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My Dear Uncle,

In my undergraduate days, a residence in G�ttingen during the Long

Vacation of 1874 was a critical point in my life. Then for the first

time, under the tuition of Professor Theodore Benfey, I came into close

relations with a great scholar of the modern type, and gained some

insight into modern methods of literary investigation; and my thoughts

have ever since turned towards the border lands between European and

Asiatic civilisation. That visit, like many other things, I owe to you;

and now I send you the result, such as it is, the best that I can do,

asking that you will allow it to go forth with your name attached to

it.

I remain always, your affectionate nephew,

WILLIAM MITCHELL RAMSAY.

King's college, Aberdeen,

17th September, 1895
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PREFACE

WHEN I was honoured by the invitation of Auburn Theological Seminary, I

referred the matter to my friends, Dr. Fairbairn and Dr. Sanday, who

knew what were my circumstances and other duties. On their advice the

invitation was accepted; and it included the condition that the

lectures must be published. In revising the printed sheets I have felt

strongly the imperfections of the exposition; but I can feel no doubt

about the facts themselves, which seem to stand out so clear and

distance, that one has only to look and write. Hence I have not

withdrawn from any of the positions maintained in my Church in the

Roman Empire before 170 (apart from incidental imperfections). The

present work is founded on the results for which evidence is there

accumulated; but, in place of its neutral tone, a definite theory about

the composition of Acts is here maintained (see p.383 f.). Many

references were made, at first, to pages of that work, and of my Cities

and Bishoprics of Phrygia (1895), where views here assumed were

explained and defended; but they had an egotistic appearance, and, on

the advice of a valued friend, have been cut out from the proof-sheets.

I use in Acts the canons of interpretation which I have learned from

many teachers (beyond all others from Mommsen) to apply to history; and

I have looked at Paul and Luke as men among men. My aim has been to

state the facts of Paul's life simply, avoiding argument and

controversy so far as was possible in a subject where every point is

controverted. I have sometimes thought of a supplementary volume of

Elucidations of Early Christian History, in which reasons should be

stated more fully.

It is impossible to find anything to say about Acts that has not been

said before by somebody. Doubtless almost everything I have to say

might be supported by some quotation. But if a history of opinion about

Acts had been desired, I should not have been applied to. Where I was

conscious of having learned any special point from any special scholar

I have mentioned his name; but that, of course does not exhaust half my

debt. The interpretation of one of the great ancient authors is a long

slow growth; one is not conscious where he learned most of his ideas;

and, if he were, their genesis is a matter of no interest or value to

others. Not merely the writers quoted, but also Sch�rer, Meyer-Wendt,

Z�ckler, Holtzmann, Clemen, Spitta, Zeller, Everett, Paley, Page, and

many others, have taught me; and I thankfully acknowledge my debt. But

specially Lightfoot, Lewin's Fatsi Sacri, and the two greatest editors

of Acts, Wetstein and Blass, have been constant companions.

Discussions with my wife, and with my friends, Professor W. P.

Paterson, Rev. A. F. Findlay, and above all, Prof. Rendel Harris, have

cleared my ideas on many points, beyond what can be distinctly

specified. The book has been greatly improved by criticisms from Prof.

Rendel Harris, and by many notes and suggestions from Rev. A. C.

Headlam, which were of great value to me. Mr. A. Souter, Caius College,

Cambridge, has aided me in many ways, and especially by compiling Index

I. But it would be vain to try to enumerate all my obligations to many

friends.

I wish to mention two facts about the genesis of my studies in this

subject: (1) Dr. Fairbairn proposed to me the subject of "St. Paul as a

Citizen" long ago; and I long shrank from it as too great and too

difficult; (2) Dr. Robertson Nicoll (mindful of early acquaintance in

Aberdeen) urged me in 1884 to write, and gave me no peace, until I

published a first article,Expositor, Oct., 1888.

An apology is due for the variations, often harsh, from the familiar

translation of Acts; but a little insertion or change often saved a

paragraph.

Lectures which I had the honour to give before the Harvard University,

Johns Hopkins University (the Levering Lectures), and Union Seminary,

New York, are worked up in this volume.

Aberdeen, 23rd September, 1895

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION

There are many sentences and paragraphs which I should have liked to

rewrite, had it been possible, not in order to alter the views

expressed, but to improve the inadequate expression.

In the new edition, however, it was not possible to introduce any

alterations affecting the arrangement of the printed lines; but some

corrections and improvements have been made through the aid of valued

correspondents and critics, especially Rev. F. Warburton Lewis, Rev. G.

W. Whitaker, and the Athenaeum reviewer. Slight, but not insignificant

verbal changes have been made in p. 18, 1. 8, 10, 11; 19, 1. 10; 27, 1.

14; 34, 1. 8; 62, 1. 15; 98, 1. 16; 1455, 1. 5; 146, 1. 6-7; 211, 1.

11; 224, 1. 6; 227, 1. 3; 242, 1. 31; 263, 1. 12; 276, 1. 27; 282, 1. 1

(footnote deleted); 307 n. 2 (Matt. XXVII 24, added); 330 1. 13-14;

363, 1. 5. The punctuation has been improved in p. 28, 1. 19, 21; and

an obscure paragraph p. 160, 1. 10-17 has been rewritten.

Besides correcting p. 141, 1. 9, I must apologise for having there

mentioned Dr. Chase incorrectly. I intended to cut out his name from

the proof, but left it by accident, while hesitating between two

corrections; and I did not know that it remained on that page, till he

wrote me on the subject. On p. 27, 1. 14, I quoted his opinion about

the solitary point on which we seem to agree; but, as he writes that my

expression "makes him responsible for what he has never maintained," I

have deleted the offending words. He adds, "may I very earnestly ask,

if your work reaches a second edition, that, if you refer to me, you

will give in some conspicuous place a reference to my papers in the

Expositor, that those interested in the subject may have the chance of

seeing what I have really said." See "The Galatia of the Acts,"

Expositor, Dec., 1893, and May, 1894 the title shows deficient

geographical accuracy on the part of my distinguished opponent, for

Luke never mentions "Galatia," but only "the Galatic Territory," and

there lies one of the fine points of the problem. After finishing the

Church in the Roman Empire before 170, I had no thought of troubling

the world with anything further on this subject; but Dr. Chase's

criticism roused me to renewed work, and then came the Auburn

invitation. With the Galatian question the date and authorship of Acts

are bound up: the more I study, the more clearly I see that it is

impossible to reconcile the "North-Galatian theory" with the

first-century origin and Lukan authorship of Acts: that theory involves

so many incongruities and inconsistencies, as to force a cool intellect

to the view that Acts is not a trustworthy contemporary authority. But,

on the "South-Galatian theory," the book opens to us a fresh chapter in

the history and geography of Asia Minor during the first century.

The form of Index II was suggested, and the details were collected in

great part by Rev. F. Warburton Lewis (formerly of Mansfield College),

and Indices III and IV were compiled, amid the pressure of his own

onerous duties, by Rev. F. Wilfrid Osborn, Vice-Principal of the

Episcopal College, Edinburgh; and my warmest gratitude is due for their

voluntary and valuable help.

I add notes on some contested points.

1. Reading the Agricola before a college class in 1893-4, I drew a

parallel between its method and that of Luke in respect of careful

attention to order of events, and inattention to the stating of the

lapse of time; but in each case knowledge acquired from other sources,

and attention to the author's order and method, enable us to fix the

chronology with great accuracy; on p. 18 my lecture on this topic is

summarized in a sentence.

2. The chronology established in this book is confirmed by the

statement in an oration falsely ascribed to Chrysostom (Vol. VIII, p.

621, Paris, 1836), that Paul served God thirty-five years and died at

the age of sixty-eight. As there can be little doubt that his martyrdom

took place about A. D. 67 this fourth century authority (which bears

the stamp of truth in its matter of fact simplicity) proves that he was

converted in 33 A. D., as wee have deduced from the statements of Luke

and Paul (p. 376, and my article in Expositor, May, 1896). If Paul died

in the year beginning 23rd Sept., 67, his birth was in 1 A.D. (before

23rd Sept.). Now he evidently began public life after the Crucifixion,

but before the death of Stephen; and he would naturally come before the

public in the course of his thirtieth year; therefore his birth falls

later than Passover A.D. 1.

3. The punctuation of Gal. II 1-4, for which an argument was advanced

in Expositor, July, 1895, p. 105 ff., is assumed in the free

translation on p. 55. The view taken my me of Gal. II 1-14 is

controverted by the high authority of Dr. Sanday in Expositor, Feb.,

1896, and defended March, 1896. Mr. Vernon Bartlet informs me that Zhan

dates Gal. II 11-14 between Acts XII 25 and XV 4 (as I do, p. 160), see

Neue Kirchl. Zft., 1894, p. 435 f.

4. The phrase "the God" (p. 118, 1. 5) refers, of course to v. 15.

5. While grateful for the publication of such essays by Lightfoot as

that quoted on p. 199, I cannot hold that great scholar (of whose

spirit in investigation I should be satisfied if I dared hope to have

caught a little) responsible for them in the same way as for works

published by himself. (1) His lectures were not written out, but in

great part spoken, and the notes taken by pupils are not a sufficient

basis: a slight verbal change in the hurry of writing often seriously

modifies the force of a lecturer's statement: moreover a speaker trusts

to tone for many effects, which it requires careful study to express in

written words. (2) Even those parts which were written out by himself,

belong to an early stage in his career, and were not revised by himself

in his maturity. (3) A writer often materially improves his work n

proof: I know that some changes were made on the proofs even of the

Ignatius, his maturest work. Hence the reader finds pages in

Lightfoot's finest style side by side with some paragraphs, which it is

difficult to believe that he expressed in this exact form, and

impossible to believe that he would ever have allowed to go forth in

print. The analogy with Acts I-V (see below, p. 370) is striking.

6. It seems to me one of the strangest things that almost all

interpreters reject the interpretation which Erasmus's clear sense

perceived to be necessary in XVI 22 (p. 217). Some of the many

difficulties involved in the interpretation that the praetors rent the

clothes of Paul and Silas are exposed by Spitta, Apostelgesch., p. 218

f. To discuss the subject properly would need a chapter. It is not

impossible that the title "praetors" may have been even technically

accurate; but I have not ventured to go beyond the statement that it

was at least employed in courtesy.

7. The short paragraph about the politarchs should be transferred from

p. 227 to p. 229, 1. 6 ff.

8. The fact that Paul's friends were permitted free access to him in

Rome and C�sareia (Acts XXVIII 30 and XXIV 23) cannot be taken as a

proof of what would be the case in a convoy, which must have been

governed with strict Roman discipline. The argument on P. 315 f. is

consistent with the supposition that Julius learned that the two

attendants of Paul were friends acting as slaves; but their presence in

the convoy was legalized only under the guise of slavery.

9. My friend and former pupil, Mr. A. A. G. Wright, sends me a good

note on p. 329, confirming the interpretation (adopted from Smith) of

chalasantes to skeuos from the practice of the herring boats in the

Moray Firth; these boats, fitted with a large lug-sail, are a good

parallels to the ancient sailing ships. In Paul's ship the sailors

"slackened the sail-tackle," and thus lowered the yard some way,

leaving a low sail, which would exercise less leverage on the hull (p.

328).

Aberdeen, 25th March, 1896

PREFACE TO THE THIRD EDITION

I am partly glad, partly sorry, to have little change to make in this

edition--glad, because the words printed, however inadequate I feel

them to be, have on the whole, stood the test of further thought and

growing knowledge--sorry, because so few of the faults which must exist

have revealed themselves to me. On p. 275 a change is made in an

important detail. The following notes are confirmatory of arguments in

the text:--

1. The examination of the development of Christianity in Phrygia,

contained in Chapters XII and XVII of my Cities and Bishoprics of

Phrygia (Part II, 1897), shows that Christianity spread with marvelous

rapidity at the end of the first and in the second century after Christ

in the parts of Phrygia that lay along the road from Pisidian Antioch

to Ephesus, and in the neighborhood of Iconium, whereas it did not

become powerful in those parts of Phrygia that adjoined North Galatia

till the fourth century. Further, in a paper printed in Studia Biblica

IV, I have pointed out that Christianity seems to have hardly begun to

affect the district of North Galatia which lies on the side of Phrygia

until the fourth century. The first parts of North Galatia to feel the

influence was so strong as in some parts of Phrygia. These facts

obviously are fatal to the theory that St. Paul's Galatian Churches

were founded in the part of North Galatia adjoining Phrygia.

2. On p. 43, 1. 1, it should be stated more clearly that Cornelius was

a "God-fearing" proselyte.

3. On p. 46, 1. 12 ff., the limits are stated beyond which Paul's work

in the eight years (not ten), 35-43, was not carried; and the rather

incautious words on p. 46, 1. 10, do not imply that he was engaged in

continuous work of preaching during that time. It is probable that

quiet meditation and self-preparation filled considerable part of these

years. The words of XI 26 (compare Luke II 24) suggest that he was in

an obscure position, and Gal. I 23 perhaps describes mere occasional

rumors about a personage who was not at the time playing a prominent

part as a preacher, as the Rev. C. E. C. Lefroy points out to me in an

interesting letter (which prompts this note). But the facts, when

looked at in this way, bring out even more strongly than my actual

words do, that (as is urged on p. 46) Paul was not yet "fully conscious

of his mission direct to the Nations, and that his work is rightly

regarded in Acts as beginning in Antioch.

4. On p. 212, as an additional example of the use of the aorist

participle, Rev. F. W. Lewis quotes Heb. IX 12, eiselthen ephapax eis

ta hagia aionian lutrosin heuramenos, "entered and obtained." I add

from a Phrygian inscription quoted in my Cities and Bishroprics of

Phrygia, Part II, 1897, p.790--

hastesi d' en polloisin ithageneon lache teimas, leiphas kai kounrous

ouden aphauroterous,

"He was presented with the freedom of many cities, and left sons as

good as himself."

5. P. 264. The safe passage of the Jewish pilgrims from the west and

north sides of the Aegean to Jerusalem was ensured by letters of many

Roman officials, especially addressed to the cities of Cos and Ephesus.

It is obvious that these cities lay on the line of the pilgrims'

voyage; and as the pilgrims were the subject of so much correspondence

they must have been numerous, and pilgrim ships must have sailed

regularly at the proper season.

6. P. 271. To illustrate the view that Paul used the School of Tyrannus

in the forenoon and no later, Mr. A. Souter quotes Augustine Confess.,

VI, 11,18, antemeridianis horis discipuli occupant (of the School of

Rhetoric at Milan), while the scholars were free in the afternoon, and

Augustine considers that those free hours ought to be devoted to

religion.

7. I have changed p. 275, 1. 2 ff. The words of 2 Cor. XII 14; XIII 1,

would become, certainly, more luminous and more full of meaning if

there had occurred an unrecorded visit of Paul to Corinth. The only

time that is open for such a visit is (as Rev. F. W. Lewis suggests)

after he left Ephesus and went to Troas; and the balance of probability

is that such a visit was made, probably in March, 56 (as soon as the

sailing season began), by ship from Philippi. The paragraph, XX, 1-4,

is confessedly obscure and badly expressed; and it is probable that, if

the book had been carried to its final stage by the author, both v. 4

would have been added between vv. 1 and 2.

8. P. 341. Mr. Emslie Smith, Aberdeen, sends me a valuable note, the

result of personal inspection of St. Paul's Bay, in which he completely

clears up the difficulty which I had to leave. It will, I hope, form

the subject of an early article in the Expositor.

9. P. 389, note 2. With the words of Eusebius compare the exactly

parallel expression of Aristides, Seberos ton apo tes anothen Phrugias

(Vol. 1, p. 505, ed. Dind.), which means that this Roman officer

belonged to a Jewish family connected with Upper Phrygia (and also, as

we know from other sources, with Ancyra in Galatia), but certainly does

not imply that he was Phrygian by birth or training. It is practically

certain that a Roman consul, with a career like that of Severus, must,

at the period when he flourished, have been educated nearer to Rome,

and probably in the metropolis. The scion of a Phrygian family, growing

up amid Phrygian surroundings in the early part of the second century,

would not have been admitted to the Roman senatorial career, as Severus

was in his youth. His family, while retaining its Phrygian connection,

had settled amid strictly Roman surroundings; and its wealth and

influence procured for the heir immediate entry into the highest career

open to a Roman. The quotation from Aristides shows that the

interpretation of Eusebius's expression given on p. 389 is on the right

lines. The history of Severus's family in Asia Minor is sketched in

Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia, Pt. II, p. 649 f.
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CHAPTER I

THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES

1. TRUSTWORTHINESS.

The aim of our work is to treat its subject as a department of history

and of literature. Christianity was not merely a religion, but also, a

system of life and action; and its introduction by Paul amid the

society of the Roman Empire produced changes of momentous consequence,

which the historian must study. What does the student of Roman history

find in the subject of our investigation? How would an observant,

educated, and unprejudiced citizen of the Roman Empire have regarded

that new social force, that new philosophical system, if he had studied

it with the eyes and the temper of a nineteenth century investigator?

As a preliminary the historian of Rome must make up his mind about the

trustworthiness of the authorities. Those which we shall use are:(1) a

work of history commonly entitled the Acts of the Apostles (the title

does not originate from the author), (2) certain Epistles purporting to

be written by Paul. Of the latter we make only slight and incidental

use; and probably even those who dispute their authenticity would admit

that the facts we use are trustworthy, as being the settled belief of

the Church at a very early period. It is, therefore, unnecessary to

touch on the authenticity of the Epistles; but the question as to the

date, the composition, and the author of the Acts must be discussed. If

the main position of this book is admitted, it will furnish a secure

basis for the Epistles to rest on.

Works that profess to be historical are of various kinds and

trustworthy in varying degrees. (1) There is the historical romance,

which in a framework of history interweaves an invented tale. Some of

the Apocryphal tales of the Apostles are of this class, springing

apparently from a desire to provide Christian substitutes for the

popular romances of the period. (2) There is the legend, in which

popular fancy, working for generations, has surrounded a real person

and real events with such a mass of extraneous matter that the

historical kernel is hardly discernible. Certain of the Apocryphal

tales of the Apostles may belong to this class, and many of the Acta of

martyrs and saints certainly do. (3) There is the history of the second

or third rate, in which the writer, either using good authorities

carelessly and without judgment, or not possessing sufficiently

detailed and correct authorities, gives a narrative of past events

which is to a certain degree trustworthy, but contains errors in facts

and in the grouping and proportions, and tinges the narrative of the

past with the colour of his own time. In using works of this class the

modern student has to exercise his historical tact, comparing the

narrative with any other evidence that can be obtained from any source,

and judging whether the action attributed to individuals is compatible

with the possibilities of human nature. (4) There is, finally, the

historical work of the highest order, in which a writer commands

excellent means of knowledge either through personal acquaintance or

through access to original authorities. and brings to the treatment of

his subject genius, literary skill, and sympathetic historical insight

into human character and the movement of events. Such an author seizes

the critical events, concentrates the reader's attention on them by

giving them fuller treatment, touches more lightly and briefly on the

less important events, omits entirely a mass of unimportant details,

and makes his work an artistic and idealised picture of the progressive

tendency of the period.

Great historians are the rarest of writers. By general consent the

typical example of the highest class of historians is Thucydides, and

it is doubtful whether any other writer would be by general consent

ranked along with him. But all historians, from Thucydides downwards,

must be subjected to free criticism. The fire which consumes the

second-rate historian only leaves the real master brighter and stronger

and more evidently supreme. The keenest criticism will do him the best

service in the long run. But the critic in his turn requires high

qualities; he must be able to distinguish the true from the false; he

must be candid and unbiased and open-minded. There are many critics who

have at great length stated their preference of the false before the

true; and it may safely be said that there is no class of literary

productions in our century in which there is such an enormous

preponderance of error and bad judgment as in that of historical

criticism. To some of our critics Herodotus is the Father of History,

to others he is an inaccurate reproducer of uneducated gossip: one

writer at portentous length shows up the weakness of Thucydides,

another can see no fault in him.

But, while recognising the risk, and the probable condemnation that

awaits the rash attempt, I will venture to add one to the number of the

critics, by stating in the following chapters reasons for placing the

author of Acts among the historians of the first rank.

The first and the essential quality of the great historian is truth.

What he says must be trustworthy. Now historical truth implies not

merely truth in each detail, but also truth in the general effect, and

that kind of truth cannot be attained without selection, grouping, and

idealisation.

So far as one may judge from books, the opinion of scholars seems to

have, on the whole, settled down to the conclusion that the author of

Acts belongs either to the second- or the third-rate historians. Among

those who assign him to the third rate we may rank all those who

consider that the author clipped up older documents and patched

together the fragments in a more or less intelligent way, making a

certain number of errors in the process. Theories of this kind are

quite compatible with assigning a high degree of trustworthiness to

many statements in the book; but this trustworthiness belongs not to

the author of the work, but to the older documents which he glued

together. Such theories usually assign varying degrees of accuracy to

the different older documents: all statements which suit the critic's

own views on early Church history are taken from an original document

of the highest character; those which he likes less belong to a less

trustworthy document; and those which are absolutely inconsistent with

his views. are the work of the ignorant botcher who constructed the

book. But this way of judging, common as it is, assumes the truth of

the critic's own theory, and decides on the authenticity of ancient

documents according to their agreement with that theory; and the

strangest part of this medley of uncritical method is that other

writers, who dispute the first critic's theory of early Church history,

yet attach some value to his opinion upon the spuriousness of documents

which he has condemned solely on the ground that they disagree with his

theory.

The most important group among those who assign the author to the

second rank of historians, consists of them that accept his facts as

true, although his selection of what he should say and what he should

omit seems to them strangely capricious. They recognise many of the

signs of extraordinary accuracy in his statements; and these signs are

so numerous that they feel bound to infer that the facts as a whole are

stated with great accuracy by a personal friend of St. Paul. But when

they compare the Acts with such documents as the Epistles of Paul, and

when they study the history as a whole, they are strongly impressed

with the inequalities of treatment, and the unexpected and puzzling

gaps; events of great importance seem to be dismissed in a brief and

unsatisfactory way; and, sometimes, when one of the actors (such as

Paul) has left an account of an event described in Acts, they find

difficulty in recognising the two accounts as descriptions of the same

event. Bishop Lightfoot's comparison of Gal. II 1-10 with Acts XV may

be quoted as a single specimen out of many: the elaborate process

whereby he explains away the seeming discrepancies would alone be

sufficient, if it were right, to prove that Acts was a second-rate work

of history. We never feel on firm historical ground, when discrepancies

are cleverly explained away: we need agreements to stand upon.

Witnesses in a law court may give discrepant accounts of the same

event; but they are half-educated, confused, unable to rise to

historical truth. But when a historian is compared with the

reminiscences of an able and highly educated actor in the same scenes,

and when the comparison consists chiefly in a laboured proof that the

discrepancies do not amount to positive contradiction, the conclusion

is very near, that, if the reminiscences are strictly honest, the

historian's picture is not of the highest rank.

But there is a further difficulty. How does it come that a writer, who

shows himself distinctly second-rate in his historical perception of

the comparative importance of events, is able to attain such remarkable

accuracy in describing many of them? The power of accurate description

implies in itself a power of reconstructing the past, which involves

the most delicate selection and grouping of details according to their

truth and reality, i.e., according to their comparative importance.

Acts, as Lightfoot pictures it, is to me an inconceivable phenomenon;

such a mixture of strength and weakness, of historical insight and

historical incapacity, would be unique and incredible. If the choice

for an intelligible theory of Acts lay between Lightfoot's view and

that which is presented in different forms by Clemen, Spitta, and other

scholars, I could only adopt the same point of view as these critics.

Lightfoot, with all his genius, has here led English scholarship into a

cul de sac: we can make no progress, unless we retrace our steps and

try a new path. But my belief is, that all the difficulties in which

Lightfoot was involved spring from the attempt to identify the wrong

events. In this attempt he naturally found discrepancies; but by a

liberal allowance of gaps in the narrative of Acts, and the supposition

of different points of view and of deficient information on Luke's

part, it was possible to show why the eye-witness saw one set of

incidents, while Acts described quite a different set.

The historian who is to give a brief history of a great period need not

reproduce on a reduced uniform scale all the facts which he would

mention in a long history, like a picture reduced by a photographic

process. If a brief history is to be a work of true art, it must omit a

great deal, and concentrate the reader's attention on a certain number

of critical points in the development of events, elaborating these

sufficiently to present them in life-like and clearly intelligible

form. True historical genius lies in selecting the great crises, the

great agents, and the great movements, in making these clear to the

reader in their real nature, in passing over with the lightest and

slightest touch numerous events and many persons, but always keeping

clear before the reader the plan of composition.

The historian may dismiss years with a word, and devote considerable

space to a single incident. In such a work, the omission of an event

does not constitute a gap, but is merely a proof that the event had not

sufficient importance to enter into the plan. A gap is some omission

that offends our reason and our sense of harmony and propriety; and

where something is omitted that bears on the author's plan, or where

the plan as conceived by the author does not correspond to the march of

events, but only to some fanciful and subjective view, there the work

fails short of the level of history.

