un souvenir du c�l�bre sanctuaire de Cyb�le, qui s'�l�vait tout

pr�s du cirque et de la basilique, et qui fut, jusqu'aux derni�res

ann�es du ive

\* [1002]S. Pierre, sa venue et son martyre � Rome

\* [1003]arri�re-pens�es

\* [1004]la mention de pat�nes de verre est � remarquer; elles

n'�taient certainemeut plus en usage � la fin du Ve

\* [1005]venons en aux athl�tes tout r�cents.
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