I may fairly claim to have entered on this investigation without any

prejudice in favour of the conclusion which I shall now attempt to

justify to the reader. On the contrary, I began with a mind

unfavourable to it, for the ingenuity and apparent completeness of the

T�bingen theory had at one time quite convinced me. It did not lie then

in my line of life to investigate the subject minutely; but more

recently I found myself often brought in contact with the book of Acts

as an authority for the topography, antiquities, and society of Asia

Minor. It was gradually borne in upon me that in various details the

narrative showed marvellous truth. In fact, beginning with the fixed

idea that the work was essentially a second-century composition, and

never relying on its evidence as trustworthy for first-century

conditions,. I gradually came to find it a useful ally in some obscure

and difficult investigations. But there remained still one serious

objection to accepting it as entirely a first-century work. According

to the almost universally accepted view, this history led Paul along a

path and through surroundings which seemed to me historically and

topographically self-contradictory. It was not possible to bring Paul's

work in Asia Minor into accordance with the facts of history on the

supposition that an important part of that work was devoted to a

district in the northern part of the peninsula, called Galatia. It may

appear at first sight a mere topographical subtlety whether Paul

travelled through North Galatia or through Lycaonia; but, when you

consider that any details given of his journeys must be false to the

one side just in proportion as they are true to the other, you will

perceive that, if you try to apply the narrative to the wrong side of

the country, it will not suit the scene, and if it does not suit, then

it must appear to be written by a person ignorant of what he pretends

to know. The case might be illustrated from our own experience. Suppose

that an unknown person came to Auburn from New York, and you wished to

find out whether he was an impostor or not. In our country we are

exposed to frequent attempts at imposition, which can often be detected

by a few questions; and you would probably ask him about his

experiences on his journey from New York to Auburn. Now suppose you had

been informed that he had come not along the direct road, but by a long

detour through Boston, Montreal, and Toronto, and had thus arrived at

Auburn; and suppose that you by questioning elicited from him various

facts which suited only a route through Schenectady and Utica, you

would condemn the man as an impostor, because he did not know the road

which he pretended to have travelled. But suppose further that it was

pointed out by some third party that this stranger had really travelled

along the direct road, and that you had been misinformed when you

supposed him to have come by the round-about way, your opinion as to

the stranger's truthfulness would be instantly affected. Precisely

similar is the case of Acts as a record of travel; generations and

centuries have been attempting to apply it to the wrong countries. I

must speak on this point confidently and uncompromisingly, for the

facts stand out so clear and bold and simple that to affect to hesitate

or to profess any doubt as to one's judgment would be a betrayal of

truth.

I know the difficulties of this attempt to understand rightly a book so

difficult, so familiar, and so much misunderstood as Acts. It is

probable that I have missed the right turn or not grasped the full

meaning in some cases. I am well aware that I leave some difficulties

unexplained, sometimes from inability, sometimes from mere omission.

But I am sustained by the firm belief that I am on the right path, and

by the hope that enough of difficulties have been cleared away to

justify a dispassionate historical criticism in placing this great

writer on the high pedestal that belongs to him.

2. DEVELOPMENT OF MODERN CRITICISM ON ACTS.

With regard to the trustworthiness of Acts as a record of events, a

change is perceptible in the tendency of recent criticism. Setting

aside various exceptional cases, and also leaving out of sight the

strictly "orthodox" view, which accepts Acts as truth without seeking

to compare or to criticise (a view which in its simplicity and

completeness needs neither defence nor examination), we may say that

for a time the general drift of criticism was to conceive the book as a

work composed in the second century with the intention of so

representing (or rather misrepresenting) the facts as to suit the

writer's opinion about the Church questions of his own time. All

theories of this class imply that the atmosphere and surroundings of

the work are of the second-century type; and such theories have to be

rounded on a proof that the details are represented in an inaccurate

way and coloured by second-century ideas. The efforts of that earlier

school of critics were directed to give the required proof; and in the

attempt they displayed a misapprehension of the real character of

ancient life and Roman history which is often astonishing, and which

has been decisively disproved in the progress of Roman historical

investigation. All such theories belong to the pre-Mommsenian epoch of

Roman history: they are now impossible for a rational and educated

critic; and they hardly survive except in popular magazines and novels

for the semi-religious order.

But while one is occasionally tempted to judge harshly the assumption

of knowledge made by the older critics where knowledge was at the time

difficult or impossible, it is only fair also to emphatically

acknowledge the debt we owe them for practising in a fearless and

independent spirit the right and much needed task of investigating the

nature and origin of the book.

Warned by the failure of the older theories, many recent critics take

the line that Acts consists of various first century scraps put

together in the book as we have it by a second-century Redactor. The

obvious signs of vivid accuracy in many of the details oblige these

critics to assume that the Redactor incorporated the older scraps with

no change except such as results from different surroundings and

occasional wrong collocation. Some hold that the Redactor made

considerable additions in order to make a proper setting for the older

scraps. Others reduce the Redactor's action to a minimum; Spitta is the

most remarkable example of this class. In the latter form the

Redaction-theory is the diametrical opposite of the old tendency

theories; the latter supposed that the second century author coloured

the whole narrative and put his own views into every paragraph, while,

according to Spitta, the Redactor added nothing of consequence to his

first century materials except some blunders of arrangement. The older

theories were rounded on the proof of a uniformity of later style and

purpose throughout the book; the later theories depend on the proof of

differences of style between the different parts. The old critics were

impressed by the literary skill of the author, while the later critics

can see no literary power or activity in him. Any argument in favour of

the one class of theories tells against the other; and, if we. admit

(as I think we must admit), that each view is rounded on a correct but

one-sided perception of certain qualities in this remarkable book, we

may fairly say that each disproves the other.

Certain theorists, and especially Clemen in his extraordinarily

ingenious and bold work Chronologie der Paulinischen Briefe, see

clearly that such a bald scissors-and-paste theory as Spitta's is quite

inadequate to explain the many-sided character of this history. Dr.

Clemen supposes that three older documents, a history of the

Hellenistic Jews, a history of Peter, and a history of Paul, were

worked into one work by a Judaist Redactor, who inserted many little

touches and even passages of considerable length to give a tone

favourable to the Judaising type of Christianity; and that this

completed book was again worked over by an anti-Judaist Redactor II,

who inserted other parts to give a tone unfavourable to the Judaising

type of Christianity, but left the Judaistic insertions. Finally, a

Redactor III of neutral tone incorporated anew document (VI 1-6), and

gave the whole its present form by a number of small touches.

When a theory becomes so complicated as Clemen's, the humble scholar

who has been trained only in philological and historical method finds

himself unable to keep pace, and toils in vain behind this daring

flight. We shall not at present stop to argue from examples in ancient

and modern literature, that a dissection of this elaborate kind cannot

be carried out. Style is seen in the whole rather than in single

sentences, still less in parts of sentences; and a partition between

six authors, clause by clause, sentence by sentence, paragraph by

paragraph, of a work that seemed even to bold and revolutionary critics

like Zeller and Baur in Germany and Renan in France to be a model of

unity and individuality in style, is simply impossible. Moreover, the

plan of this study is not to argue against other theories, but to set

forth a plain and simple interpretation of the text, and appeal to the

recognised principle of criticism that, where a simple theory of origin

can be shown to hold together properly, complicated theories must give

way to it.

One feature in Dr. Clemen's theory shows true insight. No simple theory

of gluing together can exhaust the varied character of the Acts: a very

complex system of junctures is needed to explain its many-sidedness.

But Dr. Clemen has not gone far enough. There is only one kind of cause

that is sufficiently complex to match the many-sided aspects of the

book, and that cause is the many-sided character of a thoughtful and

highly educated man.

Dr. Clemen seems to assume that every instance where Paul adopts an

attitude of conciliation towards the Jews is added by a Judaistic

Redactor, and every step in his growing estrangement from them is due

to an anti-Judaistic Redactor. He does not, I venture to think, allow

due scope to the possibility that an historian might record both

classes of incidents in the interests of truth. It is admitted that a

dislocation occurred in the early Church, and that the contention

between the Judaising and the Universalising (to adopt a convenient

designation) parties was keen for a time. It is natural that the

estrangement should be gradual; and the historian sets before us a

gradual process. He shows us Paul acting on the principle that the Jews

had the first claim (XIII 46), and always attempting to conciliate

them; but he also shows us that Paul did not struggle against the

facts, but turned his back on the Jews when they rejected him (as their

Whole history proves, even without the evidence of Acts, that they were

sure to do}. It is hard to find a sufficient foundation for Dr.

Clemen's theory without the preliminary assumption that an early

Christian must necessarily be incapable of taking a broad and unbiased

view of history as: a whole. Grant that assumption, and his theory is

built up with marvellous skill, patience and ingenuity.

3. WORKING HYPOTHESIS OF THE INVESTIGATION.

Our hypothesis is that Acts was written by a great historian, a writer

who set himself to record the facts as they occurred, a strong

partisan, indeed, but raised above partiality by his perfect confidence

that he had only to describe the facts as they occurred, in order to

make the truth of Christianity and the honour of Paul apparent. To a

Gentile Christian, as the author of Acts was, the refusal of the Jews

to listen to Paul, and their natural hatred of him as untrue to their

pride of birth, must appear due to pure malignity; and the growing

estrangement must seem to him the fault of the Jews alone. It is not my

object to assume or to prove that there was no prejudice in the mind of

Luke, no fault on the part of Paul; but only to examine whether the

facts stated are trustworthy, and leave them to speak for themselves

(as. the author does). I shall argue that the book was composed by a

personal friend and disciple of Paul, and if this be once established

there will be no hesitation in accepting the primitive tradition that

Luke was the author..

We must face the facts boldly. If Luke wrote Acts, his narrative must

agree in a striking and convincing way with Paul's: they must confirm,

explain and complete one another. This is not a case of two

commonplace, imperfectly educated, and not very observant witnesses who

give divergent accounts of certain incidents which they saw without

paying much attention to them. We have here two men of high education,

one writing a formal history, the other speaking under every obligation

of honour and conscience to be careful in his words: the subjects they

speak of were of the most overpowering interest to both: their points

of view must be very similar, for they were personal friends, and one

was the teacher of the other, and naturally had moulded to some extent

his mind during long companionship. If ever there was a case in which

striking agreement was demanded by historical criticism between two

classes of documents, it is between the writings of Paul and of Luke.

There is one subject in particular in which criticism demands absolute

agreement. The difference of position and object between the two

writers, one composing a formal history, the other writing letters or

making speeches, may justifiably be invoked to account for some

difference in the selection of details. But in regard to the influence

of the Divine will on human affairs they ought to agree. Both firmly

believed that God often guided the conduct of His Church by clear and

open revelation of His will; and we should be slow to believe that one

of them attributed to human volition what the other believed to be

ordered by direct manifestation of God (p. 140). We shall try to prove

that there is a remarkable agreement between them in regard to the

actions which they attribute to direct revelation..

Further, we cannot admit readily that peculiarities of Luke's narrative

are to be accounted for by want of information: in his case this

explanation really amounts to an accusation of culpable neglect of a

historian's first duty, for full information was within Luke's reach,

if he had taken the trouble to seek it. We shall find no need of this

supposition. Finally, it is hard to believe that Paul's letters were

unknown to Luke; he was in Paul's company when some of them were

written; he must have known about the rest, and could readily learn

their contents in the intimate intercommunication that bound together

the early Churches. We shall try to show that Luke had in mind the idea

of explaining and elucidating the letters.

In maintaining our hypothesis it is not necessary either to show that

the author made no mistake, or to solve every difficulty. From them

that start with a different view more may be demanded; but here we are

making a historical and literary investigation. The greatest historians

of other periods are not above error; and we may admit the possibility

that a first-century historian has made errors. We shall not make much

use of this proviso; but still the conditions of the investigation must

be clearly laid down.

Again, in almost every ancient writer of any value there remain

unsolved problems by the score. Where would our philological scholars

be, if every question were satisfactorily disposed of? The plan and the

date of Horace's longest work, the Art of Poetry, are unsolved and

apparently insoluble; every theory involves serious difficulties; yes

that does not make its authenticity doubtful. That there remain some

difficulties not explained satisfactorily in Acts does not disprove its

first-century origin.

Further, it is necessary to study every historian's method, and not to

judge him according to whether or not he uses our methods. For example,

Thucydides makes a practice of putting into the mouths of his character

speeches which they never delivered; no modern historian would do this:

the speeches of Thucydides, however, are the greatest and most

instructive part of his history. They might be truly called

unhistorical; but the critic who summed up their character in that

epithet would only show his incapacity for historical criticism.

Similarly the critic must study Luke's method, and not judge him

according to whether he writes exactly as the critic considers a

history ought to be written.

Luke's style is compressed to the highest degree; and he expects a

great deal from the reader. He does not, attempt to sketch the

surroundings and set the whole scene like a picture before the reader;

he states the bare facts that seem to him important, and leaves the

reader to imagine the situation. But there are many cases in which, to

catch his meaning properly, you must imagine yourself standing with

Paul on the deck of the ship, or before the Roman official; and unless

you reproduce the scene in imagination, you miss the sense. Hence,

though his style is simple and clear, yet it. often becomes obscure

from its brevity; and the meaning is lost, because the reader has an

incomplete, or a positively false idea of the situation. It is always

hard to recreate the remote past; knowledge, imagination, and, above

all, sympathy and love are all needed. But Asia Minor, in which the

scene is often laid, was not merely little known, but positively

wrongly known.

I know of no person except Bishop Lightfoot who has seriously attempted

to test or revise or improve the traditional statements (often, the

traditional blunders) about Asian antiquities as bearing on Acts; but

the materials were not at his disposal for doing this successfully. But

it is bad method to found theories of its composition on wrong

interpretations of its meaning: the stock misconceptions should first

be cleared away, and the book studied in relation to the localities and

the antiquities.

Luke was deficient in the sense for time; and hence his chronology is

bad. It would be quite impossible from Acts alone to get a true idea of

the lapse of time. That is the fault of his age; Tacitus, writing the

biography of Agricola (about 98 A.D.), makes no chronological

statement, until in the last paragraph he gives a series of statistics.

Luke had studied the sequence of events carefully, and observes it in

his arrangement minutely, but he often has to carry forward one thread

of his narrative, and then goes back in time to take up another thread;

and these transitions are sometimes rather harsh. Yet, in respect of

chronology, he was, perhaps, less careless than would appear: see p.

23.

His plan leads him to concentrate attention on the critical steps.

Hence he often passes lightly over a long period of gradual development

marked by no striking incident; and from his bad chronological sense he

gives no measure of the lapse of time implied in a sentence, a clause,

or even a word. He dismisses ten years in a breathe and devotes a

chapter to a single incident. His character as an historian, therefore,

depends on his selection of topics. Does he show the true historian's

power of seizing the great facts, and marking dearly the stages in the

development of his subject? Now, what impresses me is the sense of

proportion in Acts, and the skill with which a complex and difficult

subject is grouped to bring out the historical development from the

primitive Church (ch. I-V) through the successive steps associated with

four great names, Stephen, Philip, Peter, Paul. Where the author passes

rapidly over a period or a journey, we shall find reason to believe

that it was marked by no striking feature and no new foundation. The

axiom from which we start must be that which is assumed in all literary

investigations--preference is to be given to the interpretation which

restores order, lucidity, and sanity to the work. All that we ask in

this place is the admission of that axiom, and a patient hearing, and

especially that the reader, before condemning our first steps as not in

harmony with other incidents, will wait to see how we can interpret

those incidents.

The dominant interpretation rests avowedly on the principle that Acts

is full of gaps, and that "nothing is more striking than the want of

proportion". Those unfortunate words of Bishop Lightfoot are worked out

by some of his successors with that "illogical consistency" which often

leads the weaker disciples of a great teacher to choose his errors for

loving imitation and emphasis. With such a theory no historical

absurdity is too gross to be imputed to Luke. But our hypothesis is

that Luke's silence about an incident or person should always be

investigated as a piece of evidence, on the principle that he had some

reason for his silence; and in the course of this study we shall in

several cases find that omission is a distinct element in the effect of

his narrative.

There is a contrast between the early chapters of Acts and the later.

In the later chapters there are few sentences that do not afford some

test of their accuracy by mentioning external facts of life, history,

and antiquities. But the earlier chapters contain comparatively few

such details; the subject in them is handled in a vaguer way, with a

less vigorous and nervous grasp; the facts are rarely given in their

local and historical surroundings, and sometimes seem to float in air

rather than to stand on solid ground..

This fundamental difference in handling must be acknowledged; but it

can be fairly attributed to difference of information and of local

knowledge. The writer shows himself in his later narrative to be a

stranger to the Levant and familiar with the Aegean; he could not stand

with the same confidence on the soil of Syria and Palestine, as on that

of Asia Minor or Greece. Moreover, he was dealing with an earlier

period; and he had not the advantage of formal historical narratives,

such as he mentions for the period described in his First Book (the

Gospel). Luke was dependent on various informants in the earlier

chapters of Acts (among them Paul and Philip); and he put together

their information, in many cases reproducing it almost verbatim.

Sometimes the form of his record gives a clue to the circumstances in

which he learned it. That line of investigation is liable to become

subjective and fanciful; but modern historical investigation always

tries to get behind the actual record and to investigate the ultimate

sources of statements.

4. THE AUTHOR OF ACTS AND HIS HERO.

It is rare to find a narrative so simple and so little forced as that

of Acts. It is a mere uncoloured recital of the important facts in the

briefest possible terms. The narrator's individuality and his personal

feelings and preferences are almost wholly suppressed. He is entirely

absorbed in his work; and he writes with the single aim to state the

facts as he has learned them. It would be difficult in the whole range

of literature to find a work where there is less attempt at pointing a

moral or drawing a lesson from the facts. The narrator is persuaded

that the facts themselves in their barest form are a perfect lesson and

a complete instruction, and he feels that it would be an impertinence

and even an impiety to intrude his individual views into the narrative.

It is, however, impossible for an author to hide himself completely.

Even in the selection of details, his personality shows itself. So in

Acts, the author shows the true Greek feeling for the sea. He hardly

ever omits to name the harbors which Paul sailed from or arrived at,

even though little or nothing in the way of incident occurred in them.

But on land journeys he confines himself to missionary facts, and gives

no purely geographical information; where any statements of a

geographical character occur, they serve a distinct purpose in the

narrative, and the reader who accepts them as mere geographical

specifications has failed to catch the author's purpose (see p. 205

f.).

Under the surface of the narrative, there moves a current of strong

personal affection and enthusiastic admiration for Paul. Paul is the

author's hero; his general aim is to describe the development of the

Church; but his affection and his interest turn to Paul; and after a

time his narrative groups itself round Paul. He is keenly concerned to

show that Paul was in perfect accord with the leaders among the older

Apostles, but so also was Paul himself in his letters. That is the

point of view of a personal friend and disciple, full of affection, and

jealous of Paul's honour and reputation.

The characterisation of Paul in Acts is so detailed and individualised

as to prove the author's personal acquaintance. Moreover, the Paul of

Acts is the Paul that appears to us in his own letters, in his ways and

his thoughts, in his educated tone of polished courtesy, in his quick

and vehement temper, in the extraordinary versatility and adaptability

which made him at home in every society, moving at ease in all

surroundings, and everywhere the centre of interest, whether he is the

Socratic dialectician in the agora of Athens, or the rhetorician in its

University, or conversing with kings and proconsuls, or advising in the

council on shipboard, or cheering a broken-spirited crew to make one

more effort for life. Wherever Paul is, no one present has eyes for any

but him.

Such a view could not have been taken by a second century author. The

Church in the second century had passed into new circumstances and was

interested in quite different questions. The catastrophe of the

persecution of Domitian, and the effect produced for the time on the

attitude of the Church by the deliberate attempt to suppress and

destroy it on the part of the imperial government, made a great gulf

between the first century and the second century of Christian history.

[1] Though the policy of the great emperors of the second century came

back to somewhat milder measures, the Church could not recover the same

feeling that Paul had, so long as Christianity continued to be a

proscribed religion, and a Christian was in theory at least an outlaw

and a rebel. Many questions that were evidently vital to the author of

Acts were buried in oblivion during the persecution of Domitian, and

could not have been present in the mind of a later author. Our view

classes Acts with 1 Peter, intermediate between the Pauline letters and

the literature of the last decade of the century (such as Revelation).

Luke shows the same attitude as Paul, but he aims at proving what Paul

feels.

The question must be fairly considered whether Luke had completed his

history. There is one piece of evidence from his own hand that he had

not completed it, but contemplated a third book at least. His work is

divided into two books, the Gospel and the Acts, but in the opening

line of the Acts he refers to the Gospel as the First discourse (protos

Had he not contemplated a third book, we expect the term Former

Discourse (proteros) In a marked position like the opening of a book,

we must take the word first strictly. [2]

We shall argue that the plan of Acts has been obscured by the want of

the proper climax and conclusion, which would have made it clear, and

also that the author did not live to put the final touches to his

second book. Perhaps we may thus account for the failure of

chronological data. In Book I there are careful reckonings of dates (in

one case by several different eras) at the great steps of the

narrative. In Book II there are no such calculations (except the vague

"under Claudius" in XI 28, in itself a striking contrast to "the

fifteenth year of Tiberius," Luke III 1). Tacitus, as we saw, appends

the dates to his Agricola: Luke incorporates his dates, but they have

all the appearance of being put into an already finished narrative. If

other reasons prove that Acts wants the finishing touches, we may

reckon among the touches that would have been added certain

calculations of synchronism, which would have furnished a chronological

skeleton for the narrative.

If the work was left incomplete, the reason, perhaps,. lay in the

author's martyrdom under Domitian.

5. THE TEXTS OF ACTS.

It was my wish to take no notice here of differences of reading, but

simply to follow Westcott and Hort (except in two impossible cases, XI

20, XII 25). This, however, proved impracticable; for there are some

cases in which over-estimate of the two great MSS. (the Sinaitic and

the Vatican) has led to the adoption of a reading that obscures

history. In several places I have been driven back on the Received Text

and the Authorised Version, and in others the Bezan Text either

contains or gives the clue to the original text; and wherever the Bezan

Text is confirmed by old Versions and by certain Greek MSS., it seems

to me to deserve very earnest consideration, as at least pointing in

the direction of an original reading subjected to wide-spread

corruption.

It is universally admitted that the text of Acts was exposed to very

careless or free handling in the second century. This came about in

various ways, for the most part unintentionally, but partly by

deliberate action. At that time great interest was taken in gathering

from trustworthy sources supplementary information, beyond what was

contained in the Gospels and Acts. Eusebius, III 39, quotes a passage

from Papias describing his eager inquiries after such information from

those who had come into personal relations with the Apostles, and

another, V 20, from Irenaeus, describing how Polycarp used to tell of

his intercourse with John and the rest that had seen the Lord. Now

there was a natural tendency to note on the margin of a MS. additional

information obtained on good authority about incidents mentioned in the

text; and there is always a danger that such notes may be inserted in

the text by a copyist, who takes them for parts accidentally omitted.

There is also a certain probability that deliberate additions might be

made to the text (as deliberate excisions are said to have been made by

Marcion). The balance of evidence is, on the whole, that Mark XVI 9-20

is a later composition, designed to complete a narrative that had all

the appearance of being defective. Again, explanatory notes on the

margin of a MS. are often added by a reader interested in the text;

there is no doubt that in some books such glosses have crept into the

text through the errors of the copyist; and there are on our view three

such cases at least in the generally accepted text of Acts.

But, beyond this, when translations were made into Syriac and Latin

(the former certainly, the later probably, as early as the middle of

the second century), the attention of scholars was necessarily directed

to the difficulties in interpretation of the text, with its occasional

archaic expressions, obscure words, and harsh constructions; and the

practical usefulness of a simplified and modernised text was thus

suggested. Tatian's Harmony of the Four Gospels, and Marcion's doctored

editions, show how attempts were made from different points of view and

in different ways to adapt the sacred narrative for popular use: Tatian

changed the order, Marcion altered the text by excision or worse. Thus

the plan of a simplified text was quite in keeping with the custom of

the second century; and the Bezan Text seems to be of that kind. As a

whole it is not Lukan: it has a fatal smoothness, it loses the rather

harsh but very individual style of Luke, and it neglects some of the

literary forms that Luke observed. But it has a high value for several

reasons: (1) it preserves with corruptions a second-century witness to

the text, and often gives valuable, and sometimes conclusive, evidence

of readings; (2) it shows what view was held as to the meaning of

various passages in the second century; (3) it adds several pieces of

information which probably rest on good evidence, though they were not

written by Luke. Thus we can often gather from the Bezan comment what

was the original reading commented on; and it vindicates the great MSS.

in XVI 12 against Dr. Hort's conjecture. It reveals to us the first

beginnings of Pauline legend (p. 106); and in this respect it stands on

much the same level as the original text of the Acta of Paul and

Thekla, where also it is hard to distinguish where history ends and

romance begins. With the help of these two authorities, combined with

early Christian inscriptions (which begin only about 190, but give

retrospective evidence), we can recover some faint idea of the

intellectual life of the second-century Christians in Asia Minor and

North Syria.

The Bezan Text will, indubitably, afford much study and some

discoveries in the future. Its explanatory simplifications often show

the influence of the translations which first suggested the idea of a

simplified text. When the need for an explanation arose in connection

with a rendering in Latin, or in Syriac, the simplification took a

Latin or Syriac colour; but this was consciously adopted as a

simplification, and not through mere blundering.

While the Bezan Text has gone furthest from the original Lukan Text,

there is no MS. which has not suffered seriously from the various

causes of depravation. Several of the errors that have affected the two

great MSS. look like changes made intentionally in order to suit a

mistaken idea of the meaning of other passages; but there is always a

possibility that in these cases an editor was making a choice between

varieties of reading that had been produced unintentionally. Only in

the Bezan Text can we confidently say that deliberate alterations were

made in the text. I believe that the Bezan Reviser made many skillful

changes in passages relating to Asia Minor and some foolish changes in

European passages. In some of these cases, the view remains open that

the Bezan reading is the original; but evidence is as yet not

sufficient to give certainty. The home of the Revision is along the

line of intercourse between Syrian Antioch and Ephesus, for the life of

the early Church lay in intercommunication, but the Reviser was

connected with Antioch, for he inserts "we" in XI 28.

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

[1] Church in R. E. Ch. XIII

[2] ton proton logon. The commentators universally regard this as an

example of the misuse of protos; but they give no sufficient proof that

Luke elsewhere misused that word. In Stephen's speech (VII 12) the

adverb proton misused for proteron occurs, but a dispassionate

consideration of the speeches in Acts must convince every reader that

they are not composed by the author, but taken verbatim from other

authorities (in this case from Philip at C�sareia, XXI 8). Blass, p.

16, points out with his usual power, that the character and distinction

of the comparative and superlative degrees was decaying in the Greek of

the N.T., and that in many adjectives one of the two degrees played the

part of both. But such changes do not affect all words simultaneously;

and the distinction between proteros and protos might be expected to

last longer than that between most other pairs. We observe that Paul

uses both, and distinguishes them correctly (though he blurs the

distinction in other words): to proteron as the former of two visits

Gal. IV 13, ten proteran anastrothen Eph. IV 22. Blass, with the

grammarian's love for making absolute rules, conjectures the last

example away, in order to lay down the law that the adjective proteros

is not employed in N.T.; but we follow the MSS., and find in them the

proof that the distinction was only in process of decay, and that the

pair proteros -- protos still survived among the more educated writers

in N.T. So long as Paul could distinguish proteros and protos, there is

a probability that Luke would not utterly confuse them; and the fact

that John uses protos in the most glaring way for proteros has no

bearing on Luke, who was a far better master of Greek. We find several

instances where Luke uses protos correctly in Acts XII 10 there were

obviously three gates and three wards to pass (Peter was allowed to

pass the first and the second, being taken presumably as a servant; but

no servant would be expected to pass beyond the outermost ward at

night, and a different course was needed there): in Luke II 2 a series

of census are contemplated as having occurred, p. 386: in Luke XI 26

the man is described as passing through several stages: cp. XIII 30,

XIV 18, XVI 5, XIX 16, XX 29. And, if there survived in Luke the

slightest idea of any difference between comparative and superlative,

the opening of a book is the place where we should expect to find the

difference expressed. We conclude, then, that the use of protos there

is more easily reconcilable with the plan of three books, than of two;

but certainty is not attainable, as proteros does not actually occur in

his writings.

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

CHAPTER II.

THE ORIGIN OF ST. PAUL

1. PAUL'S NATIONALITY.

In the growth of Christianity we observe that all the threads of

development which had been formed in the life of the great races of

older history are gathered together into one complex whole. Hence we

have just the same assurance of the truth of Christianity that we have

of the trustworthiness of earlier history: the earlier works into the

later, the later grows out of the earlier, in such a way that all must

be taken together. The correspondence is in itself a guarantee of

truth. Each exists for the other: each derives its full

comprehensibility from the other. We must accept the general outline of

early history as a whole, or we must reject it as a whole on the plea

of insufficient evidence. There is not a fact of early history, whether

Christian or pre-Christian, which is not susceptible of being disputed

with a fair show of rational and logical argument: the evidence is

nowhere such as would convince a man whose mind is made up against the

trustworthiness of ancient history. Let any one test the evidence for

any point in regard to the battles of Salamis or of Marathon; and he

will find that everywhere he is reduced to a balance of evidence, and

frequently to a balance so delicate that no one can feel any assured

confidence on the point. Yet our confidence in the general facts

regarding each battle and its results is not, as a rule, affected by

our uncertainty as to the details. Doubtless there will always be some

who argue that the trustworthiness of the whole must be proportionate

to the trustworthiness of the parts, and conclude that, where all

details are so uncertain, the whole is unworthy of study; and those who

cannot see--or rather feel--for themselves the fallacy of the argument

will not be convinced by any reasoning that can be adduced. But for

those who do not adopt the extreme agnostic position, there is no other

logical position except that of accepting the. general scheme of

ancient history, in which Christianity is the crowning factor that

gives unity and rational plan to the whole.

The life of Paul partakes of the uncertainty that envelopes all ancient

history. As regards every detail we shall find ourselves in the

position of balancing evidence; as to almost every detail we shall find

ourselves amid a bewildering variety of opposite opinion and assertion

among modern scholars of every school and shade; and, strangest of all,

in regard to two or three points where there exists the nearest

approach to a general agreement between all the various schools, we

shall find ourselves unable to agree. Owing to the peculiar character

of the evidence, we shall find it best to begin in the middle of Paul's

life and study the events of the years 44 to 61, and thereafter to

sketch in outline the first half of his life.

At present, however, we must emphasise the complex influences amid

which Paul grew up. According to the law of his country, he was first

of all a Roman citizen. That character superseded all others before the

law and in the general opinion of society; and placed him amid the

aristocracy of any provincial town. In the first century, when the

citizenship was still jealously guarded, the civitas may be taken as a

proof that his family was one of distinction and at least moderate

wealth. It also implies that there was in the surroundings amid which

he grew up, a certain attitude of friendliness to the Imperial

government (for the new citizens in general, and the Jewish citizens in

particular, were warm partisans of their protector, the new Imperial

regime), and also of pride in a possession that ensured distinction and

rank and general respect in Tarsus. As a Roman, Paul had a nomen and

pr�nomen, probably taken from the Roman officer who gave his family

civitas; but Luke, a Greek, had no interest in Roman names. Paulus, his

cognomen, was not determined by his nomen: there is no reason to think

he was an �milius (as some suggest).

Paul was, in the second place, a "Tarsian, a citizen of a distinguished

city" (XXI 39, IX 11). He was not merely a person born in Tarsus, owing

to the accident of his family being there: he had a citizen's rights in

Tarsus. We may confidently assume that Paul was careful to keep within

demonstrable law and custom, when he claimed to be a Tarsian citizen in

describing himself to the Tribune. According to the strict

interpretation of the Roman law, the civitas superseded all other

citizenship, but this theoretical exclusiveness was opposed to the

Imperial spirit; and it is clear that Roman cives in a provincial city

commonly filled the position of high-class citizens, and even had

magistracies pressed upon them by general consent. Now, if Paul's

family had merely emigrated to Tarsus from Judea some years before his

birth, neither he nor his father would have been "Tarsians," but merely

"residents" (incol�). It is probable, but not certain, that the family

had been planted in Tarsus with full rights as part of a colony settled

there by one of the Seleucid kings in order to strengthen their hold on

the city. Such a re-foundation took place at Tarsus, for the name

Antiocheia was given it under Antiochus IV (175-164 B.C.). The Seleucid

kings seem to have had a preference for Jewish colonists in their

foundations in Asia Minor. Citizenship in Tarsus might also have been

presented to Paul's father or grandfather for distinguished services to

the State; but that is much less probable.

In the third place, Paul was "a Hebrew sprung from Hebrews ". The

expression is a remarkable one. It is used not to a Jewish audience,

but to a Greek Church (Phil. III 5), and it is similar to a familiar

expression among the Greeks: "a priest sprung from priests" is a term

commonly applied to members of the great sacerdotal families which play

so important a part in the society of Asian cities. He was a Jew at

least as much as he was a Tarsian and a Roman, as regards his early

surroundings; and it is obvious that the Jewish side of his nature and

education proved infinitely the most important, as his character

developed. But it is a too common error to ignore the other sides. Many

interpreters seem to think only of his words, XXII 3, "I am a Jew born

in Tarsus," and to forget that he said a few moments before, "I am a

Jew, a Tarsian, a citizen of no mean city". To the Hebrews he

emphasises his Jewish character, and his birth in Tarsus is added as an

accident: but to Claudius Lysias, a Greek-Roman, he emphasises his

Tarsian citizenship (after having told of his Roman citizenship). Now,

there is no inconsistency between these descriptions of himself. Most

of us have no difficulty in understanding that a Jew at the present day

may be a thoroughly patriotic English citizen, and yet equally proud of

his ancient and honourable origin. In the extraordinarily mixed society

of the Eastern provinces, it was the usual rule in educated society

that each man had at least two nationalities and two sides to his

character. If we would clearly understand the society in which Paul

worked, and the mission of Rome to make the idea of cosmopolitanism and

universal citizenship a practical reality--an idea that had been first

conceived by the Stoic philosophy in its attempt to fuse Greek and

oriental thought into a unified system--we must constantly bear in mind

that double or even triple character, which was so common.

To the Hebrew of that period it was specially easy to preserve the

Hebraic side of his life along with his Greek citizenship; for the

Jewish colony in a Seleucid city preserved as a body its double

character. It was not merely a part of the city, whose members were

citizens, but it was also recognised by the Seleucid Empire and

afterwards by the Roman Empire as "the Nation of the Jews in that

city". Thus arose a strange and often puzzling complication of rights,

which caused much heart-burning and jealousy among the non-Jewish

citizens of the city, and which was at last terminated by the action of

Vespasian in A.D. 70, when he put an end to the legal existence of a

"Jewish nation," and resolved the Jews into the general population of

the Empire.

From this wide and diversified training we may understand better Paul's

suitability to develop the primitive Judaic Church into the Church of

the Roman World (for beyond that he never went in practice, though in

theory he recognised no limit short of universal humanity), his

extraordinary versatility and adaptability (which evidently impressed

Luke so much, p. 22), and his quickness to turn the resources of

civilisation to his use. The Jew in his own land was rigidly

conservative; but the Jew abroad has always been the most facile and

ingenious of men. There are no stronger influences in education and in

administration than rapidity and ease of travelling and the postal

service; Paul both by precept and example impressed the importance of

both on his Churches; and the subsequent development of the Church was

determined greatly by the constant intercommunication of its parts and

the stimulating influence thereby produced on the whole.

2. PAUL'S FAMILY.

If Paul belonged to a family of wealth and position, how comes it that

in great part of his career (but not in the whole, p. 312) he shows all

the marks of poverty, maintaining himself by his own labour, and

gratefully acknowledging his indebtedness to the contributions of his

Philippian converts, in Rome, in Corinth, and twice in Thessalonica

(Phil. IV 15, II Cor. XI 9; see p. 360)? It was not simply that he

voluntarily worked with his hands in order to impress on his converts

the dignity and duty of labour, for he conveys the impression, II Cor.

XI 8 f., I Thess. II 9, that he had to choose between accepting help

from his' converts, and making his own living. But it often happens in

our own experience that a member of a rich family is in a position of

poverty. It would be enough simply to accept the fact; but, as Paul in

his later career is found in a different position, and as the same

conjecture about his poverty must arise in every one's mind, we may

glance for a moment at the relations in which Paul would stand to his

own family after his conversion.

The relations between Paul and his family are never alluded to by

himself, and only once by Luke, who tells how his sisters son saved his

life in Jerusalem by giving private information of the secret

conspiracy against him, XXIII 16. How could this young man get

immediate information about a conspiracy, which was concocted by a band

of zealots, and arranged in private with the high priests and elders?

In absolute secrecy lay the sole hope of success; and the conspiracy

must therefore have been imparted only to a few, and probably only the

leaders of the extreme Jewish party were aware of it. We must, I think,

infer that the nephew acquired his information in the house of some

leading Jew (to which he had access as belonging to an influential

family), and that he was himself not a Christian, for in the heated

state of feeling it may be taken as practically certain that a

Christian would not have had free and confidential entry to the house

of one of the Jewish leaders. But, further, if Paul's nephew were

trusted with such a secret, it must have been assumed that he was

hostile to Paul.

Now, as Paul himself says, he had been brought up in strict Judaic

feeling, not as a Sadducee, accepting the non-Jewish spirit, but as a

Pharisee; and we must infer that the spirit of his family was strongly

Pharisaic. The whole history of the Jews shows what was likely to be

the feeling among his parents and brothers and sisters, when he not

merely became a Christian, but went to the Gentiles. Their pride was

outraged; and we should naturally expect that such a family would

regard Paul as an apostate, a foe to God and the chosen race, and a

disgrace to the family; his own relatives might be expected. to be his

most bitter enemies. Looking at these probabilities, we see a special

force in Paul's words to the Philippians, III 8, that he had given up

all for Christ, "for whom I suffered the loss of all things and do

count them but refuse". These emphatic words suit the mouth of one who

had been disowned by his family, and, reduced from a position of wealth

and influence in his nation to poverty and, contempt.

Perhaps it is some terrible family scene that made Paul so keenly alive

to the duty owed by a father to his children. Probably nothing in

family life makes a more awful and lasting impression on a sensitive

mind than a scene where a respected and beloved parent makes a demand

beyond what love or duty permits, and tries to enforce that demand by

authority and threats. If Paul had to face such a scene, we can

appreciate the reason why he lays so much stress on the duty of parents

to respect their children's just feelings: "ye fathers, provoke not

your children to wrath; but bring them up in the education and

admonition of the Lord" (VI 4): "fathers, provoke not your children,

lest they lose heart" (Col. III 21). Not every person would think this

one of the most important pieces of advice to give his young societies

in Asia Minor. But, according to our conjecture, Paul had good cause to

know the harm that parents may do by not reasonably considering their

children's desires and beliefs. At the same time he strongly emphasises

in the same passages the duty of children to obey their parents, and

sets this before the duty of parents to their children. That also is

characteristic of one who had been blameless as touching all the

commandments (Phil. III 6), and who therefore must have gone to the

fullest extreme in compliance with his father's orders before he

announced that he could comply no further.

3. PERSONALITY.

While Luke is very sparing of personal details, he gives us some few

hints about Paul's physical characteristics as bearing on his moral

influence. As an orator, he evidently used a good deal of gesture with

his hands; for example, he enforced a point to the Ephesian Elders by

showing them "these hands" (XX 34). When he addressed the audience at

Pisidian Antioch, or the excited throng of Jews in Jerusalem, he

beckoned with the hand; when he addressed Agrippa and the distinguished

audience in the Roman governor's hail, he "stretched forth his hand".

This was evidently a characteristic and hardly conscious feature of his

more impassioned oratory; but, when more quiet and simple address was

suitable (as in the opening of his speech to the Ephesian Elders,

before the emotion was wrought up), or when a purely argumentative and

restrained style was more likely to be effective (as in addressing the

critical and cold Athenian audience, or the Roman procurator's court),

no gesture is mentioned. On the other hand, in the extreme excitement

at Lystra he "rent his garments"; and in the jailor's critical

situation, XVI 28, Paul called out with a loud voice. Wherever any

little fact is mentioned by Luke, we can always observe some special

force in it, and such details must have had real importance, when an

author so brief and so impersonal as Luke mentions them; and they are

very rare in him. Alexander tried to obtain a hearing from the Ephesian

mob by such a gesture; and the din, as they howled like a lot of

dervishes, is set before us strongly by the fact that speaking was

impossible and gesture alone could be perceived. Peter, when he

appeared to his astonished friends in Mary's house after his escape,

beckoned to them to make no noise that might attract attention and

betray his presence. Otherwise such gestures are mentioned only where

the hand is stretched out to aid or to heal or to receive help.

Two of the most remarkable instances of Paul's power over others are

prefaced by the statement that Paul "fixed his eyes on" the man (XIII

9, XIV 9, cp. XXIII 1); and this suggests that his fixed, steady gaze

was a marked feature in his personality, and one source of his

influence over them that were brought into relations with him. Luke

frequently notes this trait. Peter tells that he fixed his gaze on the

heavenly vision, XI 6; and he fixed his eyes on the lame man, III 4.

Stephen turned his fixed gaze towards heaven, and saw it open to

disclose the vision of glory to him. In these cases the power of the

eye is strongly brought out. The same trait is alluded to where intense

astonishment or admiration is involved, as when the bystanders gazed at

Peter and John after they had healed the lame man, or Stephen's

auditors stared on him as they saw his face suffused with glory, or the

disciples gazed upwards as Jesus was taken away from them, or Cornelius

stared at the Angel. In the third Gospel, IV 20, the stare of the

congregation in Nazareth at Jesus, when He first spoke in the synagogue

after His baptism, suggests that a new glory and a new consciousness of

power in Him were perceived by them. The power which looks from the

eyes of an inspired person attracts and compels a corresponding fixed

gaze on the part of them that are brought under his influence; and this

adds much probability to the Bezan reading in III 3, where the fixed

gaze of the lame man on Peter seems to rouse the power that was latent

in him. The Greek word is almost peculiar to Luke, and occurs chiefly

in Acts. Elsewhere in N.T. it is used only by Paul in II Cor. III 7,

13; and it has often seemed to me as if there were more of Lukan

feeling and character in II Cor. than in any other of Paul's letters. A

consideration of these passages must convince every one that the action

implied by the word (atenizein) is inconsistent with weakness of

vision: in fact, Paul says that the Jews could not gaze fixedly on the

glory of Moses' face, implying that their eyes were not strong enough.

The theory which makes Paul a permanent sufferer in his eyes, unable to

see distinctly persons quite near him, and repulsive to strangers on

account of their hideous state (Gal. IV 13 f.), is hopelessly at

variance with the evidence of Luke. In that word, as he uses it, the

soul looks through the eyes.

The word twice occurs in the Third Gospel, once in a passage peculiar

to Luke, and once when the servant maid stared at Peter and recognised

him, where her fixed gaze is not mentioned by Matthew or Mark.

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

CHAPTER III.

THE CHURCH IN ANTIOCH

1.THE GENTILES IN THE CHURCH.

(XI 19) THEY THEN THAT WERE SCATTERED THROUGH THE TRIBULATION THAT

AROSE ON ACCOUNT OF STEPHEN TRAVELLED (i.e., made missionary journeys)

AS FAR AS PHOENICE AND CYPRUS AND ANTIOCH, SPEAKING THE WORD TO JEWS

AND NONE SAVE JEWS. (20) BUT THERE WERE SOME OF THEM, MEN OF CYPRUS AND

CYRENE, WHO WHEN THEY ARE COME TO ANTIOCH, USED TO SPEAK TO GREEKS

ALSO, GIVING THE GOOD NEWS OF THE LORD JESUS. (21) AND THE HAND OF THE

LORD WAS WITH THEM, AND A GREAT NUMBER THAT BELIEVED TURNED UNTO THE

LORD.

When Acts was written, the Church of Antioch was only about fifty years

old, but already its beginning seems to have been lost in obscurity. It

had not been founded, it had grown by unrecorded and almost unobserved

steps. In the dispersion of the primitive Church at Jerusalem, during

the troubles ensuing on the bold action of Stephen, certain Cypriote

and Cyrenaic Jews, who had been brought up in Greek lands and had wider

outlook on the world than the Palestinian Jews, came to Antioch. There

they made the innovation of addressing not merely Jews but also Greeks.

We may understand here (1) that the words used imply successful

preaching and the admission of Greeks to the Christian congregation,

and (2) that such an innovation took place by slow degrees, and began

in the synagogue, where Greek proselytes heard the word. The Cypriote

and Cyrenaic Jews began pointedly to include these Greeks of the

synagogue in their invitations, and thus a mixed body of Jews and

Greeks constituted the primitive congregation of Antioch; but the

Greeks had entered through the door of the synagogue (see pp. 62, 85,

156).

In verses 19-21 the narrative for the moment goes back to a time

earlier than X and XI 1-18, and starts a new thread of history from the

death of Stephen (VII 60). That event was a critical one in the history

of the Church. The primitive Church had clung to Jerusalem, and lived

there in a state of simplicity and almost community of goods, which was

an interesting phase of society, but was quite opposed to the spirit in

which Jesus had said, "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel

to the whole creation". For the time it seemed that the religion of

Christ was stagnating into a sociological experiment. Stephen's vigour

provoked a persecution, which dispersed itinerant missionaries over

Judea and Samaria (VIII 1-4), first among whom was Philip the colleague

of Stephen. New congregations of Christians were formed in many towns

(VIII 14, 25, 40, IX 31, 32, 35, 42, X 44); and it became necessary

that, if these were to be kept in relation with the central body in

Jerusalem, journeys of survey should be made by delegates from

Jerusalem. The first of these journeys was made by Peter and John, who

were sent to Samaria, when the news that a congregation had been formed

there by Philip reached Jerusalem (VIII 14). This may be taken as a

specimen of many similar journeys, one of which is recorded (IX 32 f.)

on account of the important development that took place in its course.

It appears from Acts that Peter was the leading spirit in these

journeys of organisation, which knit together the scattered

congregations in Judea and Samaria. Hence the first great question in

the development of the Church was presented to him, viz., whether

Hebrew birth was a necessary condition for entrance into the kingdom of

the Messiah and membership of the Christian Church. That question must

necessarily be soon forced on the growing Church; for proselytes were

not rare, and the Christian doctrine, which was preached in the

synagogues, reached them. It was difficult to find any justification

for making the door of the Church narrower than the door of the

synagogue, and there is no record that any one explicitly advocated the

view that Christianity should be confined to the chosen people, though

the condition and regulations on which non-Jews should be admitted

formed the subject of keen controversy in the following years.

According to Acts, this great question was first presented definitely

to Peter in the case of a Roman centurion named Cornelius; and a

vision, which had appeared to him immediately before the question

emerged, determined him to enter the house and the society of

Cornelius, and set forth to him the good news, on the principle that

"in every nation he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is

acceptable to Him" (X 35). Peter's action was immediately confirmed by

the communication of Divine grace to the audience in Cornelius's house;

and, though it was at first disputed in Jerusalem, yet Peter's defence

was approved of by general consent.

But this step, though an important one, was only the first stage in a

long advance that was still to be made. Cornelius was a proselyte; and

Peter in his speech to the assembly in his house laid it down as a

condition of reception into the Church that the non-Jew must approach

by way of the synagogue (X 35), and become "one that fears God".

Without entering on the details of a matter which has been and still is

under discussion, we must here allude to the regulations imposed on

strangers who wished to enter into relations with the Jews. Besides the

proselytes who came under the full Law and entered the community of

Moses, there was another class of persons who wished only to enter into

partial relations with the Jews. These two classes were at a later time

distinguished as "Proselytes of the Sanctuary" and "of the Gate"; but

in Acts the second class is always described as "they that fear God"

[3] The God-fearing proselytes were bound to observe certain ceremonial

regulations of purity in order to be permitted to come into any

relations with the Jews; and it is probable that these rules were the

four prohibitions enumerated in XV 28, to abstain from the flesh of

animals sacrificed to idols, and from blood, and from animals

strangled, and from marriage within the prohibited degrees (many of

which were not prohibited by Greek or Roman law). These prohibitions

stand in close relation to the principles laid down in Leviticus XVII,

XVIII, for the conduct of strangers dwelling among the Israelites; and

it would appear that they had become the recognised rule for admission

to the synagogue and for the first stage of approximation to the Jewish

communion. They stand on a different plane from the moral law of the

Ten Commandments, being rules of purity.

While no one, probably, urged that the Church should be confined to

born Hebrews, there was a party in the Church which maintained that

those non-Jews who were admitted should be required to conform to the

entire "Law of God ": this was the party of "champions of the

circumcision," [4] which played so great a part in the drama of

subsequent years. This party was silenced by Peter's explanation in the

case of Cornelius, for the preliminary vision and the subsequent gift

of grace could not be gainsaid. But the main question was not yet

definitely settled; only an exceptional case was condoned and accepted.

The Church Of Antioch then was in a somewhat anomalous condition. It

contained a number of Greeks, who were in the position of "God-fearing

proselytes," but had not conformed to the entire law; and the question

was still unsettled what was their status in the Church.

2. THE COMING OF BARNABAS AND THE SUMMONING OF SAUL.

(XI 22) AND THE REPORT CONCERNING THEM CAME TO THE EARS OF THE CHURCH

IN JERUSALEM; AND THEY SENT FORTH BARNABAS AS FAR AS ANTIOCH: (23) WHO

WHEN HE WAS COME, AND HAD SEEN THE GRACE OF GOD, WAS GLAD; AND HE

EXHORTED THEM ALL THAT WITH PURPOSE OF HEART THEY SHOULD CLEAVE UNTO

THE LORD (24) (FOR HE WAS A GOOD MAN, AND FULL OF THE HOLY SPIRIT AND

OF FAITH); AND MUCH PEOPLE WAS ADDED UNTO THE LORD. (25) AND HE WENT

FORTH TO TARSUS TO SEEK FOR SAUL; (26) AND WHEN HE HAD FOUND HIM, HE

BROUGHT HIM UNTO ANTIOCH. AND IT CAME TO PASS THAT EVEN FOR A WHOLE

YEAR THEY MET IN THE ASSEMBLY, AND TAUGHT MUCH PEOPLE; AND THAT THE

DISCIPLES WERE CALLED "CHRISTIANS" FIRST IN ANTIOCH.

As in previous cases, an envoy was sent from the Church in Jerusalem to

survey this new congregation, and judge of its worthiness; and Barnabas

was selected for the purpose. The same test that had been convincing in

the case of Cornelius satisfied Barnabas in Antioch: he saw the grace

of God. Then he proceeded to exhort and encourage them, which he was

qualified to do because the Divine Spirit was in him. Sparing as Luke

is of words, he feels bound to state that Barnabas was qualified by

grace for the work (see p. 174). The result of his course of

ministration [5] was a great increase to the congregation.

Mindful of his former short experience of Saul, Barnabas bethought

himself that he was well suited to the peculiar circumstances of the

Antiochian congregation: and he accordingly went to Tarsus, and brought

Saul back with him to Antioch. This journey must apparently have been

made in the early months of A.D. 43; and the rest of that year was

spent by the two friends in Antioch. The date shows that the early

stages of Christian history in Antioch were slow. The congregation must

have grown insensibly, and no marked event occurred, until the

attention of the Church in Jerusalem was called to its existence. The

one important fact about it was that it came into existence in this

peculiar way. But with the advent of Barnabas and Saul, its history

enters on a new phase. It became the centre of progress and of

historical interest in the Church.

It lies in Luke's style to give no reason why Barnabas summoned Saul to

Antioch. This historian records the essential facts as they occurred;

but he does not obtrude on the reader his own private conception as to

causes or motives. But we cannot doubt that Barnabas, who became Saul's

sponsor at Jerusalem (IX 27), and related to the Apostles the

circumstances of his conversion, knew that God had already called him

"to preach Him among the Gentiles" (Gal. I 16), and recognised that

this congregation of the Gentiles was the proper sphere for Saul's

work. We find in Barnabas's action the proof of the correctness of

Paul's contention in Epist. Gal., that his aim as an Apostle had been

directed from the first towards the Gentiles; his sphere was already

recognised.

As we shall see later, Paul must have spent nearly eight years at

Tarsus. Why are these eight years a blank? Why were they such a

contrast to the crowded hours of the period that was just beginning? On

our hypothesis as to the meaning of Luke's silence, we conclude that

Paul was still not fully conscious of the full meaning of his mission;

he was still bound in the fetters of Judaic consistency, and acted as

if the door of the synagogue was the portal through which the Nations

must find their way into the Church. He had not yet learned, or at

least he had not yet so fully shaken himself free from the prejudices

of education and tradition as to act on the knowledge, that God "had

opened a door of faith unto the nations" (XIV 27, p. 85).

A point in Luke's style here deserves note. He has mentioned in IX 30

that Saul was sent away to Tarsus; and he now takes up the thread from

that point, saying that Barnabas went to Tarsus to seek for Saul. He

implies that the reader must understand Tarsus to have been Saul's

headquarters during the intervening period. Not merely. does XI 25

require one to look back, but also IX 30 requires one to look forward;

each is the complement of the other, and the two together hit off a

long period during which no critical event had to be recorded. The same

period, together with the following year in Antioch, is described by

Paul himself, Gal. I 21, 22: "Then I came into the climes of Syria and

Cilicia: and I continued to be unknown by face to the churches of

Judea, but they only heard say, He that once persecuted us now

preacheth the faith'". Paul and Luke complete each other, and make up a

picture of over ten years of quiet work within the range of the

synagogue and its influence.

The words of v. 25 seem harsh until one takes them as a direct backward

reference to IX 30, and as implying a statement about the intervening

period. The Bezan Commentator, not catching the style of Luke, inserts

an explanatory clause, "hearing that Saul is in Tarsus," which rounds

off the sense here by cutting away the necessity of finding in XI 25

the completion of a period of history whose beginning is recorded in IX

30.

The term "Christians" attests that the congregation became a familiar

subject of talk, and probably of gossip and scandal, in the city; for

obviously the name originated Outside the brotherhood. The Brethren,

then, were talked of in popular society as "they that are connected

with Christos": such a title could not originate with the Jews, to whom

"the Christ" was sacred. The name Christos therefore must have been the

most prominent in the expressions by which the Greek Brethren described

or defined their faith to their pagan neighbours. The latter,

doubtless, got no clear idea of what this Christos was: some took

Christos as one of the strange gods whom they worshipped (XVII 18);

others took him as their leader (p. 254). In any case the name belongs

to popular slang.

In accordance with the tendency of popular language to find some

meaning for strange words, the strange term Christos was vulgarly

modified to Chr�stos, the Greek adjective meaning "good, useful," which

seemed to popular fancy a more suitable and natural name for a leader

or a deity. "Chr�stians" was the form in which the name was often used;

and it occurs in inscriptions.

3. THE ANTIOCHIAN COLLECTION FOR THE POOR OF JERUSALEM.

(XI 27 A) AND AT THIS PERIOD THERE CAME DOWN FROM JERUSALEM PROPHETS TO

ANTIOCH. (28A) AND THERE STOOD UP ONE OF THEM, AGABUS BY NAME, AND

SIGNIFIED BY THE SPIRIT THAT THERE SHOULD BE GREAT FAMINE OVER ALL THE

WORLD; WHICH CAME TO PASS IN THE DAYS OF CLAUDIUS. (29A) AND THE

DISCIPLES ACCORDING TO THE MEANS OF THE INDIVIDUAL ARRANGED TO SEND

CONTRIBUTIONS FOR RELIEF TO THE BRETHREN SETTLED IN JUDEA. (30A) AND

THIS TOO THEY DID, AND DESPATCHED the relief TO THE ELDERS BY THE HAND

OF BARNABAS AND SAUL. (XII 25A) AND BARNABAS AND SAUL FULFILLED THE

MINISTRATION OF RELIEF, AND RETURNED FROM JERUSALEM BRINGING AS

COMPANION JOHN SURNAMED MARK.

Luke's brief statement about the famine is declared by Dr. Sch�rer to

be unhistorical, improbable, and uncorroborated by other evidence. [6]

Opinions differ widely; for the famine seems to me to be singularly

well attested, considering the scantiness of evidence for this period.

Suetonius alludes to assidu� 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. [7] Thus widespread

dearth over the Roman world is fully attested independently; beyond the

Roman world our evidence does not extend. Dr. Sch�rer seems to require

a distinct statement that a famine took place in the same year all over

Europe, Asia, and Africa. But that is too hard on Luke, for he merely

says that famine occurred over the whole (civilised) world in the time

of Claudius: of course the year varied in different lands.

The great famine in Palestine occurred probably in A.D. 46. The

commentators as a rule endeavour, by straining Josephus, or by quoting

the authority of Orosius, to make out that the famine took place in 44,

and even that it occasioned the persecution by Herod.

The eagerness to date the famine in 44 arises from a mistake as to the

meaning and order of the narrative of Acts. Between XI 30 and XII 25

there is interposed an account of Herod's persecution and his miserable

death, events which belong to the year 44; and it has been supposed

that Luke conceives these events as happening while Barnabas and Saul

were in Jerusalem. But that is not the case. Luke describes the

prophecy of Agabus, and the assessment imposed by common arrangement on

the whole congregation in proportion to their individual resources.

Then he adds that this arrangement was carried out and the whole sum

sent to Jerusalem. The process thus described was not an instantaneous

subscription. The money was probably collected by weekly contributions,

for the congregation was not rich, and coin was not plentiful in Syrian

cities. This collection would take a considerable time, as we gather

both from the analogy of the later Pauline contribution (p. 288), and

from the fact that the famine was still in the future, and no necessity

for urgent haste existed. The arrangements were made beforehand in full

reliance on the prophecy; but there is no reason to think that the

money was used until the famine actually began, and relief was urgently

needed. The manner of relief must, of course, have been by purchasing

and distributing corn, for it would have shown criminal incapacity to

send gold to a starving city; and the corn would not be given by any

rational person, until the famine was at its height. When Sir Richard

Wallace relieved the distress in Paris after the siege, he did not

content himself with telegraphing money from London, nor yet with

distributing gold to the starving people in Paris. He brought food and

gave it. As he did, so we may be sure did the Antiochian delegates do;

and no rational person will suppose that the corn was brought to

Jerusalem until the famine was actually raging. But in a land where

transport was difficult, preparations took time; and Luke states at the

outset the general course of the preparations which the Divine

revelation aroused.

Thereafter, before describing the actual distribution of relief in

Jerusalem, the author's method requires him to bring down the general

narrative of events in Jerusalem and Judaea to the point when the

famine began; and then at last he mentions the actual administering of

the relief. He, therefore, tells about the persecution of Herod (which

took place near the time when Agabus prophesied), and about Herod's

death; and then at last he mentions the execution of the Antiochian

design and the return of the delegates to their own city.

As thus interpreted, Luke's chronology harmonises admirably with

Josephus. Agabus came to Antioch in the winter of 43-44; and in the

early part of 44 Herod's persecution occurred, followed by his death,

probably in the autumn. In 45 the harvest was probably not good, and

provisions grew scarce in the country; then, when the harvest of 46

failed, famine set in, and relief was urgently required, and was

administered by Barnabas and Saul. It is an interesting coincidence

that relief was given liberally in Jerusalem by Queen Helena (mother of

Izates, King of Adiabene), who bought corn in Egypt and figs in Cyprus,

and brought them to Jerusalem for distribution. She came to Jerusalem

in 45, and her visit lasted through the season of famine; she had a

palace in Jerusalem. The way in which she imparted relief to the

starving people illustrates the work that Barnabas and Saul had to

perform. [8]

The service in Jerusalem must have occupied Barnabas and Saul for. a

considerable time. They acted as administrators (diakonoi) of the

relief; and it becomes evident how much is implied in the words of XI

29, XII 25 from the comparison of VI 1 "the daily ministration" of food

to the poor. The same term (diakonia) that is used in these cases is

applied (with logou understood) to the steady constant work of a

missionary or an apostle, XX 24, XXI 19, I 17, 25, VI 4. The Antiochian

delegates did not merely act as carriers of money; they stayed in

Jerusalem through the famine and acted as providers and distributors,

using all the opportunity of encouraging and comforting the distressed

that was thus afforded. In this way Saul's second visit to Jerusalem

was an important moment in the development of the Church, and is

related as such by Luke: it united far-distant parts of the Church at a

great crisis; it gave to the poor in Jerusalem the sense of brotherhood

with the Antiochian brethren, and to the Antiochian congregation that

consciousness of native life and power which comes only from noble work

nobly done. But for this end it was necessary that the work should be

done from first to last by the Antiochian congregation, and that every

starving disciple in Jerusalem should realise that he owed his relief

to his brethren at Antioch. Great part of the effect would have been

lost, if the delegates had merely handed a sum of money to the leaders

in Jerusalem to distribute; and the author, who is so sparing of words,

does not fail to assure us that the two delegates "completed the

ministration" before they returned to Antioch.

It must be noticed that only the Elders at Jerusalem are here

mentioned, whereas in XV Paul and Barnabas were sent to the Apostles

and Elders. The marked difference may probably be connected with the

author's conception of the appropriate duties of each. In XV, when a

matter of conduct and principle was in question, the Apostles were

primarily concerned; but when it was a matter of the distribution of

food, the Apostles were not concerned, for it was right that they

should not "serve tables," but "continue in the ministry of the word"

(VI 2-4). It would have been quite natural to say that the

contributions were sent to the congregation, or to the Brethren, in

Jerusalem; and it is apparent that here the Elders represent the

congregation of Jerusalem as directors of its practical working, while

in XV the Apostles and Elders represent the Church in every aspect. The

omission of the Apostles in XI 29 commonly explained on other grounds,

not very honourable to them. Even Lightfoot says: "the storm of

persecution had broken over the Church of Jerusalem." One leading

Apostle had been put to death; another, rescued by a miracle, had fled

for his life. It is probable that every Christian of rank had retired

from the city. No mention is made of the Twelve; the salutations of the

Gentile Apostles are received by the Elders'. They arrived charged with

alms for the relief of the poor brethren of Jerusalem. Having deposited

these in trustworthy hands, they would depart with all convenient

speed. But Luke expressly says that the administration of the relief

was performed in detail by the two Antiochian delegates (XII 25); and

one can only marvel that Lightfoot ever stooped to the idea that they

sneaked into the city and sneaked out hastily again, leaving the poor

without a single "Christian of rank" to minister to them. Nor is there

any good reason to think that the Apostles all fled from Jerusalem, and

left the disciples to look after themselves. It was not men like that

who carried Christianity over the empire within a few years. Such an

act of cowardice should not be attributed to the Apostles without

distinct evidence; and here the evidence tells in the opposite

direction: (1) at the far more serious persecution following the death

of Stephen, "all scattered abroad except the Apostles" (VIII 1): (2) it

is implied that "James and the Brethren" were in Jerusalem, when Peter

escaped from prison and retired (XII 17); and immediately after, Herod

went away and the persecution was at an end. The author of Acts

evidently had the impression that the guidance of affairs rested with

the Apostles in Jerusalem; and they are conceived by him as being there

permanently, except when absent on a special mission.

It is not mere accidental collocation, that immediately on the return

of Barnabas and Saul comes the record of the flourishing state of the

Church in Antioch, with its band of prophets and teachers (XIII 1): the

result of their noble work in Jerusalem was apparent in the fuller and

more perfect manifestation of Divine power and grace to the Church in

Antioch.

Further, when Paul had founded a group of new churches in the four

provinces, Galatia, Asia, Macedonia, Achaia, he, as the crowning act of

organisation, instituted a general collection among them for the poor

at Jerusalem; and arranged that representatives should go up along with

himself to Jerusalem bearing the money. His object was both to

strengthen the separate congregations by good work, and to strengthen

the whole Church by bringing its scattered parts into personal

relations of service and help. We cannot doubt that it was his

experience of the immense effect produced by the first Divinely ordered

contribution which led Paul to attach such importance and devote so

much trouble to the organisation of the second general contribution;

and he uses the same word to indicate the management of the second fund

that Luke uses of the first (diakonein, II Cor. VIII 19). [9]

The preceding notes have shown how much is contained in the brief

record of Luke: all the main points in the execution of the scheme of

relief are touched in the few words XI 29, 30, XII 25. But we are not

reduced to this single account of the mission to Jerusalem. Paul, in

writing to the Galatians, also mentions it; his reason for alluding to

it lay in certain incidental and unessential facts that occurred at

Jerusalem; but he tells enough to show what was the primary object of

the visit. In describing his intercourse with the older Apostles, he

mentions his second visit to Jerusalem in the following terms (I expand

the concise language of Paul to bring out the close-packed meaning):--

(Gal. II 1) THEN IN THE FOURTEENTH YEAR after it pleased God to call

me, I WENT UP AGAIN TO JERUSALEM WITH BARNABAS, AND TOOK TITUS ALSO AS

A COMPANION. (2) NOW I may explain that I WENT UP ON AN ACCOUNT OF A

REVELATION (which shows how completely my action was directly guided by

the Divine will, and how independent it was of any orders or

instructions from the Apostles). AND I COMMUNICATED TO THEM WITH A VIEW

TO CONSULTATION THE GOSPEL WHICH I CONTINUE PREACHING AMONG THE

GENTILES, BUT I did so PRIVATELY TO THOSE WHO WERE RECOGNISED AS THE

LEADING SPIRITS, not publicly to the whole body of Apostles; since the

latter course would have had the appearance of consulting the official

governing body, as if I felt it a duty to seek advice from them;

whereas private consultation was a purely voluntary act. MY PURPOSE IN

THIS CONSULTATION WAS TO CARRY WITH ME THE LEADING SPIRITS OF THE

CHURCH, SINCE MISUNDERSTANDING OR WANT OF COMPLETE APPROVAL ON THEIR

PART MIGHT ENDANGER OR FRUSTRATE MY EVANGELISTIC WORK WHETHER IN THE

FUTURE OR THE PAST, if doubt or dispute arose as to the rights of my

converts to full membership in the Church without further ceremony. (3)

NOW, as I have touched on this point, I may mention parenthetically

that NOT EVEN WAS MY COMPANION TITUS, GREEK AS HE WAS, REQUIRED TO

SUBMIT TO CIRCUMCISION, much less was the general principle laid down

that the Jewish rite was a necessary preliminary to the full membership

of the Church. (4) FURTHER, THE OCCASION of my consulting the leading

Apostles WAS BECAUSE OF CERTAIN INSINUATING FALSE BRETHREN, WHO ALSO

CREPT INTO OUR SOCIETY IN AN UNAVOWED WAY TO ACT THE SPY ON OUR FREEDOM

(WHICH WE FREE CHRISTIANS CONTINUE ENJOYING THROUGHOUT MY MINISTRY), IN

ORDER TO MAKE US SLAVES to the ritual which they count necessary. (5)

BUT NOT FOR AN HOUR DID WE YIELD TO THESE FALSE BRETHREN BY COMPLYING

WITH THEIR IDEAS, OR EXPRESSING AGREEMENT WITH THEM; AND OUR FIRMNESS

THEN WAS INTENDED TO SECURE THAT THE GOSPEL IN ITS TRUE FORM SHOULD

CONTINUE IN LASTING FREEDOM FOR YOU to enjoy. (6) BUT FROM THE

RECOGNISED LEADERS--HOW DISTINGUISHED SOEVER WAS THEIR CHARACTER IS NOT

NOW THE POINT; GOD ACCEPTETH NOT MAN'S PERSON--THE RECOGNISED LEADERS,

I SAY, IMPARTED NO NEW INSTRUCTION TO ME; (7) BUT, ON THE CONTRARY,

PERCEIVING THAT I THROUGHOUT MY MINISTRY AM CHARGED SPECIALLY WITH THE

MISSION TO FOREIGN (NON-JEWISH) NATIONS AS PETER IS WITH THE JEWISH

MISSION--(8) FOR HE THAT WORKED FOR PETER TO THE APOSTOLATE OF THE

CIRCUMCISION WORKED ALSO FOR ME TO BE THE MISSIONARY TO THE

GENTILES--(9) AND PERCEIVING from the actual facts THE GRACE THAT HAD

BEEN GIVEN ME, THEY, JAMES AND CEPHAS AND JOHN, THE RECOGNISED PILLARS

OF THE CHURCH, GAVE PLEDGES TO ME AND TO BARNABAS OF A JOINT SCHEME OF

WORK, OURS TO BE DIRECTED TO THE GENTILES, WHILE THEIRS WAS TO THE

JEWS. (10) ONE CHARGE ALONE THEY GAVE US, TO REMEMBER THE POOR brethren

at Jerusalem. A DUTY WHICH AS A MATTER OF FACT I at that time MADE IT

MY SPECIAL OBJECT TO PERFORM.

As is pointed out elsewhere in full detail, the concluding sentence

defines the object which Paul carried out in Jerusalem: other events

were incidental. This journey, therefore, is declared in Epist. Gal. to

have been made according to revelation, and in Acts the exact

circumstances of the revelation are narrated; the object of the visit

is described in Acts as being to relieve the distress of the poor

brethren in Jerusalem, and in Epist. Gal. Paul says he directed his

attention specially to helping the poor brethren; another purpose is

said in Epist. Gal. to have been achieved on this journey, v. 3, but

Paul immediately adds that this other purpose was carried out as a mere

private piece of business, and implies thereby that it was not the

primary or official purpose of the journey.

How graceful and delicate is the compliment which the older Apostles

paid to Paul! "the only advice and instruction which we have to give is

that you continue to do what you have been zealously doing," so they

spoke at the conclusion of his visit. And in what a gentlemanly spirit

does Paul refer to that visit! His object is to prove to the Galatians

that, on his visits to Jerusalem, he received nothing in the way of

instruction or commission from the older Apostles; and to do this he

gives an account of his visits. When he comes to the second visit he

might have said in the tone of downright and rather coarse candour, "So

far from receiving on this occasion, I was sent by Divine revelation to

be the giver". But not even in this hot and hasty letter does he swerve

from his tone of respect and admiration, or assume in the slightest

degree a tone of superiority to Peter and James. The facts are all

there to show the real situation; but they are put so quietly and

allusively (the revelation in verse 2, the object in verse 10), as to

avoid all appearance of boasting in what was really a very legitimate

cause of satisfaction; and even of self-gratulation. It is precisely

because on his second visit Paul was so obviously not the recipient,

that he appeals to it with such perfect confidence as proving his

independence.

Here as everywhere we find that Acts supplements and explains the

incidents and arguments used by Paul in his letter. And we see that the

influence which we have just ascribed to the visit in promoting the

unity and solidarity of the whole Church is fully confirmed by Paul in

verse 9; it resulted in a formal recognition by the older Apostles of

the co-ordinate Apostolate of the two Antiochian delegates.

The same party in the Church which had criticised Peter's conduct to

Cornelius, was discontented with the conduct of Barnabas and Saul to

their companion, Titus; but in the circumstances their discontent did

not take public action, though it was so apparent as to put Saul on his

guard, and once more they seem to have acquiesced in an exceptional

case, as they did in that of Cornelius. But it was now becoming evident

that two distinct and opposed opinions existed in the Church, and were

likely to come to open conflict; and Saul privately satisfied himself

that the leaders were in agreement with himself on the subject of

difference.

But why is Acts silent about this? Simply because it never came to an

open discussion, and therefore did not reach the proper level of

importance. Luke confines himself to the great steps in development.

Nor is it strange that Titus is not mentioned by Luke. In carrying the

relief to Jerusalem, it is obvious that Barnabas and Saul must have had

assistants. The work was one of considerable magnitude, and involved a

good deal of organisation. We may gather from Luke that the two envoys

were entrusted with the management; but the whole details of purchase,

transport, and distribution lie outside of his conception and plan. The

essential fact for his purpose was that relief was sent by the

congregation in Antioch (XI 30), and its distribution personally

carried out by Paul and Barnabas in Jerusalem (XII 25); and he tells us

no more. In his letter Paul says that Titus was privately selected

associate and not an official; and we may confidently add that he was

one of the assistants who were needed to carry out the work described

in Acts (see also the omission is made on p. 170.

The only strange fact in reference to Titus, is that he nowhere appears

in Acts; and that is equally hard to explain on every theory. Clearly

he played a considerable part in the early history of the Church (as

Luke himself did); and, on our hypothesis of Luke's historical insight

and power of selecting and grouping details, the complete omission of

Titus's name must be intentional, just as the silence about Luke is

intentional. A suggestion to explain the omission is made on p. 390.

The situation on this visit is strikingly different from that described

in Acts XV as existing at the next visit (see Chap. VII). Paul has here

private communications with the three leading Apostles in prudent

preparation against future difficulties. In the later stage, public

meetings to hear the recital of his and Barnabas's experiences among

the Gentiles are followed by a formal Council, in which "the leading

Apostles stand forth as the champions of Gentile liberty".

We find ourselves obliged to regard this visit as more important than

is generally believed. Canon Farrar, who may be quoted as a clear and

sensible exponent of the accepted view, calls it "so purely an episode

in the work of St. Paul, that in the Epistle to the Galatians he passes

it over without a single allusion ". According to our view, if it had

been a mere episode without influence on the development of the Church,

Luke would have passed it unmentioned; but it was a step of great

consequence in the development of the Antiochian congregation and of

the Church as a whole; and therefore it required a place in this

history.

The wonderful revelation described by Paul himself in his second letter

to the Corinthians XII 2-4 took place in the fourteenth year before

A.D. 56, when that letter was written; and therefore probably occurred

in 43 or 44. This brings us near the period when Agabus came to

Antioch; but all speculation is barred by the description: he "heard

unspeakable words which it is not lawful for man to utter". Another

revelation, however, can with certainty be ascribed to this visit, and,

specially, to its concluding days.

4. THE RETURN FROM JERUSALEM TO ANTIOCH.

(XXII 17) WHEN I HAD RETURNED TO JERUSALEM, AND WHILE I PRAYED IN THE

TEMPLE, I FELL INTO A TRANCE, (18) AND SAW HIM SAYING UNTO ME, "MAKE

HASTE, AND GET THEE QUICKLY OUT OF JERUSALEM; BECAUSE THEY WILL NOT

RECEIVE OF THEE TESTIMONY CONCERNING ME". (19) AND I SAID, "LORD, THEY

THEMSELVES KNOW THAT I IMPRISONED AND BEAT IN EVERY SYNAGOGUE THEM THAT

BELIEVED ON THEE: (20) AND WHEN THE BLOOD OF STEPHEN THY WITNESS WAS

SHED, I ALSO WAS STANDING BY, AND CONSENTING, AND KEEPING THE: GARMENTS

OF THEM THAT SLEW HIM (and therefore they must see that some great

thing has happened to convince me)". (21) AND HE SAID UNTO ME, "DEPART:

FOR I WILL SEND THEE FORTH FAR HENCE UNTO THE NATIONS ".

Let us clearly conceive the probable situation at that time. In the

famine-stricken city it is not to be supposed that Barnabas and Saul

confined their relief to professing Christians, and let all who were

not Christians starve. Christian feeling, ordinary humanity, and policy

(in the last respect Paul was as little likely to err as in the

others), alike forbade an absolute distinction. The Antiochian

delegates must have had many opportunities of siding their Jewish

brethren, though they addressed their work specially to their Brethren

in the Church; and the result must have been that they occupied a

position of peculiar advantage for the time, not merely in the Church

(where the respect and honour paid them shines through Gal. II 1-10),

but also in the city as a whole. Now it was part of Paul's missionary

method not to insist where there was no opening, and not to draw back

where the door was open. It might well seem that the remarkable

circumstances of his mission to Jerusalem, the revelation by which it

was ordered, and the advantage it secured to him in the city, were the

opening of a door through which he might powerfully influence his own

people. The thought could not fail to occur to Paul; and the remarkable

incident described in XXII 17-21 shows that it was in his mind.

This incident is usually assigned to the first visit which Paul paid to

Jerusalem after his conversion. But he does not say or even imply that

it was his first visit; and we must be guided by the suitability of the

circumstances mentioned to the facts recorded about the various visits.

Now Luke gives a totally different reason for his departure from

Jerusalem at the first visit: he attributes it to the prudence of the

Brethren, who learned that a conspiracy was made to slay him, and

wished both to save him and to avoid the general danger that would

arise for all, if persecution broke out against one. The revelation of

XXII 18, to which Paul attributes his departure, suits the first visit

very badly; but such discrepancy does not count for much with the

modern interpreters, orthodox and "critical" alike, who, having

achieved the feat of identifying the second visit of Gal. II 1-10 with

the third visit of Acts XV (pp. 59, 154 f.), have naturally ceased to

expect agreement between Luke and Paul on such matters. Accordingly,

Lightfoot actually quotes the discrepancy between XXII 18 f. and IX 29.

to illustrate and defend the discrepancy between Gal. II 2 and Acts XV

4.

Again, the reasoning of XXII 20, 21, is not suitable to the first

visit. Paul argues that circumstances make him a peculiarly telling

witness to the Jews of the power of Jesus: and the reply is that Jesus

will send him far hence to the Nations. Now, the first visit was

followed, not by an appeal to the Nations, but by many years of quiet

uneventful work in Cilicia and Antioch, within the circle of the

synagogue and its influence. But this revelation points to the

immediate "opening of a door of belief to the Nations"; and that did

not take place until Paul went to Paphos and South Galatia (XIV 27, pp.

41, 85).

To place this revelation on the first visit leads to hopeless

embarrassment, and to one of those discrepancies which the orthodox

historians, like Lightfoot, labour to minimise, while the critical

historians naturally and fairly argue that such discrepancies prove

Acts to be not the work of Paul's pupil and friend, but a work of later

origin. On this point I can only refer to what is said on p. 15; on the

principle there laid down, we cannot connect XXII 17 f. with IX 28 f.

On the other hand this revelation suits excellently the state of

matters. which we have just described at the conclusion of the second

visit. Paul was tempted by the favourable opportunity in Jerusalem; and

his personal desire always turned strongly towards his Jewish brethren

(Rom. IX 1-5). He prayed in the temple: he saw Jesus: he pleaded with

Jesus, representing his fitness for this work: and he was ordered to

depart at once, "for I will send thee forth far hence to the Nations".

Thereupon he returned to Antioch; and in a few days or weeks a new

revelation to the Antiochian officials sent him on his mission to the

West, and opened the door of belief to the Nations.

One objection to this view is likely to be made. Many infer from XXII

18 that the visit was short. But there is no implication as to the

duration of the visit. The words merely show that Paul was thinking of

a longer stay, when the vision bade him hasten away forthwith. The

second visit, according to Lightfoot's supposition, was even shorter

than the first, but on our view it began when the failure of harvest in

46 turned scarcity into famine, and it probably lasted until the

beginning of 47. Our reference of XXII 17 to the second visit is

corroborated by the reading of the two great uncial MSS. in XII 25,

"returned to Jerusalem": this seems to be an alteration made

deliberately by an editor, who, because these passages referred to the

same visit, tampered with the text of XII 25 to bring it into verbal

conformity with XXII 17.

5. THE MISSION OF BARNABAS AND SAUL.

(XIII 1) NOW THERE WAS AT ANTIOCH, CONNECTED WITH "THE CHURCH," [10] A

BODY OF PROPHETS AND TEACHERS, BARNABAS, SYMEON (SURNAMED NIGER), AND

LUCIUS (HE OF CYRENE), WITH MANA�N (FOSTER-BROTHER OF HEROD THE

TETRARCH) AND SAUL. (2) AS THESE WERE: LEADING A LIFE OF RELIGIOUS

DUTIES AND FASTS, THE: HOLY SPIRIT SAID, "SEPARATE ME BARNABAS AND SAUL

FOR THE WORK WHEREUNTO I HAVE CALLED THEM". (3) THEN THEY (i.e., the

Church) HELD A SPECIAL FAST, AND PRAYED, AND LAID THEIR HANDS UPON

THEM, AND GAVE THEM LEAVE TO DEPART.

A new stage in the development of the Antiochian Church is here marked.

It was no longer a mere "congregation"; it was now "the Church" in

Antioch; and there was in it a group of prophets and teachers to whom

the grace of God was given.

There is indubitably a certain feeling that a new start is made at this

point; but it is only through blindness to the style of a great

historian that some commentators take this as the beginning of a new

document. The subject demanded here a fresh start, for a great step in

the development of the early Church was about to be narrated, "the

opening of a door to the Gentiles" (XIV 27). The author emphasised this

step beyond all others, because he was himself a Gentile; and the

development of the Church through the extension of Christian influence

was the guiding idea of his historical work.

Probably the variation between the connecting particles (kai and te)

marks a distinction between three prophets, Barnabas, Symeon and

Lucius, and two teachers, Manaen and Saul. In Acts VI 5, the list of

seven deacons is given without any such variation; and it seems a fair

inference that the variation here is intentional. [11] The distinction

between the qualifications required in prophets and in teachers is

emphasised by Paul in I Cor. XII 28. As regards Barnabas and Saul their

difference in gifts and qualifications appears clearly in other places.

Everywhere Saul is the preacher and teacher, Barnabas is the senior and

for a time the leader on that account.

There is a marked distinction between the general rule of life in v. 2,

and the single special ceremony in v. 3. An appreciable lapse of time

is implied in 2: after the two envoys returned from Jerusalem, the

regular course of Church life went on for a time and, so long as

everything was normal, the historian finds nothing to relate. The

prophets and teachers had regular duties to which their energies were

devoted; and they practised in their life a certain regular rule of

fasting. They were not like the Elders, who were chosen as

representative members of the congregation; they were marked out by the

Divine grace as fitted for religious duties in the congregation. The

"work" in v. 2 is defined in the subsequent narrative (XIII 41, XIV 26,

XV 3, 38, etc.) as preaching the Gospel in new regions outside of the

province Syria and Cilicia, in which there already existed Christian

communities.

What is the subject in v. 3? It cannot be the five officials just

mentioned, because they cannot be said to lay their hands on two of

themselves. Evidently some awkward change of subject takes place; and

the simplest interpretation is that the Church as a whole held a

special service for this solemn purpose. Codex Bez� makes all clear by

inserting the nominative "all" (pantes); and on our view this

well-chosen addition gives the interpretation that was placed in the

second century on a harsh and obscure passage. Similarly in XV 2 it is

meant that the congregation appointed the delegates to Jerusalem; and

the reader is expected to supply the nominative, though it has not

occurred in, the immediately preceding sentence. It seemed to the

author so obvious that such action was performed by universal consent,

that he did not feel any need to express the nominative. Such a way of

thinking was possible only at a very early time. During the second

century (if not even earlier) the action of officials began to

supersede that of the whole congregation in such matters; and, when

even a beginning had been made, it could no longer be assumed as

self-evident that such actions as XIII 3, XV 2, were performed by the

congregation; and the writer would necessarily express the nominative.

The Bezan Reviser belonged to the period when the change had begun and

the need of expressing the nominative was felt; but he lived before the

time when official action had regularly superseded that of the

congregation, for in that case he would have taken the officials in

this case to be the agents (as many modern commentators understand the

passage).

What was the effect of the public ceremony described in v. 3? The high

authority of Lightfoot answers that it constituted Barnabus and Saul as

Apostles. He acknowledges that Saul's "conversion may indeed be said in

some sense to have been his call to the Apostleship. But the actual

investiture, the completion of his call, took place some years later at

Antioch (Acts XIII 2). "He considers that Barnabas and Saul were only

prophets before this, and did not become Apostles until they were

elevated to that rank by their "consecration to the office" at Antioch

(Ed. Galat. p. 96).

Our view, on the contrary, is that Barnabas and Saul were Apostles

before this. The Apostle was always appointed by God and not by the

Church. The proof of Apostleship lay in the possession of apostolic

message and powers, conversion of others and performance of signs. It

is an historical anachronism to attribute to this period such belief in

the efficacy of a Church-ceremony. Moreover, in XXII 17, 21, and XXVI

17, Paul claims to have been an Apostle from his conversion, and

represents his work in Cilicia and Syria as an Apostolate. In Gal. I he

declares that his message came direct from God at his conversion.

Further, there is no sign in XIII 2, 3, that this "consecration" by the

Church was more efficacious than the original Divine call: the ceremony

merely blessed Barnabas and Saul for a special work, which was

definitely completed in the next three years. In XIV 26 the work for

which they had been committed to the grace of God in XIII 2 is declared

to be fulfilled; and they returned to their ordinary circle of duties

in the Church at Antioch.

The last word in verse 3 should not be "sent them away" (as in the

Authorised and Revised Versions). The Spirit sent them away (verse 4);

and the Church released them from their regular duties and bade them

"God-speed". The Greek verb (apelusan, like the Latin dimittere) is

used of the superior giving his visitor leave to depart (for a visitor

in the East is considered to be paying his respects, and does not

presume to depart without formal permission to go), or of a host

allowing his guests to depart, or of a commanding officer giving

soldiers honourable dismissal after their term of service. The correct

rendering of this term will prove important at a later stage (p. 155).

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

[3] phoboumenoi or sebomenoi ton theon

[4] oi ek peritome, XI 2, Gal. II 12: "some of the sect of the

Pharisees that believed," XV 5.

[5] parekalei, imperfect.

[6] Eine ungeschichtliche Generalisirung, and again, ist, wie an sich

unwahrscheinlich, so auch nirgends bezeugt (J�d. Volk I p. 474.

[7] Le Bas-Waddington no. 1192, Studia Biblica IV p. 52 f.

[8] Date of the famine. Orosius VII 6 puts it in the fourth year of

Claudius, which began January 25, A.D. 44. But Orosius's dates at this

point are put one year too early owing to a mistake in adapting to

Claudius's years a series of events arranged in his authority according

to a different system of chronology; this kind of mistake is known to

have been frequently made by ancient chroniclers, and is proved in

Orosius's case by the fact that he assigns to the tenth year of

Claudius a famine at Rome which Tacitus Ann. II 43 places in A.D. 51 We

therefore take Orosius as an authority for dating the commencement of

the famine in 45. Josephus mentions the famine as having occurred while

Tiberius Alexander was procurator of Judea; and there is general

agreement that Alexander's administration lasted from 46 to 48: though

the time when it began was not absolutely certain, July 45 is the

earliest admissible date, and 46 is far more probable: his predecessor

Cuspius Fadus was sent by Claudius in 44, and a good deal occurred

during his office. But Josephus also mentions the famine in connection

with Queen Helena's arrival in 45. Helena, however, seems to have

remained a considerable time, and Josephus's words are in perfect

accord with our view that scarcity began with a bad harvest in 45. In

the preceding chapter, Lightfoot's view is quoted according to his

edition of Gal., where he says that Barnabas and Saul had come to

Jerusalem and returned to Antioch before Herod's death. Since the

chapter was in type, I notice that in a posthumous essay "printed from

lecture notes" he dates the famine 45; but that seems hardly consistent

with his edition, and as he republished his edition without change

throughout his life, it must represent his mature opinion. Perhaps he

means that Paul and Barnabas brought the famine-money to Jerusalem a

year or more before the famine began, which we cannot accept as a

natural or a useful procedure.

[9] See Mr. Rendall's admirable paper in Expositor, Nov., 1893.

[10] Prof. Armitage Robinson, quoted in Church in R. E. p. 52.

[11] Compare Mr. Page's note on the grouping of the list in I 13.

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

CHAPTER IV.

THE MISSIONARY JOURNEY OF BARNABAS AND SAUL

1 CYPRUS AND SALAMIS.

(XIII 4) THEY ACCORDINGLY, BEING SENT FORTH BY THE HOLY SPIRIT, CAME

DOWN TO the harbour SELEUCEIA, AND THENCE SAILED AWAY TO CYPRUS; (5)

AND WHEN THEY REACHED SALAMIS THEY BEGAN TO PROCLAIM THE WORD OF GOD IN

THE SYNAGOGUES OF THE JEWS; AND THEY HAD JOHN ALSO AS A SUBORDINATE.

(6) AND THEY MADE A missionary PROGRESS THROUGH THE WHOLE ISLAND UNTIL

they reached PAPHOS.

The harbour is mentioned, according to Luke's common custom (XIV 25,

XVIII 18, XVI 11). When he has once mentioned the harbour of any city,

he omits it on a subsequent occasion (cp. XX 6 with XVI 11). The

failure to name the harbour of Berea is remarkable (XVII 14); doubtless

there is some reason for it.

As they were able to make the harbour of Salamis, on the south coast,

they were not impeded by westerly winds, which commonly blew throughout

the summer (see p. 298). With such winds, they would have run for the

Cilician coast, and worked along it westward with the aid of land

breezes and the current (p. 299), till they could run across to the

north coast of Cyprus, as Barnabas had to do on his next journey (if

the Periodoi Barnab� can be trusted). But they probably started on the

opening of the sailing season (March 5).

John Mark is brought before the reader's notice here in a curiously

incidental way. He came with Barnabas and Saul from Antioch (see XII

25); why should he not be mentioned at the outset? A superficial view

might see want of method in this apparently haphazard reference to the

third traveller. But surely the object is to emphasise the secondary

character of John Mark, in view of what was to happen in Pamphylia: he

was not essential to the expedition; he had not been selected by the

Spirit; he had not been formally delegated by the Church of Antioch; he

was an extra hand, taken by Barnabas and Saul on their own

responsibility. This obviated the criticism that the delegation

consisted of three persons, and that Mark's retirement from Pamphylia

was fatal to the official and representative character of the rest of

the mission--a criticism which may probably have been actually used in

the subsequent rather bitter controversy described in XV. This might

have been formally and. expressly set forth at an earlier stage; but

the historian briefly expresses it by saying nothing about John Mark

until he appears incidentally as a supernumerary and subordinate. The

silence is singularly expressive, and therefore carefully calculated.

There must have been a large Jewish colony in Salamis, with more

synagogues than one. Cypriote Jews are often mentioned in Acts IV 36,

XI 20, XXI 16); and Barnabas himself was a Cypriote. The practice of

Saul always had been to go first to the synagogues; and up to the

present time there is no reason to think that he had directly addressed

the Gentiles except as hearers in the synagogue.

His procedure here is exactly as at Damascus, where he proceeded to

preach in the synagogues immediately after his conversion (IX 20). It

was right that the first offer should be addressed to the Jews (XIII

46). Moreover he was always sure of a good opening for his Gentile

mission among the "God-fearing," who formed part of his audience in

every synagogue.

In v. 6 how briefly the work of a considerable period is summed up!

Four Greek words (dielthontes holen ten neson) contain all that is said

about a missionary journey throughout the island. We understand from

this brevity that there was no important fact for the historian's

purpose. The passage is a typical one: the same formula occurs with

slight variations in many later parts of the narrative; and in this

first case its meaning is specially clear, so that it throws its light

on all the subsequent examples (which is, of course, intended by the

historian). Doubtless the process which has just been described at

Salamis is intended to apply everywhere. In each city where there was a

settlement of Jews, the missionaries preached in the synagogue.

Further, the Cypriote Jews were not unfavourable to the new teaching.

The influence and example of Barnabas were naturally effective with his

fellow-countrymen. Moreover, the Word had already been preached in

Cyprus not long after Stephen's martyrdom XI 19, and converts had been

made. There was therefore a small audience ready to listen to the

travelling preachers in several, perhaps in all, of the Cyprian cities.

Finally, the doctrine that was preached was probably not such as to

rouse strong feeling among the Jews; and, so long as the Gentiles were

not specially appealed to and set on an equality with the Jews, the

early Pauline teaching is not said to have caused more ill-will than

the preaching of the older Apostles.

But we may also probably make some negative inferences. There was no

specially marked effect; no sign of the Divine guidance or power was

manifested; and the address was made only through the synagogues and

nowhere directly to the Gentiles. These are the points on which the

historian always lays special stress; signs of the Divine power were

the guarantee of Paul's Divine mission, and the steps by which Paul

turned more and more decidedly to the Gentiles marked the stages in

history as Luke conceived it.

We conclude, then, that the silence observed with regard to the Cyprian

evangelisation is not due to mere ignorance on the part of the

historian or to want of authorities, but to deliberate plan. On the

scale on which his work was planned, and his incidents selected, there

was nothing more to say.

The Apostles are said to have made a preaching tour through the whole

island. In a writer so sparing of words as Luke, the addition of the

word "whole" is important. We cannot press it so far as to suppose that

they went through every place in the island. Its force may probably be

best seen by supposing it were omitted: in that case the Greek

(dielthontes ten neson achri Paphou) would permit the interpretation

that after landing at Salamis they went along the direct road to

Paphos, preaching at convenient places. The word "whole" is probably

intended to bring out clearly that they made a complete tour of the

Jewish communities in the island, preaching in each synagogue.

2. PAPHOS.

(XIII 6) AND WHEN THEY HAD GONE THROUGH THE WHOLE ISLAND UNTO PAPHOS,

THEY FOUND A CERTAIN MAN, MAGlAN, PROPHET OF LIES, JEW, BY NAME

BAR-JESUS, (7) WHO WAS IN THE COMPANY OF THE PROCONSUL, SERGIUS PAULUS,

A MAN OF UNDERSTANDING. THE PROCONSUL SUMMONED TO HIS PRESENCE BARNABAS

AND SAUL, AND SOUGHT [12] TO HEAR THE WORD OF GOD. (8) AND THERE STOOD

FORTH AGAINST THEM THE MAGlAN, ETOIMAS (Son Of the Ready), FOR SO IS

THIS NAME TRANSLATED, SEEKING TO DIVERT THE PROCONSUL FROM THE FAITH.

(9) BUT SAUL, OTHERWISE PAUL, FILLED WITH THE HOLY SPIRIT, LOOKED

FIXEDLY AT HIM, (10) AND SAID, "O FULL OF ALL GUILE AND ALL VILLANY,

THOU SON OF THE DEVIL, THOU ENEMY OF ALL RIGHTEOUSNESS, WILT THOU NOT

CEASE TO PERVERT THE RIGHT WAYS OF THE LORD? (11) AND NOW, BEHOLD THE

HAND OF THE LORD IS UPON THEE, AND THOU SHALT BE BLIND, NOT SEEING THE

SUN FOR A SEASON." AND IMMEDIATELY THERE FELL ON HIM A MIST AND A

DARKNESS; AND HE WENT ABOUT SEEKING SOME TO LEAD HIM BY THE HAND. (12)

THEN THE PROCONSUL, WHEN HE SAW WHAT WAS DONE, BELIEVED, BEING STRUCK

TO THE HEART AT THE TEACHING OF THE LORD.

We notice, first, the accuracy of the title proconsul, applied to the

governor of Cyprus. The remarkable incident that follows is connected

with a definite individual, who is named and characterised. He was

Sergius Paulus, a man of ability. [13] Greek inscription of Soloi [14]

on the north coast of Cyprus is dated "in the proconsulship of Paulus,"

who probably is the same governor that played a part in the strange and

interesting scene now to be described.

The order and style of narrative adopted in this incident is noteworthy

in itself, and instructive in regard to the author's plan and his

conception of history. He directs the reader's attention first to the

prominent figure round whom the incident is centred: "in Paphos they

found a certain Bar-jesus". Nothing is said about the length of

residence in Paphos, nor about the conduct of the missionaries in the

earlier part of their visit. Before anything else is mentioned about

Paphos, Bar-jesus is named, and then it is explained who he was and how

the missionaries came in contact with him. The order of narrative does

not follow the order of time, but is guided by the special interest

felt by the author, i.e., he seizes first the detail or the personage

that is most important in his eyes.

If we attempt, to follow the order of development in time, the incident

might be thus described. The missionaries came to Paphos. There they

began preaching in the synagogues as they had done in other cities.

They soon acquired notoriety and were talked about through the city;

and the report about these strangers who were teaching a new kind of

philosophy reached the Roman governor's ears. The governor was a highly

educated man, interested in science and philosophy; and his attention

was caught by the report of the two strangers, who were giving public

teaching in rhetoric and moral philosophy (p. 271).

Travellers of that class were well known at the time. Those who aimed

at high rank and fame as teachers of philosophy often travelled through

the great cities of the Empire, giving public demonstrations of their

skill: thus they became famous, and were accepted finally in some of

the great universities as established teachers and Professors of

Philosophy or Morals.

The governor, Sergius Paulus, then invited or commanded a Roman

proconsul's invitation was equivalent to a command--the two travellers

to his court, and sought to hear a specimen of their skill and a

demonstration of their philosophy on the subject which, as he had been

informed, was their favourite topic, the nature of God and His action

towards human beings. The exposition which they gave seemed to him

striking and excellent; and the marked effect which it produced on him

was apparent to all who were in his train (who in Roman language would

be termed his comites). Among these was a Jew, Etoimas Bar-jesus by

name, a man skilled in the lore and the uncanny arts and strange powers

of the Median priests or magi. On v. 6 see p. 115.

It is often said that the governor was "under the influence of" the

Magian; implying the view that the mind of Sergius Paulus was dominated

by Bar-jesus, but that the Roman, deeply impressed by the way in which

Paul seemed to overpower the Magian, recognised the new master as more

powerful than the old, and thus passed under the influence of a better

teacher. This account seems to me not to be consistent with the text,

and to give a far too unfavourable conception of the governor's

character; while it certainly conveys rather a vulgar idea of the way

in which Paul's teaching first affected the Roman world. According to

the conception of Luke's method as a historian, which guides us in this

attempt to realise the facts, the words of Acts require a different

interpretation. The author, who is singularly delicate, concise, and

appropriate in his use of language, would not have praised Sergius

Paulus as "a man of understanding," when describing the relation in

which the Magian stood to him, if he had understood that the Roman was

"under the influence of" the false prophet. Either we must say that the

author scatters his words heedlessly on the page, or we must understand

that these words of praise coming at that precise point exclude any

idea of weak submission to the strong personality of the Magian.

Moreover the Greek words express the simple fact that the Magian was

one of the train of comites who always accompanied a Roman governor.

Some of these were personal friends who came with him from Rome, others

were young Romans of rank who thus gained an insight into

administrative life (which as yet they were too young to enter on),

others were in official attendance on the governor, and others were

provincials, men of letters or of scientific knowledge or of tastes and

habits that rendered them agreeable or useful to the great man.

There is also no reason to think that the Magian was an inmate of the

proconsul's house. The words do not imply that; and the facts in no way

suggest it.

3. THE MAGIAN AND THE APOSTLE.

To us the Roman governor is the prominent figure in this scene; and his

attitude towards the new teaching is what interests us most. But in the

estimation of Luke, the Magian is the most important character, next to

Paul; and therefore the reader's attention is directed first upon him.

His prominence is perhaps due to different estimate of historical

importance: ancient views on this subject differ from modern. But is it

not more probable that Luke is justified in his view? It is clear that

the Magian was here the representative of a System and a religion; and

that his discomfiture was in itself a wide-reaching triumph. He is

Commonly said to be a magician, a mere "Jewish impostor"; and he is

compared to the modern gipsy teller of fortunes. Such comparisons,

while having a certain element of truth, are misleading, and give a

false idea of the influence exerted on the Roman world by Oriental

personages like this Magian. The Magian represented in his single

personality both the modern fortune-teller and the modern man of

science; and he had a religious as well as a merely superstitious

aspect to the outer world.

No strict line could then be drawn between lawful honourable

scrutinising of the secret powers of Nature and illicit attempts to pry

into them for selfish ends, between science and magic, between

chemistry and alchemy, between astronomy and astrology. The two sides

of investigation passed by hardly perceptible degrees into one another:

and the same man might be by times a magician, by times the forerunner

of Newton and Thomson (Lord Kelvin). It was not possible in the infancy

of knowledge to know where lay the bounds between the possible and the

impossible, between the search for the philosopher's stone or the

elixir of life and the investigation of the properties of argon or the

laws of biology. It was not possible then: he would be rash who would

say that it is possible now. A writer may venture on many prophecies

about the future of science today, for which he would have been

ridiculed as an impostor or a dreamer twenty years ago; and doubtless

there are things he must not say now, which will be said soon.

It is certain that the priests of some Eastern religions possessed very

considerable knowledge of the powers and processes of nature; and that

they were able to do things that either were, or seemed to be,

marvellous. Which of these alternatives was true is a point on which

individual judgments will vary widely; but ray own experience makes me

believe that, so far as influence over human or animal nature and life

was concerned, their powers were wonderful. It is natural that the

Magian's knowledge and powers should have made him a striking and

interesting personality; and a person like the proconsul, keenly

interested in nature and philosophy, would enjoy his society.

The influence of this Eastern religion--one nature with many

varieties--was widely spread; and it was inevitable that the new

religion, which was strongly opposed to its methods of dominating its

votaries and crushing their personality and individuality, should often

be brought in collision with its teachers. Bar-jesus represented the

strongest influence on the human will that existed in the Roman world,

an influence which must destroy or be destroyed by Christianity, if the

latter tried to conquer the Empire. Herein lies the interest of this

strange scene; and we cannot wonder that to Luke, familiar with the

terrible power of that religion, the Magian seemed the prominent figure

round whom the action moved.

At Philippi, and at Ephesus also, collisions took place between the two

influences, of slavery and of freedom for the human mind; but neither

was so impressive as this at Paphos.

It is characteristic of the simple and natural evolution of the

incidents, that no calculation of these great issues is represented as

influencing the drama. Human action is swayed for the most part by

trivial motives; and the Magian here was actuated chiefly by the fear

of losing his prominent place in the governors train. His position as

friend and associate (amicus and comes were the technical terms to

denote his position) of the governor was an honourable one, gratifying

at once to ambition, to vanity, and to worse passions. In this position

he could learn a great deal about people and events. In the East it is

always believed that the governor's friend may influence his judgment;

and every suppliant, every litigant, and every criminal tries to

propitiate or to bribe the friend. We cannot tell in what proportion

the more noble and the baser motives were mixed in the Magian's mind;

but they all lie on the surface of the situation, and each had

doubtless some effect on him. He saw in the new teachers mere rivals

trying to supplant him; and human nature could not accept defeat

without a struggle.

Another point of method to note in the narrative is that no reason is

stated for the Magian's opposition. It is a general rule throughout

Acts that facts alone are stated, and causes left to the reader to

gather from the facts: the author sees the causes so clearly that he

does not think of stating them. In this case he even omits part of the

sequence of facts: he does not say that the Apostles expounded their

views, but leaves the reader to understand that the proconsul's desire

was obeyed; and the words of verses 8, 10 ("seeking to turn aside the

proconsul from the faith," and "pervert the right ways of the Lord")

imply that the exposition was made. Then we may be certain that the

Magian would not so far violate politeness and the respect due to the

proconsul as to interrupt them, unless he had seen that a marked effect

was produced on the governor's mind; and he interfered from fear that,

if he did not put the strangers down or turn them into ridicule, they

might supplant himself in the governors society.

This view of the situation lies implicit in the text; and it is put

explicitly by the Bezan Reviser, who makes Bar-jesus "stand forth in

opposition to them, seeking to divert the proconsul from the faith,

because he was listening with much pleasure to them". If the added

words are a gloss, they are inserted with great skill and judgment. But

to me they appear to be an addition, inserted to make the narrative

simpler and easier: the author, as usual, left the reason unstated.

4. SAUL, OTHERWISE PAUL.

The name Paul, here applied for the first time by the historian to the

person whom he has hitherto called Saul, has given rise to much

discussion and many theories. We shall not begin by theorising as to

the names of this individual, but by inquiring what was the meaning of

that very common formula, "Saul, otherwise Paul" in the society of the

Eastern provinces; and shall then apply the results to this case.

The custom which was thus expressed seems to have originated in the

bilingual governments and countries of the later centuries B.C. (or, at

least, to have become common and familiar then). At that time Greece

had gone forth to conquer the East; and a varnish of Greek culture was

spread over many non-Greek races, affecting the richer and the educated

classes of the natives, but hardly reaching the mass of the people.

Then it was the fashion for every Syrian, or Cilician, or Cappadocian,

who prided himself on his Greek education and his knowledge of the

Greek language, to bear a Greek name; but at the same time he had his

other name in the native language, by which he was known among his

countrymen in general. His two names were the alternative, not the

complement, of each other; and the situation and surroundings of the

moment, the r�le which he was playing for the time being, determined

which name he was called by. In a Greek house he played the Greek, and

bore the Greek name: in a company of natives, he was the native, and

bore the native name. He did not require both to complete his legal

designation, as a Roman required both nomen and pr�nomen. His Greek

name, taken alone, was a full legal designation in a Greek court.

This has an obvious bearing on the case of Saul, otherwise "Paul". In

the earlier part of this book he has been a Jew among Jews; and we have

seen only his Hebrew name. Nothing has hitherto transpired to show that

he was anything but "Hebrew sprung from Hebrews". In Cyprus he went

through the country city by city, synagogue by synagogue: and he was

the Jew in all. But here he is in different surroundings: he stands in

the hall of the proconsul, and he answers the questions of the Roman

official. The interview, doubtless, began, as all interviews between

strangers in the country still begin, with the round of questions: What

is your name? (or who are you? ) Whence come you? What is your

business? The type is seen in the question of the Cyclops to Ulysses

(Odyssey IX 252): "Strangers, who are ye? Whence sail ye over the wet

ways? On some trading enterprise, or at adventure do ye rove? "

To these questions how would Saul answer? After his years of recent

life as a Jew, filled with the thought of a religion that originated

among Jews, and was in his conception the perfected form of Jewish

religion, did he reply: "My name is Saul, and I am a Jew from Tarsus"?

First, let us see what he himself says as to his method of addressing

an audience (I Cor. IX 20 f.), "to the Jews I made myself as a Jew that

I might gain Jews; to them that are under the law as under the law

(though not myself under the law); to them that are without the law as

without the law; I am become all things to all men; and I do all for

the Gospel's sake". We cannot doubt that the man who wrote so to the

Corinthians replied to the questions of Sergius Paulus, by designating

himself as a Roman, born at Tarsus, and named Paul. By a marvellous

stroke of historic brevity, the author sets before us the past and the

present in the simple words: "Then Saul, otherwise Paul, fixed his eyes

on him and said"

The double character, the mixed personality, the Oriental teacher who

turns out to be a freeborn Roman, would have struck and arrested the

attention of any governor, any person possessed of insight into

character, any one who had even an average share of curiosity. But to a

man with the tastes of Sergius Paulus, the Roman Jew must have been

doubly interesting; and the orator or the preacher knows how much is

gained by arousing such an interest at the outset.

Coming forward in this character and name, Paul was taking a momentous

step, the importance of which was fully marked in the narrative. In the

first place, he was taking the leading place and guiding the tone of

the interview instead of being, as heretofore, the subordinate

following Barnabas. Hence in the narrative we find that Barnabas

introduced Saul to the Apostles; Barnabas brought Saul to Antioch;

Barnabas and Saul carried the Antiochian aims to Jerusalem; Barnabas

and Saul brought back John Mark with them from Jerusalem; Barnabas was

first and Saul last in the body of prophets and teachers of the Church

at Antioch; Barnabas and Saul were selected by the Spirit; and Barnabas

and Saul were invited to the proconsul's presence. But now Paul took

this new departure, and Paul and his company sailed away from Paphos to

Pamphylia; Paul and Barnabas addressed the Gentiles in Antioch; Paul

and Barnabas disputed with the Judaising party on their return to

Syrian Antioch; and henceforth the regular order places Paul first.

There are only two exceptions to this rule, and these serve to bring

out its true character more clearly.

(1) In the Council at Jerusalem, and in the letter of the Apostles and

Elders, XV 12, 25, the order is Barnabas and Paul; but there we are

among Jews, who follow the order of seniority and Jewish precedence.

The only surprising thing here is that they use the name Paul, not the

Hebrew Saul. We can only infer from that that the Greek-speaking Jews

generally used the name Paul (compare p. 169), and that the historian's

use of the name Saul in the earlier part of this narrative was

deliberately chosen to emphasise the contrast between Paul's earlier

and his later manner.

(2) In the episode where the two Apostles were worshipped at Lystra,

Barnabas is named first as Zeus the chief god, and Paul next as Hermes

the messenger. But the same qualities which mark out Paul to us as the

leader, marked him out to the populace of Lycaonia as the agent and

subordinate. The Western mind regards the leader as the active and

energetic partner; but the Oriental mind considers the leader to be the

person who sits still and does nothing, while his subordinates speak

and work for him. Hence in the truly Oriental religions the chief god

sits apart from the world, communicating with it through his messenger

and subordinate. The more statuesque figure of Barnabas was therefore

taken by the Orientals as the chief god, and the active orator, Paul,

as his messenger, communicating his wishes to men. Incidentally, we may

notice both the diametrical antithesis of this conception of the Divine

nature to the Christian conception, and also the absolute negation of

the Oriental conception in Christ's words to His Disciples, "whosoever

would become great among you shall be your minister; and whosoever

would be first among you shall be your servant" (Matt. XX 26).

How delicate is the art which by simple change in the order of a

recurring pair of names, and by the slight touch at the critical.

moment, "Saul, otherwise Paul," suggests and reveals this wide-reaching

conception in Luke's mind of historical development!

In the second place, when Paul thus came forward under his new aspect

and personality, he was inaugurating a new policy. He was appealing

direct for the first time to the Gr�co-Roman world as himself a member

of that world. This is put plainly in XIV 27 as the great innovation

and the great fact of the journey: as soon as Paul and Barnabas

returned to Syrian Antioch, they made a report to the assembled Church

"of all things that God had done with them, and how He had opened a

door of faith unto the Gentiles". The first Stage in the admission of

the Gentiles to the Christian Church was taken long before this

journey. But the full implication of the Apostolate to the Gentiles was

not even by Paul himself realised for many years. The second stage was

achieved on this journey, and the historian fixes the psychological

moment precisely at the point where the Apostles faced the Magian in

the presence of the proconsul of Cyprus. Amid the conflict of the two

religions before the Roman governor, Paul stepped forward in his

character of citizen of the Empire; and his act was followed by that

transport of power, which attested the grace that was given to the bold

innovator, and the Divine approval and confirmation of his step. On

former occasions the grace that was evident in Antioch confirmed the

high character of the Antiochian Brotherhood in the eyes of Barnabas

(Acts XI 23, and the grace that was given Paul had justified his

apostolate in the eyes of James, Peter and John (Gal. II 9).

Such is the situation in which we stand when we transport ourselves in

thought to the time and the country where the events took place, and

take the few brief words of Luke in the sense which they bore to the

men of his time. But now let us turn from this picture to see what is

made of the scene by the critic, who sits in his study and writes as if

the men of this book were artificial figures and not real human beings.

Weizs�cker, one of the most distinguished of modern German scholars,

finds in this delicacy of language nothing but a sign of double

authorship. The late author, he says, used two earlier authorities, one

of whom employed the name Saul, while the other designated the Apostle

as Paul, and by a mere conjecture he puts the change at this point.

Weizs�cker emphasises this view that the point was selected by an

arbitrary conjecture, and that any other point might have been chosen

equally well. It might almost seem that, in a statement like this, the

learned professor is taking his fun off us, and is experimenting to see

how much the world will accept at the mouth of a deservedly famous

scholar without rebelling.

Mr. Lewin states better than almost any other the force of this passage

when he says: "The dropping of the Jewish, and the adoption of a Roman

name, was in harmony with the great truth he was promulgating--that

henceforth the partition between Jew and Gentile was broken down". He

then asks, "Why is not the name of Paul introduced when he first left

Antioch to commence his travels?" and after he has in a rather

hesitating way suggested some quite unsuitable occasions as possible

for the change, he rightly concludes, "It occurs more naturally

immediately afterwards when Saul stands forth by himself and becomes

the principal actor" The marvels described in Acts concern my present

purpose only in so far as they bear upon the historical effect of the

narrative. In themselves they do not add to, but detract from its

verisimilitude as history. They are difficulties; but my hope is to

show first that the narrative apart from them is stamped as authentic,

second that they are an integral part of it. To study and explain them

does not belong to me. Twenty years ago I found it easy to dispose of

them; but now-a-days probably not even the youngest among us finds

himself able to maintain that we have mastered the secrets of nature,

and determined the limits which divide the unknown from the impossible.

That Paul believed himself to be the recipient of direct revelations

from God, to be guided and controlled in his plans by direct

interposition of the Holy Spirit, to be enabled by the Divine power to

move the forces of nature in a way that ordinary men cannot, is

involved in this narrative. You must make up your own minds to accept

or to reject it, but you cannot cut out the marvellous from the rest,

nor can you believe that either Paul or this writer was a mere victim

of hallucinations. To the men of that age only what was guaranteed by

marvellous accompaniments was true; to us unusual accompaniments tend

to disprove truth. The contrast between the ages is himmelweit.

The marvellous is indissolubly interwoven--for good or for bad--with

this narrative, and cannot be eliminated. Do the marvellous adjuncts

discredit the rest of the narrative, or does the vividness and accuracy

of the narrative require us to take the marvels with the rest and try

to understand them? Every one must answer the question for himself.

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

[12] In classical Greek the meaning would be "put questions to them";

and perhaps that is the sense here.

[13] xunetos (in Attic) "of practical ability," sophos "cultivated".

[14] Found and made known by General Cesnola: but more accurately and

completely published in Mr. D. G Hogarth's Devia Cypria, p. 114.

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

CHAPTER V.

FOUNDATION OF THE CHURCHES OF GALATIA [15]

1. PAMPHYLIA.

(XIII 13) AND PAUL AND HIS COMPANY SET SAIL FROM PAPHOS AND CAME TO

PERGA IN the province PAMPHILIA. AND JOHN DEPARTED FROM THEM, AND

RETURNED TO JERUSALEM; (14) BUT THEY WENT ACROSS FROM PERGA AND ARRIVED

AT PISIDIAN ANTIOCH.

The phrase "Perga of Pamphylia" is not intended to distinguish this

Perga from others (cp. XXI 39): there was no other city of the same

name. Nor is it a mere piece of geographical information: this

historian has no desire to teach the reader geography. The sense is

"they proceeded to Pamphylia, to the special point Perga"; and the

intention is to define their next sphere of work as being Pamphylia.

This sense would have naturally been understood by every one, were it

not that no missionary work was actually done in Pamphylia, for the

next fact mentioned is that John left the party, and the others went on

to Pisidian Antioch; and the conclusion has sometimes been drawn

hastily that Pamphylia had never been contemplated as a mission-field,

and was merely traversed because it lay between Cyprus and Antioch. But

the plain force of the words must be accepted here, for it lies in the

situation that Pamphylia was the natural continuation of the work that

had been going on, first in Syria and Cilicia for many years, and next

in Cyprus. They went to Pamphylia to preach there, and, as they did not

actually preach there, something must have occurred to make them change

their plan. Further, the reason for this change of plan must have been

merely a temporary one, for they preached in Pamphylia on their return

journey.

We are justified in connecting with this change of plan the one fact

recorded about the missionary party in Pamphylia: John left them in

circumstances that made a deep and painful impression on Paul, and

remained rankling in his mind for years (XV 38). The historian places

together in a marked way the departure of John and the onward journey

of the others without preaching in Pamphylia. Now, as we have seen, it

does not lie in this historian's manner to state reasons; he rarely

says that one event was the cause of another, but merely states the

facts side by side, and leaves the reader to gather for himself the

causal connection between them.

Other reasons, which need not be repeated here, point to the same

conclusion, that a change of plan was the reason why John abandoned the

expedition. He conceived that the new "proposal was a departure from

the scheme" with which they had been charged, "carrying their work into

a region different in character and not contemplated by the Church".

Further, we observe that the country between Perga and Pisidian Antioch

is not mentioned; the journey is not even summed up briefly as the

Cyprian journey between Salamis and Paphos was described (XIII 6): it

is simply said that "they went across (the intervening mountain lands

of Taurus) to Antioch," as in XVIII 27 Apollos "conceived the intention

to go across (the intervening �gean Sea) to Achaia". On our hypothesis

that the narrative is singularly exact in expression, and that the

slightest differences are significant, we gather that the journey to

Antioch was a mere traversing of the country without preaching, with

the view of reaching Antioch. On the other hand, it is stated that the

return journey some years later from Antioch to Perga was a preaching

journey, though no marked effects are recorded on it.

Again, it is a rule in this historian's clear and practical style, that

when Paul is entering (or intending, even though unsuccessfully, to

enter) a new field of missionary enterprise, the field is defined (as

in v. 4); and the definition usually takes the form of a Roman

provincial district. This will become apparent as the narrative

proceeds, and the inferences that can be drawn from the form of

definition or absence of definition in each case will illustrate and

give precision to the rule. It is, I believe, a fair inference from the

want of any indication of a wider sphere that when the travellers went

to Pisidian Antioch, they had not in mind a wider field of work than

the city: they went to Pisidian Antioch and not to the province

Galatia, in which it was included.

The name is rightly given as Pisidian Antioch in the great MSS.; the

form "Antioch of Pisidia" is a corruption. Besides other reasons,

Antioch was not considered by Luke to be in Pisidia (p. 124).

The facts, then, which can be gathered from the narrative of Acts are

these. Paul and his companions came to Perga with the view of

evangelising the next country on their route, a country similar in

character to and closely. connected in commerce and racial type with

Cyprus and Syria and Cilicia. For some reason the plan was altered, and

they passed rapidly over the Pamphylian lowlands and the Pisidian

mountain-lands to Antioch, postponing the evangelisation of these

districts till a later stage of their journey. They went to Antioch for

some reason which concerned only that city, and did not contemplate as

their object the evangelisation of the province to which it belonged.

John, however, refused to participate in the changed programme,

presumably because he disapproved of it. His refusal seems to have been

felt as a personal slight by Paul, which suggests that the change of

plan was in some way caused by Paul. What then was the reason? Is any

clue to it given in any other part of Acts or in the words of Paul

himself?

In passing from Perga to Pisidian Antioch, the travellers passed from

the Roman province Pamphylia to the Roman province Galatia, and the

rest of their journey lay in Galatia until they returned to Perga. Now,

we possess a letter written by Paul to the Churches of Galatia, in

which he says: "Ye know that it was by reason of physical infirmity

that I preached the Gospel unto you on the first of my two visits; and

the facts of my bodily constitution which were trying to you were not

despised nor rejected by you, but ye received me as a messenger of

God". We learn, then, from Paul himself that an illness (we may

confidently say a serious illness) was the occasion of his having

originally preached to the churches of Galatia. The words do not

necessarily imply that the illness began in Galatia; they are quite

consistent with the interpretation that the illness was the reason why

he came to be in Galatia and had the opportunity of preaching there;

but they imply that the physical infirmity lasted for some considerable

time, and was apparent to strangers, while he was in Galatia.

Here we have a reason, stated by Paul himself, which fully explains all

the curious phenomena of the text of Acts. Paul had a serious illness

in Pamphylia, and on that account he left Perga and went to Antioch. It

is unnecessary to repeat the argument that this is in perfect agreement

with the known facts. Any constitutional weakness was liable to be

brought out by "the sudden plunge into the enervating atmosphere of

Pamphylia" after the fatigue and hardship of a journey on foot through

Cyprus, accompanied by the constant excitement of missionary work,

culminating in the intense nervous strain of the supreme effort at

Paphos. The natural and common treatment for such an illness is to go

to the higher ground of the interior; and the situation of Antioch

(about 3600 ft. above the sea, sheltered by mountains on the north and

east, and overlooking a wide plain to the south and south-west), as

well as its Jewish population, and commercial connection with the

Pamphylian coast-cities, made it a very suitable place for Paul's

purpose.

But why then did the historian not state this simple fact? It lies out

of his purpose and method to notice such personal details. He states in

the briefest possible form the essential facts of the evangelisation of

the world; and everything else he passes over as of ephemeral nature.

We are dealing with a first century, and not a nineteenth century

historian,--one who had not the eager desire to understand causes and

reasons which characterises the present day, one who wrote for a public

that was quite satisfied with a statement of facts without a study of

causes. There is too much tendency to demand from the first century

writers an answer to all the questions we should like to put.

Moreover, Luke passes very lightly over the sufferings and the dangers

that Paul encountered; many he omits entirely, others he mentions

without emphasising the serious nature of the case (p. 279 f.).

It is plain that Paul at the moment felt deeply wounded. The journey

which he felt to be absolutely necessary in the interests of future

work was treated by Mark as an abandonment of the work; and his

sensitive nature would consider Mark's arguments, plausible as they

were in some respects, as equivalent to a declaration of want of

confidence. But that feeling, though it lasted for some years, was not

of the permanent nature which would put it on the same plane as the

facts recorded by Luke. Who can think that Paul would have desired

permanent record of his illness and Mark's desertion? And his desire on

a matter personal to himself would be Luke's law.

2.THE "THORN IN THE FLESH".

The character of the Pamphylian country, not merely in its modern

half-cultivated condition, but at all times, must have been enervating

and calculated to bring out any latent weakness of constitution. Now it

is a probable and generally accepted view that the "physical weakness,"

which was the occasion why Paul preached to the Galatians, was the same

malady which tormented him at frequent intervals. I have suggested that

this malady was a species of chronic malaria fever; and, in view of

criticisms, it is necessary to dwell on this point; for I have incurred

the blame of exaggerating an ephemeral attack. The question is put

whether such an illness "could reasonably have called forth their

contempt and loathing. [16]

A physical weakness, which recurs regularly in some situation that one

is regularly required by duty to face, produces strong and peculiar

effect on our human nature. An attentive student of mankind has caught

this trait and described it clearly in one of the characters whom his

genius has created. I quote from Charles Reade's description of a

clergyman engaged in warfare against the barbarity of prison

discipline, upon whom every scene of cruelty which he had often to

witness produced a distressing physical effect, sickness and trembling.

"His high-tuned nature gave way. He locked the door that no one might

see his weakness; and, then, succumbing to nature, he fell first into a

sickness and then into a trembling, and more than once hysterical tears

gushed from his eyes in the temporary prostration of his spirit and his

powers. Such are the great. Men know their feats, but not their

struggles. The feeling of shame at this weakness is several times

described in the course of the narrative (It is Never too Late to

Mend); and, when at last nature, on the verge of a more serious

physical prostration, ceased to relieve itself in this painful way, "he

thanked Heaven for curing him of that contemptible infirmity, so he

called it". Yet that weakness did not prevent the sufferer from facing

his duty, but only came on as a consequence; and it could be hidden

within the privacy of his chamber. Let the reader conceive the distress

and shame of the sufferer, if the weakness had prostrated him before

his duty was finished, and laid him helpless before them all when he

required his whole strength. Surely he would have "besought the Lord

that it might depart from" him, and regarded it as "a messenger of

Satan sent to buffet him" (II Cor. XII 7, 8).

Now, in some constitutions malaria fever tends to recur in very

distressing and prostrating paroxysms, whenever one's energies are

taxed for a great effort. Such an attack is for the time absolutely

incapacitating: the sufferer can only lie and feel himself a shaking

and helpless weakling, when he ought to be at work. He feels a contempt

and loathing for self, and believes that others feel equal contempt and

loathing.

Charles Reade's hero could at least retire to his room, and lock the

door, and conceal his weakness from others; but, in the publicity of

Oriental life, Paul could have no privacy. In every paroxysm, and they

might recur daily, he would lie exposed to the pity or the contempt of

strangers. If he were first seen in a Galatian village, or house, lying

in the mud on the shady side of a wall for two hours shaking like an

aspen leaf, the gratitude that he expresses to the Galatians, because

they "did not despise nor reject his infirmity," was natural and

deserved.

Fresh light is thrown on this subject by an observation of Mr. Hogarth,

my companion in many journeys. In publishing a series of inscriptions

recording examples of punishment inflicted by the God on those who had

approached the sanctuary in impurity, he suggests that malarial fever

was often the penalty sent by the God. The paroxysms, recurring

suddenly with overpowering strength, and then passing off, seemed to be

due to the direct visitation of God. This gives a striking effect to

Paul's words in Gal. IV 14, "you did not despise nor reject my physical

infirmity, but received me as an angel of God": though the Galatians

might have turned him away from their door as a person accursed and

afflicted by God, they received him as God's messenger. The obvious

implication of this passage has led many to the view that Paul's malady

was epilepsy, which was also attributed to the direct visitation of

God.

A strong corroboration is found in the phrase: "a stake in the flesh,"

which Paul uses about his malady (II Cor. XII 7)--That is the peculiar

headache which accompanies the paroxysms: within my experience several

persons, innocent of Pauline theorising, have described it as "like a

red-hot bar thrust through the forehead". As soon as fever connected

itself with Paul in my mind, the "stake in the flesh" impressed me as a

strikingly illustrative metaphor; and the oldest tradition on the

subject, quoted by Tertullian and others, explains the" stake in the

flesh "as headache.

The malady was a "messenger of Satan". Satan seems to represent in

Pauline language any overpowering obstacle to his work, an obstacle

which it was impossible to struggle against: so Satan prevented him

from returning to Thessalonica, in the form of an ingenious obstacle,

which made his return impossible for the time (p. 230). The words

"messenger sent to buffet me," imply that it came frequently and

unexpectedly, striking him down with the power of the Enemy.

The idea that the malady was an affection of the eyes, resulting from

blinding at his conversion, seems inadequate in itself, unsuitable to

his own words, and contradicted by the evidence as to the power of his

eyes (p. 38).

Paul describes the malady as sent to prevent him from "being exalted

overmuch by reason of the exceeding greatness of the revelations" which

had been granted to him; and he clearly implies that it came later than

the great revelation, when "he was caught up even to the third heaven"

about 43 A.D. (p. 60). The malady certainly did not begin long before

this journey; and the attack in Pamphylia may perhaps have been the

first

3. THE SYNAGOGUE IN PISIDIAN ANTIOCH.

(XIII 13) JOHN DEPARTED FROM THEM AND RETURNED TO JERUSALEM; (14) BUT

THEY WENT ACROSS FROM PERGA AND ARRIVED AT PISIDIAN ANTIOCH. AND THEY

WENT INTO THE SYNAGOGUE ON THE SABBATH DAY, AND SAT DOWN; (15) AND

AFTER THE READING OF THE LAW AND THE PROPHETS, THE ARCHISYNAGOGOI SENT

TO THEM SAYING, "GENTLEMEN, BRETHREN, IF THERE IS IN YOU A WORD OF

ENCOURAGEMENT TO THE PEOPLE, SAY ON". (16) AND PAUL STOOD UP AND MADE A

GESTURE WITH HIS HAND AND SPOKE . . . (42) AND AS THEY WENT OUT, THEY

BESOUGHT THAT THESE WORDS MIGHT BE SPOKEN TO THEM THE NEXT SABBATH.

(43) NOW, WHEN THE SYNAGOGUE BROKE UP, MANY OF THE JEWS AND OF THE

GOD-FEARING PROSELYTES FOLLOWED PAUL AND BARNABAS: WHO, SPEAKING TO

THEM, URGED THEM TO CONTINUE IN THE GRACE OF GOD. (44) AND THE NEXT

SABBATH ALMOST THE WHOLE CITY WAS GATHERED TOGETHER TO HEAR THE WORD OF

GOD. (45) BUT WHEN THE JEWS SAW THE MULTITUDES, THEY WERE FILLED WITH

JEALOUSY, AND CONTRADICTED THE THINGS WHICH WERE SPOKEN BY PAUL, AND

BLASPHEMED. (46) AND PAUL AND BARNABAS SPAKE OUT BOLDLY AND SAID, "IT

WAS NECESSARY THAT THE WORD OF GOD SHOULD FIRST BE SPOKEN TO YOU.

SEEING YE THRUST IT FROM YOU, AND JUDGE YOURSELVES UNWORTHY OF ETERNAL

LIFE, LO, WE TURN TO THE GENTILES." . . . (48) AND AS THE GENTILES

HEARD THIS, THEY WERE GLAD AND GLORIFIED THE WORD OF GOD: AND AS MANY

AS WERE ORDAINED TO ETERNAL LIFE BELIEVED. (49) AND THE WORD OF THE

LORD WAS SPREAD ABROAD THROUGHOUT ALL THE REGION. (50) BUT THE JEWS

URGED ON THE DEVOUT WOMEN OF HONOURABLE ESTATE, AND THE CHIEF MEN OF

THE CITY, AND STIRRED UP A PERSECUTION AGAINST PAUL AND BARNABAS, AND

CAST THEM OUT OF THEIR BORDERS. (51) BUT THEY SHOOK OFF THE DUST OF

THEIR FEET AGAINST THEM, AND CAME UNTO ICONIUM. (52) AND THE DISCIPLES

WERE FILLED WITH JOY AND WITH THE HOLY GHOST.

The route between Perga and Pisidian Antioch, with its perils of

rivers, perils of robbers, and the later legend connected with the

journey across the Pisidian mountains by the city which still bears the

Apostle's name, is described elsewhere, and need not here detain us.

The usual punctuation of vv. 13, 14, seems to arise from the idea that

Paul's sermon was delivered on the first Sabbath after he reached

Antioch. So, Conybeare and Howson say, "a congregation came together at

Antioch on the Sabbath which immediately succeeded the arrival of Paul

and Barnabas". It seems, however, not possible that such powerful

effect as is described in v. 44 should have been produced on the whole

city within the first ten days after they arrived in Antioch. Moreover,

when Paul's teaching had become more definite and pronounced, he

preached three successive Sabbaths to the Jews at Thessalonica (p.

228), and it seems implied that the rupture took place there unusually

soon; hence, at this time, when he had been preaching for years in the

Jewish synagogues of Cilicia, Syria and Cyprus, it is improbable that

the quarrel with the Jews of Antioch took place on the second Sabbath.

But, when the passage is properly punctuated, there remains nothing to

show that Paul's speech was delivered on his first Sabbath in Antioch.

Nothing is said as to the first days of the Apostles' stay in the city.

We are to understand, according to the rule already observed (p. 72

f.), that the usual method was pursued, and that some time passed

before any critical event took place. As at Paphos, the fame of the new

teachers gradually spread through the city. The historian gives an

address to the synagogue with an outline of the teaching which produced

this result; the address delivered on a critical Sabbath, after feeling

had already been moved for some time, may well have remained in the

memory or in the manuscript diary of some of the interested hearers,

and thus been preserved. We make it part of our hypothesis that Luke

took his task as a historian seriously, and obtained original records

where he could.

Paul's address to the assembled Jews and proselytes was doubtless

suggested by the passages, one from the Law, one from the Prophets,

which were read before he was called to speak. It has been conjectured

that these passages were Deut. I and Isaiah I, which in the Septuagint

Version contain two marked words employed by Paul: the Scriptures were

probably read in Greek in this synagogue of Grecised Jews (see pp. 84,

169). Deut. I naturally suggests the historical retrospect with which

Paul begins; and the promise of remission of sins rises naturally out

of Isaiah I 18. Dean Farrar mentions that "in the present list of

Jewish lessons, Deut. I-III 22 and Isaiah I 1-22 stand forty-fourth in

order". That list is of decidedly later origin; but probably it was

often determined by older custom and traditional ideas of suitable

accompaniment.

The climax of the address passed from the historical survey (with its

assurance of unfailing Divine guidance for the Chosen People) to the

sending of Jesus, who had been slain by the rulers of Jerusalem

("because they knew Him not, nor the voices of the prophets which are

read every Sabbath," v. 27), but whom God had raised from the dead.

Then follow the promise and the peroration:--

(XIII 38) BE IT KNOWN UNTO YOU THEREFORE, BRETHREN, THAT THROUGH THIS

MAN IS PROCLAIMED UNTO YOU REMISSION OF SINS; (39) AND BY HIM EVERY ONE

THAT BELIEVETH IS JUSTIFIED FROM ALL THINGS, FROM WHICH YE COULD NOT BE

JUSTIFIED BY THE LAW OF MOSES. (40) BEWARE, THEREFORE, LEST THAT COME

UPON YOU, WHICH IS SPOKEN IN THE PROPHETS; "BEHOLD, YE DESPISERS, AND

WONDER, AND PERISH; FOR I WORK A WONDER IN YOUR DAYS".

This outspoken declaration that the Judaic system was superseded by a

higher message from God is not said to have hurt the feelings of the

Jews who were present. Paul was invited to continue his discourse on

the following Sabbath; many of the audience, both Jews and proselytes,

followed the Apostles from the synagogue; and both Paul and Barnabas

addressed them further, and emphasised the effect of the previous

address.

There must have been something in the situation or in the supplementary

explanations given by Paul and Barnabas, which made his words specially

applicable to the Gentiles; and a vast crowd of the citizens gathered

to hear Paul on the following week. Paul's address on this occasion is

not given. It was in all probability addressed pointedly to the

Antiochians, for violent opposition and contradiction and jealousy were

roused among the Jews. We may fairly infer that the open door of belief

for the whole world irrespective of race was made a prominent topic;

for the passion which animated the Jewish opposition is said to have

been jealousy. The climax of a violent scene was the bold declaration

of Paul and Barnabas that they "turned to the Gentiles, since the Jews

rejected the Gospel".

In this scene the same fact that was observed at Paphos came out

prominently. The eager interest and the invitation of the general

population stimulated Paul; and his ideas developed rapidly. The first

thoroughly Gentile congregation separate from the synagogue was

established at Pisidian Antioch. Where he saw no promise of success, he

never persisted; but where "a door was opened unto him," he used the

opportunity (I Cor. XVI 9, II Cor. II 12). The influence attributed to

the women at Antioch, v. 50, is in perfect accord with the manners of

the country. In Athens or in an Ionian city, it would have been

impossible (p. 252).

4. THE CHURCH AT PISIDIAN ANTIOCH.

The deep impression that had already been produced on the general

population of Antioch was intensified when the preaching of Paul and

Barnabas began to be addressed to them directly and exclusively. The

effect was now extended to the whole Region. This term does not

indicate the lands immediately around the fortifications of Antioch,

and belonging to that city. The free population of those lands were

citizens of Antioch; and the term "city," according to the ancient

idea, included the entire lands that belonged to it, and not the mere

space covered by continuous houses and a fortified wail. "A city was

not walls, but men;" and the saying had a wider and more practical

meaning to the ancients than is generally taken from it in modern

times. The phrase that is here used, "the whole Region," indicates some

distinct and recognised circle of territories.

Here we have a fact of administration and government assumed in quiet

undesigned fashion: Antioch was the centre of a Region. This is the

kind of allusion which affords to students of ancient literature a test

of accuracy, and often a presumption of date. I think that, if we put

this assumption to the test, we shall find (1) that it is right, (2)

that it adds a new fact, probable in itself but not elsewhere formally

stated, about the Roman administration of Galatia, (3) that it explains

and throws new light on several passages in ancient authors and

inscriptions. Without discussing the subject too elaborately, we may

point out the essentials.

My friend Prof. Sterrett, of Amherst, Massachusetts, has discovered and

published an inscription of Antioch, which speaks of a "regionary

centurion" (hekatontarchen rhegeonarion), evidently a military official

charged with certain duties (probably in the maintenance of peace and

order) within a certain Regio of which Antioch was the centre. [17]

Thus we have epigraphic authority to prove that Antioch under the Roman

administration was the centre of a Region. Further, we can determine

the extent and the name of that Region, remembering always that in a

province like Galatia, where evidence is lamentably scanty, we must

often be content with reasonable probability, and rarely find such an

inscription as Prof. Sterrett's to put us on a plane of demonstrated

certainty.

It is natural in the administration of so large a province as Galatia,

and there are some recorded proofs, that a certain number of distinct

Regiones (or chorai) existed in Southern Galatia. To quote the exact

names recorded, we have Phrygia or Phrugia chora, Isauria or Isaurike

(chora), Pisidia, Lycaonia or Galatike chora (with tes Lukanoias

understood, denoting the Roman part of Lycaonia in contrast with

Lycaonia Antiochiana or Agtiochaane chora the part of Lycaonia ruled by

King Antiochus). There can be no doubt that Pisidian Antioch (strictly

"a Phrygian city towards Pisidia") was the centre of the Region called

Phrygia in inscriptions enumerating the parts of the province, and "the

Phrygian Region of (the province) Galatia" in Acts XVI 6, or "the

Phrygian Region" XVIII 23. This central importance of Antioch was due

to its position as a Roman Colony, which made it the military and

administrative centre of the country.

Thus, without any formal statement, and without any technical term, but

in the course of a bare, simple and brief account of the effects of

Paul's preaching, we find ourselves unexpectedly (just as Paul and

Barnabas found themselves unintentionally) amid a Roman provincial

district, which is moved from the centre to the extremities by the new

preaching. It is remarkable how the expression of Luke embodies the

very soul of history (p. 200).

A certain lapse of time, then, is implied in the brief words of v. 49.

The process whereby the whole region was influenced by the Word must

have been a gradual one. The similar expression used in XIX 10 may

serve as a standard of comparison: there, during a period of two years

in Ephesus, "all they which dwelt in Asia heard the Word". The sphere

of influence is immensely wider in that case; but the process is the

same. Persons from the other cities came to Antioch as administrative

centre, the great garrison city, which was often visited by the Roman

governor and was the residence of some subordinate officials: they came

for law-suits, for trade, for great festivals of the Roman unity (such

as that described in the Acta of Paul and Thekla). [18] In Antioch they

heard of the new doctrine; some came under its influence; the knowledge

of it was thus borne abroad over the whole territory; probably small

knots of Christians were formed in other towns.

How long a period of time is covered by v. 49 we cannot tell with

certainty; but it must be plain to every one that the estimate of the

whole residence at Antioch as two to six months, is, as is elsewhere

said, a minimum. It may be observed that in the Antiochian narrative a

period of some weeks is passed over in total silence, then thirty-three

verses are devoted to the epoch-making events of two successive

Sabbaths, and then another considerable period is summed up in v. 49.

The action by which Paul and Barnabas were expelled from Antioch has

been fully described elsewhere. The expulsion was inflicted by the

magistrates of the city, and was justified to their minds in the

interests of peace and order. It was not inflicted by officials of the

province, and hence the effect is expressly restricted by the historian

to Antiochian territory. Slight as the details are, they suit the

circumstances of the time perfectly. [19]

In the additions of this kind made to Codex Bez� we have the beginnings

of a Pauline myth. There is nothing in which popular fancy among the

early Christians showed itself so creative as the tortures of its

heroes. The earliest Acta of martyrs contain only a moderate amount of

torture, such in kind as was inseparable from Roman courts of justice;

as time passed, these tortures seemed insufficient, and the old Acta

were touched up to suit what the age believed must have taken place.

Where we possess accounts of a martyrdom of different dates, the older

are less filled with sufferings than the later. A similar process of

accretion to Acts was actually beginning, but was checked by the

veneration that began to regard its text as sacred.

Luke passes very lightly over Paul's sufferings: from II Tim. III 11,

we see that he must have endured much. He was three times beaten with

the rods of lictors before A.D. 56 (II Cor. XI 25). Now, since the

Roman governors whom he met were favourable to him, these beatings must

have taken place in "colonies," whose magistrates were attended by

lictors. It is probable that the persecution which is mentioned in

Antioch, and hinted. at in Lystra, included beating by lictors. It is

noteworthy that the magistrates of these two cities are not expressly

mentioned, and therefore there was no opportunity for describing their

action. The third beating by lictors was in Philippi, also a colony.

Similarly it can hardly be doubted that some of the five occasions on

which Paul received stripes from the Jews were in the Galatian cities,

where some Jews were so active against him.

5. ICONIUM.

(XIV 1) AND IT CAME TO PASS IN ICONIUM AFTER THE SAME FASHION as in

Antioch THAT THEY ENTERED INTO THE SYNAGOGUE OF THE JEWS AND SO SPAKE

THAT A GREAT MULTITUDE, BOTH OF JEWS AND OF GREEKS, BELIEVED. (2) BUT

THE DISAFFECTED AMONG THE JEWS STIRRED UP AND EXASPERATED THE MINDS OF

THE GENTILES AGAINST THE BRETHREN. (4) AND THE POPULACE WAS DIVIDED;

AND PART HELD WITH THE JEWS AND PART WITH THE APOSTLES. (5) AND WHEN

THERE WAS MADE AN ONSET BOTH OF THE GENTILES AND OF THE JEWS WITH THEIR

RULERS, TO ENTREAT THEM SHAMEFULLY, AND TO STONE THEM, (6) THEY BECAME

AWARE OF IT, AND FLED INTO LYCAONIA.

According to the reading of the MSS., the narrative of these incidents

is obscure; and it is hard to believe that the text is correct. In v. 1

the great success of the preaching is related, while in v. 2 the

disaffected Jews rouse bitter feeling against the Apostles (the aorists

implying that the efforts were successful). Then in v. 3 we are

astonished to read, as the sequel of the Jewish action, that the

Apostles remained a long time preaching boldly and with marked success:

and finally, in v. 4, the consequences of the Jewish action are set

forth. It is therefore not surprising that the critics who look on Acts

as a patchwork have cut up this passage. It must be conceded that

appearances in this case are in their favour, and that the correctness

and originality of the narrative can hardly be defended without the

supposition that some corruption has crept into it; but the great

diversity of text in the various MSS. and Versions is, on ordinary

critical principles, a sign that some corruption did take place at a

very early date.

The close relation of vv. 2 and 4 is patent; and Spitta's hypothesis of

a primitive document containing vv. 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, gives a clear and

excellent narrative. Only, in place of his improbable theory that v. 3

is a scrap from an independent and complete narrative, I should regard

it as an early gloss, similar to the many which have crept into the

Bezan Text. The emphasis laid on the marvel at Lystra, which perhaps

implies that it was the first sign of special Divine favour in the

Galatian work (p. 115), may corroborate this view to some extent.

Marvels and tortures are the two elements which, as time goes on, are

added to the story of every saint and martyr; the Bezan Text of this

passage shows a further addition of the same type (p. 113), and is

distinguished by numerous additions telling of the Divine intervention

in Paul's work. All such additions, probably, grew in the popular

belief, and then became attached as true facts to the original text.

The Bezan Text of 2, 3, is a good example of its character as a

modernised and explanatory edition of an already archaic and obscure

text. The discrepancy between v. 2 and v. 3 called for some remedy,

which was found in the supposition that there were two tumults in

Iconium: on this supposition v. 2 was interpreted of the first tumult,

and a conclusion, "and the Lord soon gave peace," was tacked on to it.

The narrative then proceeds, after the renewed preaching of v. 3, to

the second tumult of vv. 4, 5 (p. 113). The double tumult lent itself

well to the growing Pauline myth, which sought to find occasion for the

sufferings and persecutions of II Cor. XI.

But, if there were two stages in the Iconian narrative in its original

uncorrupted form, we might reasonably argue from the words "in the same

way (as at Antioch)," that the two stages were (1) successful preaching

in the synagogue, brought to a conclusion by the jealousy and

machinations of the Jews; (2) Paul and Barnabas turned to the Gentile

population exclusively and were remarkably successful among them. But

conjectural alteration of the text would be required to elicit that

meaning; and we cannot spend more time here on this passage.

It is to be noted that no effect on the Region around Iconiurm is

mentioned. According to our hypothesis we must recognise the difference

from the narrative at Antioch, where the wide-spread effect is

emphasised so strongly. The difference is natural, and the reason is

clear, when we consider the difference between the two cities: Antioch

was the governing centre of a wide Region which looked to it for

administration, whereas Iconium was a comparatively insignificant town

in the Region round Antioch.

Again, when Paul and Barnabas went from Antioch to Iconium, they were

not going to a new district, but to an outlying city of the same

district; hence there is no definition of their proposed sphere of

duty. They were expelled from Antioch, and they came to Iconium. The

case was very different when they found it expedient to leave Iconium.

They then had to cross the frontier to a new Region of the same

province, which began a few miles south and east from Iconium. The

passage to a new Region and a new sphere of work is clearly marked in

the text.

6. THE CITIES OF LYCAONIA.

(XIV 6) Paul and Barnabas FLED UNTO THE CITIES OF LYCAONIA, LYSTRA AND

DERBE, AND THE SURROUNDING REGION; (7) AND THERE THEY WERE ENGAGED IN

PREACHING THE GOSPEL.

The expression used in XIV 6 is remarkable (p. 90): "they fled into

Lycaonia, especially to the part of it which is summed up as the

cities, Lystra and Derbe, and the surrounding Region". To understand

this we must bear in mind that the growth of cities in Central and

Eastern Asia Minor was connected with the spread of Greek civilisation;

and in the primitive pre-Greek condition of the country there were no

cities organised according to the Greek system, and hardly any large

settlements, except the governing centres, which were, however,

Oriental towns, not Greek cities. Now, in v. 6 a Region comprising part

of Lycaonia is distinguished from the rest as consisting of two cities

and a stretch of cityless territory (i.e., territory organised on the

native pre-Greek village system).

Here, as in XIII 14, we have one of those definite statements,

involving both historical and geographical facts, which the student of

ancient literature pounces upon as evidence to test accuracy and date.

Is the description accurate? If so, was it accurate at all periods of

history, or was it accurate only at a particular period? To these

questions we must answer that it was accurate at the period when Paul

visited Lycaonia; that it was accurate at no other time except between

37 and 72 A.D.; and that its only meaning is to distinguish between the

Roman part of Lycaonia and the non-Roman part ruled by Antiochus. It is

instructive as to Luke's conception of Paul's method, and about Luke's

own ideas on the development of the Christian Church, that he should

here so pointedly define the Roman part of Lycaonia as the region to

which Paul went and where he continued preaching.

In modern expression we might call this district Roman Lycaonia; but

that would not be true to ancient usage. Territory subject to Rome was

not termed ager Romanus (p. 347), but was designated after the province

to which it was attached; and this district was Galatica Lycaona,

because it was in the province Galatia. It was distinguished from

"Lycaonia Antiochiana," which was ruled by King Antiochus.

Such was official usage; but we know the capriciousness of popular

nomenclature, which often prefers some other name to the official

designation. The inhabitants of the Roman part spoke of the other as

"the Antiochian Region" (Antiochize chora, and the people of the latter

spoke of the Roman part as the Galatic Region (Galatike chora) It was

unnecessary for persons who were living in the country to be more

precise. Now this Region of Roman or Galatic Lycaonia is three times

mentioned in Acts. (1) In XIV 7 it is defined by enumerating its parts;

and as Paul goes to it out of Phyrgia, it is necessary to express that

he went into Lycaonia: the advice which the Iconians gave him would be

to go into Lycaonia. (2) In XVI 1-3 the writer does not sum up the

district as a whole, for his narrative requires a distinction between

the brief visit to Derbe and the long visit to Lystra. (3) In XVIII 23,

as he enters the Roman Region from the "Antiochian Part," the writer

uses the name which Paul would use as he was entering it, and calls it

"the Galatic Region". This is characteristic of Acts: it moves amid the

people, and the author has caught his term in many a case from the

mouth of the people. But this is done with no subservience to vulgar

usage; the writer is on a higher level of thought, and he knows how to

select those popular terms which are vital and powerful, and to reject

those which are vulgar and inaccurate: he moves among the people, and

yet stands apart from them.

The subsequent narrative makes it clear that Paul visited only Lystra

and Derbe. Why, then, should the author mention that Paul proceeded "to

Lystra and Derbe and the Region in which they lie"? The reason lies in

his habit of defining each new sphere of work according to the existing

political divisions of the Roman Empire. It is characteristic of Luke's

method never formally to enunciate Paul's principle of procedure, but

simply to state the facts and leave the principle to shine through

them; and here it shines clearly through them, for he made the limit of

Roman territory the limit of his work, and turned back when he came to

Lystra. He did not go on to Laranda, which was probably a greater city

than Derbe at the time, owing to its situation and the policy followed

by King Antiochus. Nor did he go to the uncivilised, uneducated native

villages or towns of Roman Galatia, such as Barata.

Accordingly, the historian in the few words (XIV 6, 7) assumes and

embodies the principle which can be recognised as guiding Paul's

action, viz., to go to the Roman world, and especially to its great

cities. There is no more emphatic proof of the marvellous delicacy in

expression that characterises the selection of words in Acts,--a

delicacy that can spring only from perfect knowledge of the characters

and actions described.

But the passage, not unnaturally, caused great difficulties to readers

of the second century, when the bounds of Galatia had changed, and the

remarkable definition of XIV 6 had become unintelligible. It was then

gathered from these words that some preaching took place in "the region

round about," and the explanation was found in the later historical

fact (which we may assume unhesitatingly as true), that converts of

Paul carried the new religion over the whole region. This fact, got

from independent knowledge, was added to the text, and thus arose the

"Western" Text, which appears with slight variations in different

authorities. In Codex Bez� the result is as follows (alterations being

in italics):--

"(4) AND THE POPULACE remained divided, SOME TAKING PART WITH THE JEWS,

AND SOME WITH THE APOSTLES, cleaving to them through the ward of God.

(5) And again the Jews, along with the Gentiles, roused perucution for

the second time, and having stoned them they cast them out of the city;

(6) and fleeing tiny came into Lycaonia, to a certain city called

LYSTRA, AND DERBE, AND THE whole SURROUNDING REGION; (7) AND THEY WERE

THERE ENGAGED IN PREACHING, and the entire population was moved at the

teaching; but Paul and Barnabas continued in Lystra."

In this text the Pauline myth has been considerably developed. The

disciples cling to the Apostles, are persecuted with them, accompany

their flight, and preach in the surrounding Region, while Paul and

Barnabas spent their time at Lystra. But the enlarged text moves in the

atmosphere of the second century. It gives us an idea of the

difficulties besetting the study of Acts even then, owing to the

changes that had occurred in the surroundings of the events narrated;

and it shows that these difficulties were not ignored and the text

accepted as inspired and above comprehension, but facts of history were

applied to explain the difficulties.

7. LYSTRA. [20]

In v. 8 we observe the marked emphasis laid on the real physical

incapacity of the lame man. Though Luke, as a rule, carries brevity

even to the verge of obscurity, here he reiterates in three successive

phrases, with growing emphasis, that the man was really lame. The three

phrases are like beats of a hammer: there is no fine literary style in

this device, but there is real force, which arrests and compels the

readers attention. Luke uses the triple beat in other places for the

same purpose, e.g. XIII 6, "Magian, false prophet, Jew," and XVI 6, 7

(according to the true text, p. 196).

The author therefore attached the utmost importance to this point. The

man was no mendicant pretender, but one whose history from infancy was

well known. The case could not be explained away: it was an

incontestable proof of the direct Divine power working through Paul and

guaranteeing his message to the Galatic province as of Divine origin.

The sign has extreme importance in the author's eyes as a proof that

Paul carried the Divine approval in his new departure in Galatia, and

we can better understand its importance he had to record in his eyes if

it were the first which on distinct evidence (p. 108); but he

attributes to it no influence in turning the people to Christianity.

The result was only to persuade the populace that the deifies whom they

worshipped had vouchsafed to visit their people; and at Malta the same

result followed from the wonders which Paul wrought. The marvels

recorded in Acts are not, as a rule, said to have been efficacious in

spreading the new religion; the marvel at Philippi caused suffering and

imprisonment; to the raising of Eutychus no effect is ascribed. The

importance of these events lies rather in their effect on the mind of

the Apostles themselves, who accepted them as an encouragement and a

confirmation of their work. But the teaching spread by convincing the

minds of the hearers (XIII 12).

The Bezan Text adds several details which have the appearance of truth.

The most important is that the lame man was "in the fear of God," i.e.,

he was a pagan of Lystra who had been attracted to Judaism before he

came under Paul's influence: after some time Paul recognised him as a

careful hearer (ekouen, corrupted ekousen in the Bezan Text) and a

person inclined towards the truth. Several other authorities give the

same statement at different points and in varying words; and it

therefore has the appearance of a gloss that has crept into the text in

varying forms. It has however all the appearance of a true tradition

preserved in the Church; for the idea that he was a proselyte is not

likely to have grown up falsely in a Gentile congregation, nor is it

likely to have lasted long in such a congregation, even though true. It

is therefore a very early gloss.

8. THE APOSTLES AS GODS.

(11) AND THE MULTITUDE, SEEING WHAT PAUL DID, LIFTED UP THEIR LIFTED IP

THEIR VOICE IN THE LYCAONIAN TONGUE, SAYING, "THE GODS HAVE TAKEN THE

FORM OF MEN AND HAVE COME DOWN TO US"; (12) AND THEY CALLED BARNABAS

ZEUS, AND PAUL HERMES. [21]

Accepted Text Bezan Text.

(13) AND THE PRIEST OF ZEUS, THE GOD BEFORE THE CITY BROUGHT OXEN AND

GARLANDS TO THE GATES, AND INTENDED TO OFFER SACRIFICE ALONG WITH THE

MULTITUDES. (14) AND HEARING, THE APOSTLES BARNABAS AND PAUL RENT THEIR

GARMENTS AND RAN HASTILY OUT AMONG THE CROWD, (15) SHOUTING AND SAYING,

"SIRS, WHAT IS THIS YE DO? WE ALSO ARE MEN OF LIKE NATURE TO YOU,

BRINGING YOU THE GLAD NEWS TO TURN FROM THESE VAIN ONES TO GOD THE

LIVING, WHICH MADE THE HEAVEN AND THE EARTH AND THE SEA AND EVERYTHING

IN THEM. (13) AND THE PRIESTS OF THE GOD, "ZEUS BEFORE THE CITY"

BROUGHT OXEN AND GARLANDS TO THE GATES, AND INTENDED TO MAKE SACRIFICE

BEYOND the usual ritual ALONG WITH THE MULTITUDES. (14) AND HEARING,

THE APOSTLES BARNABAS AND PAUL RENT THEIR GARMENTS AND RAN HASTILY OUT

AMONG THE CROWD, (15) SHOUTING AND SAYING, "SIRS, WHAT IS THIS YE DO?

WE ARE MEN OF LIKE NATURE TO YOU, BRINGING YOU THE GLAD NEWS OF THE

GOD, THAT YOU MAY TURN FROM THESE VAIN ONES TO THE GOD, THE LIVING,

WHICH MADE THE HEAVEN AND THE EARTH AND THE SEA AND EVERYTHING IN THEM.

(16) WHO IN THE BYGONE GENERATIONS LEFT ALL NATIONS TO GO IN THEIR OWN

WAYS. (17) AND YET HE LEFT NOT HIMSELF WITHOUT WITNESS, IN THAT HE DID

GOOD, GIVING YOU FROM HEAVEN RAINS AND FRUITFUL SEASONS, FILLING YOUR

HEARTS WITH FOOD AND GLADNESS." (18) AND, SAYING THIS, THEY SCARCE

RESTRAINED THE MULTITUDES FROM DOING SACRIFICE UNTO THEM.

Paul is here the Messenger of the Supreme God (p. 84): he says in Gal.

IV 14, "ye received me as a Messenger of God". The coincidence, as

Prof. Rendel Harris points out, is interesting.

The Bezan Text has in several details the advantage of local

accuracy--the plural "priests," the title "Zeus before the city," the

phrase "the God," the "extra sacrifice". Dr. Blass rejects the Bezan

reading "priests" on the ground that there was only one priest of a

single god; but there was regularly a college of priests at each of the

great temples of Asia Minor. The "God before the city" had in almost

every case been seated in his temple when there was no city; and he

remained in his own sacred place after civilisation progressed and a

Greek or Roman city was rounded in the neighbourhood. According to the

Bezan Text the proposed sacrifice was an extra beyond the ordinary

ritual which the priests performed to the God. This sense of epithueni

does not occur elsewhere, but seems to lie fairly within the meaning of

the compound. Dr. Blass, who is usually so enthusiastic a supporter of

the Western Text, rejects these three variations; but they add so much

to the vividness of the scene, that one cannot, with him, regard them

as mere corruptions.

In Asia Minor the great God was regularly termed by his worshippers

"the God"; and Paul, who introduces the Christian God to his Athenian

audience as "the Unknown God," whom they have been worshipping, might

be expected to use the familiar term "the God" to the Lystran crowd.

Here, probability favours the originality of the Bezan Text.

There remain some serious difficulties in this episode: Dr. Blass

rejects the idea of some commentators that the sacrifice was prepared

at the gates of the temple; and explains that the priests came from the

temple before the city to the gates of the city. But in that case Lukan

usage would lead us to expect pule. (cp. IX 24, XVI 13), rather than

pulon (cp. X 17, XII 13, 14). Another difficulty occurs in v. 14. Dr.

Blass's explanation is that the Apostles had gone home after healing

the lame man, and there heard what was going on and hurried forth from

their house. This explanation is not convincing.

Probably a better knowledge of the localities might make the narrative

clearer: it has been for years a dream of mine to make some excavations

at Lystra, in the hope of illustrating this interesting episode. One

suggestion, however, may be made. The college of priests probably

prepared their sacrifice at the outer gateway of the temple-grounds,

because, being no part of the ordinary ritual, it could not be

performed on one of the usual places, and because they wished the

multitudes to take part; whereas sacrifice at the city-gates seems

improbable for many reasons. Then as the day advanced, the Apostles,

who were continuing their missionary work, heard that the priests and

people were getting ready to celebrate the Epiphany of the Gods; and

they hurried forth from the city to the temple.

The use of the Lycaonian language shows that the worshippers were not

the Roman coloni, the aristocracy of the colony, but the natives, the

less educated and more superstitious part of the population (incol�, p.

218).

9. DERBE.

(XIV 19) AND THERE CAME JEWS FROM ANTIOCH AND ICONIUM; AND THEY

PERSUADED THE MULTITUDES AND STONED PAUL AND DRAGGED his body OUT OF

THE CITY, CONSIDERING THAT HE WAS DEAD. (20) BUT, WHEN THE DISCIPLES

ENCIRCLED HIM, HE STOOD UP AND WENT INTO THE CITY; AND ON THE MORROW HE

WENT FORTH WITH BARNABAS TO DERBE. (21) AND THEY PREACHED THE GLAD NEWS

TO THAT CITY AND MADE MANY DISCIPLES.

It is interesting to observe the contrast between the emphasis of XIV 8

and the cautiousness of statement in XIV 19. The writer considered that

there was full evidence as to the real condition of the lame man; but

all that he can guarantee in XIV 19 is that his persecutors considered

Paul to be dead; and beyond that he does not go. As usual, he simply

states the facts, and leaves the reader to judge for himself. A writer

who tried to find marvels would have found one here, and said so.

In Derbe nothing special is recorded: the same process went on as in

previous cases. Here on the limits of the Roman province the Apostles

turned. New magistrates had now come into office in all the cities

whence they had been driven; and it was therefore possible to go back.

10. ORGANISATION OF THE NEW CHURCHES.

(XIV 21) THEY RETURNED TO LYSTRA AND TO ICONIUM AND TO ANTIOCH, (22)

CONFIRMING THE SOULS OF THE DISCIPLES, EXHORTING THEM TO CONTINUE IN

THE FAITH, AND THAT THROUGH MANY TRIBULATIONS WE MUST ENTER INTO THE

KINGDOM OF GOD. (23) AND WHEN THEY HAD APPOINTED FOR THEM ELDERS IN

EVERY CHURCH, AND HAD PRAYED WITH FASTING, THEY COMMENDED THEM TO THE

LORD, ON WHOM THEY HAD BELIEVED.

On the return journey the organisation of the newly rounded churches

occupied Paul's attention. It is probable that, in his estimation, some

definite organisation was implied in the idea of a church; and until

the brotherhood in a city was organised, it was not in the strictest

sense a church. In this passage we see that the fundamental part of the

Church organisation lay in the appointment of Elders (presbuteroi). In

XIII 1 we found that there were prophets and teachers in the Antiochian

church; here nothing is said about appointing them, but the reason

indubitably is that prophets and teachers required Divine grace, and

could not be appointed by men: they were accepted when the grace was

found to have been given them.

Paul used the word Bishops (episkopoi) as equivalent to Elders. This is

specially clear in XX, where he summoned the Ephesian Elders, v. 17,

and said to them: "the Holy Spirit hath made you Bishops," verse 28. It

is therefore certain that the "Bishops and Deacons" at Philippi (Phil.

I 1) are the Elders and Deacons, who were the constituted officials of

the Church. The Elders are also to be understood as "the rulers"

(proistamenoi) at Rome and Thessalonica (Rom XII 8, I Thess. V 12).

Both terms, Elders and Bishops, occur in the Epistles to Titus and

Timothy; but it is plain from Tit. I 5-7 that they are synonymous.

It is clear, therefore, that Paul everywhere instituted Elders in his

new Churches; and on our hypothesis as to the accurate and methodical

expression of the historian, we are bound to infer that this first case

is intended to be typical of the way of appointment followed in all

later cases. When Paul directed Titus (I 5) to appoint Elders in each

Cretan city, he was doubtless thinking of the same method which he

followed here. Unfortunately, the term used (cheirotonesantes) is by no

means certain in meaning; for, though originally it meant to elect by

popular vote, yet it came to be used in the sense to appoint or

designate (e.g., Acts X 41). But it is not in keeping with our

conception of the precise and often pragmatically accurate expression

of Luke, that he should in this passage have used the term

cheirotonesantes, unless he intended its strict sense. If he did not

mean it strictly, the term is fatally ambiguous, where definiteness is

specially called for. It must, I think, be allowed that the votes and

voice of each congregation were considered; and the term is obviously

used in that way by Paul, II Cor. VIII 19.

It is also apparent that a certain influence to be exercised by himself

is implied in the instructions given to Titus (I 5); but those

instructions seem only to mean that Titus, as a sort of presiding

officer, is to instruct the people what conditions the person chosen

must satisfy, and perhaps to reject unsuitable candidates. Candidature,

perhaps of a merely informal character, is implied in I Tim. III 1;

but, of course, if election has any scope at all, candidature goes

along with it. The procedure, then, seems to be not dissimilar to Roman

elections of magistrates, in which the presiding magistrate subjected

all candidates to a scrutiny as to their qualifications, and had large

discretion in rejecting those whom he considered unsuitable.

Finally, it is stated in XX 28 that the Holy Spirit made men Bishops;

but this expression is fully satisfied by what may safely be assumed as

the final stage of the appointment, viz. the Bishops elect were

submitted to the Divine approval at the solemn prayer and fast which

accompanied their appointment. This meeting and rite of fasting, which

Paul celebrated in each city on his return journey, is to be taken as

the form that was to be permanently observed (cp. XIII 3).

The use of the first person plural in v. 22 is not personal, but

general; Paul impressed on them the universal truth that "we

Christians" can enter the kingdom of God by no other path than that of

suffering. At the same time the author, by using the first person,

associates himself with the principle, not as one of the audience at

the time, but as one who strongly realised its truth. This is one of

the few personal touches in Acts; and we must gather from it that, at

the time when he was writing, the principle was strongly impressed on

him by circumstances. I can understand this personal touch, in

comparison with the studious suppression of personal feelings and views

throughout Acts, in no other way than by supposing that Luke was

composing this history during a time of special persecution. On that

supposition the expression is luminous; but otherwise it stands in

marked contrast to the style of Acts. Now evidence from a different

line of reasoning points to the conclusion that Luke was writing this

second book of his history under Domitian, the second great persecutor

(Ch. VII).

11. PISIDIA AND PAMPHYLIA.

(XIV 24) AND HAVING MADE A MISSIONARY JOURNEY THROUGH PISIDIA, THEY

CAME INTO PAMPHYLIA; (25) AND AFTER HAVING SPOKEN THE WORD IN PERGA,

THEY CAME DOWN TO the harbour ATTALEIA; (26) AND FROM THENCE THEY

SAILED AWAY TO ANTIOCH, WHENCE THEY HAD BEEN COMMITTED TO THE GRACE OF

GOD FOR THE WORK WHICH THEY FULFILLED. (27) AND REACHING ANTIOCH, AND

HOLDING A MEETING OF THE CHURCH, THEY PROCEEDED TO ANNOUNCE ALL THAT

GOD DID WITH THEM, AND THAT HE OPENED TO THE NATIONS THE GATE OF BELIEF

(See p. 85).

Next, the journey goes on from Antioch (v. 21), leading first into

Pisidia, a Region of the province Galatia, and then into the province

Pamphylia. It is clearly implied that Pisidian Antioch was not in

Pisidia; and, strange as that seems, it is correct (p. 104). Any Church

founded in Pisidia would rank along with those founded in Galatic

Phrygia and Galatic Lycaonia as one of "the Churches of Galatia"; but

neither Pisidia nor Pamphylia plays any further part in early Christian

History. There was, however, a Pauline tradition at Adada.

Attaleia seems to be mentioned here solely as the port of departure

(though they had formerly sailed direct up the Cestrus to Perga). Not

catching Luke's fondness for details connected with the sea and

harbours (p. 20), the Bezan Reviser reads: "they came down to Attaleia,

giving them the good news".

12. THE CHURCHES.

In Lukan and Pauline language two meanings are found of the term

Ecclesia. It means originally simply "an assembly"; and, as employed by

Paul in his earliest. Epistles, it may be rendered "the congregation of

the Thessalonians". It is then properly construed with the genitive,

denoting the assembly of this organised society, to which any man of

Thessalonica may belong if he qualifies for it. The term Ecclesia

originally implied that the assembled members constituted a

self-governing body like a free Greek city (polis). Ancient religious

societies were commonly organised on the model of city organisation.

The term was adopted in the Septuagint, and came into ordinary use

among Grecian Jews.

Gradually Paul's idea of "the Unified Church" became definite; and,

with the true philosophic instinct, he felt the need of a technical

term to indicate the idea. Ecclesia was the word that forced itself on

him. But in the new sense it demanded a new construction; it was no

longer "the church of the Thessalonians," but "the Church in Corinth";

and it was necessarily singular, for there was only one Church.

The new usage grew naturally in the mind of a statesman, animated with

the instinct of administration, and gradually coming to realise the

combination of imperial centralisation and local home rule, which is

involved in the conception of a self-governing unity, the Universal

Church, consisting of many parts, widely separated in space. Each of

these parts must govern itself in its internal relations, because it is

distant from other parts, and yet each is merely a piece carved out of

the homogeneous whole, and each finds its justification and perfect

ideal in the whole. That was a conception analogous to the Roman view,

that every group of Roman citizens meeting together in a body

(conventus Civium Romanorum) in any part of the vast Empire formed a

part of the great conception "Rome," and. that such a group was not an

intelligible idea, except as a piece of the great unity. Any Roman

citizen who came to any provincial town where such a group existed was

forthwith a member of the group; and the group was simply a fragment of

"Rome," cut off in space from the whole body, but preserving its

vitality and self-identity as fully as when it was joined to the whole,

and capable of reuniting with the whole as soon as the estranging space

was annihilated. Such was the Roman constitutional theory, and such was

the Pauline theory. The actual working of the Roman theory was

complicated by the numberless imperfect forms of citizenship, such as

the provincial status (for the provincials were neither Romans nor

foreigners; they were in the State yet not of the State), and other

points in which mundane facts were too stubborn; and it was impeded by

failure to attain full consciousness of its character. The Pauline

theory was carried out with a logical thoroughness and consistency

which the Roman theory, could never attain in practice; but it is

hardly doubtful that, whether or not Paul himself was conscious that

the full realisation of his idea could only be the end of a long

process of growth and not the beginning, his successors carried out his

theory with a disregard of the mundane facts of national and local

diversity that produced serious consequences. They waged relentless war

within the bounds of the Empire against all provincial distinctions of

language and character, they disregarded the force of associations and

early ties, and aimed at an absolute uniformity that was neither

healthy nor attainable in human nature. The diversities which they

ejected returned in other ways, and crystallised in Christian forms, as

the local saints who gradually became more real and powerful in the

religious thought and practice of each district than the true Christian

ideas; and, as degeneration proceeded, the heads of the Church

acquiesced more and more contentedly in a nominal and ceremonial unity

that had lost reality.

As is natural, Paul did not abandon the old and familiar usage of the

term Ecclesia, when the new and more technical usage developed in his

mind and language. The process is apparent in Gal. I 13, where the new

sense occurs, though hardly as yet, perhaps, with full consciousness

and intention. Elsewhere in that letter the term is used in the old

sense, "the Churches of Galatia ". In I Cor. I 2 the new sense of

Ecclesia is deliberately and formally employed.

The term Ecclesia is used in Acts in both these ways, and an

examination of the distinction throws some light on the delicacy of

expression in the book. It occurs in the plural. sense of

"congregations" or "every congregation" in XIV 23, XV 41, XVI 5. In

each of these eases it is used about Paul's work in the period when he

was employing the term in its earlier sense; and there is a fine sense

of language in saying at that period that Paul went over the

congregations which he had rounded in Syria and Cilicia and in Galatia.

In all other cases (in the Eastern Text at least), Luke uses Ecclesia

in the singular, in some cases markedly in the sense of the Unified

Church (e.g., IX 31), in some cases as "the Church in Jerusalem" (VIII

1), and in some cases very pointedly,. "the Church in so far as it was

in Jerusalem" or "in Antioch" (XI 22, XIII 1); and in some cases where

the sense "congregation" might be permitted by the context, the sense

of "the Church" gives a more satisfactory meaning.

The author, therefore, when he speaks in his own person, stands on the

platform of the developed Pauline usage, and uses Ecclesia in the sense

of "the single Unified Church," but where there is a special dramatic

appropriateness in employing the earlier Pauline term to describe

Paul's work, he employs the early term. [22]

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

[15] Date. On our view this journey began in March 47, and ended about

July or August 49.

[16] Expositor, Dec., 1893, p. 4417.

[17] Partly to guard against a possible objection, partly to show how

much may depend on accuracy in a single letter, it may be added that

Prof. Sterrett in publishing this inscription makes a conjectural

alteration, which would deprive us of the help that the inscription

gives. He prints egeonarion but this is an arbitrary change in

violation of his own copy.

[18] Church in R. E., p. 396; Cities and Bishoprics, p. 56.

[19] A slight addition made in Codex Bez� at this point presents some

features of interest. In the Approved Text the Jews "roused

persecution" against the Apostles; but in the Codex they roused "great

affliction and persecution" The additional words are not characterised

by that delicate precision in the choice of terms which belongs to

Luke. "Affliction" (thlipsis)refers more to the recipient,

"persecution" (diogmos) to the agent; hence the "to rouse persecution"

is a well-chosen phrase, but "to rouse affliction "is not. The words of

Codex Bez� have been added under the influence of the enumeration of

his sufferings given by Paul in II Cor. XI 23 (cp. II Tim. III 11). The

disproportion between that list and the references to physical

sufferings in Acts led to a series of additions, designed to bring

about a harmony between the two authorities.

[20] The variation in the declension of the word Lystra (Accusative

Lustran XIV 6, XVI 1, dative Lustrois XIV 8, XVI 2.) is sometimes taken

as a sign that the author employed two different written authorities

(in one of which the word was declined as feminine singular and in the

other as neuter plural), and followed them implicitly, using in each

case the form employed in the authority whom he was following at the

moment. This suggestion has convinced neither Spitta nor Clemen, who

both assign XVI 1-3 to one author. Only the most insensate and

incapable of compilers would unawares use the double declension twice

in consecutive sentences. The author, whoever he was and whenever he

lived, certainly considered that the proper declension of the name was

Lustrois, Lustran; and the only question is this: was that variation

customary in the Lystran Greek usage? If it was customary, then its

employment in Acts is a marked proof of first-hand local knowledge, and

if it was not customary, the opposite. We have unfortunately no

authorities for the Lystran usage: the city name occurs in the

inscriptions only in the nominative case, Lustra. It is certain that

many names in Asia Minor, such as Myra, etc., occur both in feminine

singular and in neuter plural; but there is no evidence as to any local

usage appropriating certain cases to each form. Excavations on the site

may yield the needed evidence to test the accuracy of this detail. One

indirect piece of evidence may be added. Myra is an analogous name. Now

the local form of accus. was Muran for the Turkish Dembre comes from

ten Mbra(n) i.e. (eis) ten Muran. [It is most probable that in XXVII 5

Muran (or Murran) should be read, not Mura.] I know no evidence as to

the local form of the dative; but the genitive appears as Muron in the

signatures of bishops. Incidentally we notice that the name of the city

is spelt Lustra, not Lystra (like Prymnessos), on coins and

inscriptions. That is an indication of Latin tone, and of the desire to

make the city name a Latin word. People who called their city Lustra

would have distinguished themselves pointedly from the Lycaonians, the

subjects of King Antiochus and mentioned in that way on his coins.

[21] In v. 12 the Accepted Text contains a gloss, which is rightly

omitted in one old Latin Version (Fl.).

[22] An exception occurs to this rule, in an addition of the Bezan

Text, according to which Apollos went to Achaia and contributed much to

strengthening the congregations (tais ekklesiais). We have here not the

original words of Luke, but an addition (as I believe, trustworthy in

point of fact) made by a second century Reviser, imitating passages

like XV 41, XVI 5, Gal. I 2, 22. This case stands in close analogy to

IX 31, where many authorities have (Codex Bez� is defective) "the

Ecclesiai throughout the whole of Judea and Galilee and Samaria," but

the singular is used in the Accepted Text founded on the great MSS.

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

CHAPTER VI.

ST. PAUL IN GALATIA

1. THE IMPERIAL AND THE CHRISTIAN POLICY

When Paul passed out of Pamphylia into Galatia, he went out of a small

province, which was cut off from the main line of historical and

political development, into a great province that lay on that line. The

history of Asia Minor at that time had its central motive in the

transforming and educative process which the Roman imperial policy was

trying to carry out in the country. In Pamphylia that process was

languidly carried out by a governor of humble rank; but Galatia was the

frontier province, and the immense social and educational changes

involved in the process of romanising an oriental land were going on

actively in it. We proceed to inquire in what relation the new Pauline

influence stood to the questions that were agitating the province.

What, then, was the character of Roman policy and the line of

educational advance in the districts of Galatic Phrygia and Galatic

Lycaonia; and what were the forces opposing the Roman policy?

The aim of Roman policy may be defined as the unification and education

in Roman ideas of the province; and its general effect may be summed up

under four heads, which we shall discuss in detail, comparing in each

case the effect produced or aimed at by the Church. We enumerate the

heads, not in order of importance, but in the order that best brings

out the relation between Imperial influence and Church influence: (1)

relation to Greek civilisation and language: (2) development of an

educated middle class: (3) growth of unity over the Empire: (4) social

facts.

(1) The Roman influence would be better defined as "Gr�co-Roman ".

Previous to Roman domination, the Greek civilisation, though fostered

in the country by the Greek kings of Syria and Pergamos, who had

successively ruled the country, had failed to affect the people as a

body; it had been confined to the coast valleys of the Hermus, Cayster,

M�ander and Lycus, and to the garrison cities rounded on the great

central plateau by the kings to strengthen their hold on the country.

These cities were at the same time centres of Greek manners and

education; their language was Greek; and, in the midst of alien tribes,

their interests naturally coincided with those of the kings who had

rounded them.

The Roman Government, far from being opposed to Greek influence, acted

in steady alliance with it. It adopted the manners of Greece, and even

recognised the Greek language for general use in the Eastern provinces.

Rome was so successful, because she almost always yielded to the logic

of facts. The Greek influence was, on the whole, European and Western

in character; and opposed to the oriental stagnation which resisted

Roman educative efforts. Rome accepted the Greek language as her ally.

Little attempt was made to naturalise the Latin language in the East;

and even the Roman colonies in the province of Galatia soon ceased to

use Latin except on state occasions and in a few formal documents. A

Gr�co-Roman civilisation using the Greek language was the type which

Rome aimed at establishing in the East.

The efforts of Rome to naturalise Western culture in Asia Minor were

more successful than those of the Greek kings had been; but still they

worked at best very slowly. The evidence of inscriptions tends to show

that the Phrygian language was used in rural parts of the country

during the second and even the third century. In some remote and rustic

districts it persisted even until the fourth century, as Celtic did in

parts of North Galatia.

The Christian influence was entirely in favour of the Greek language.

The rustics clung longest to Paganism, while the Greek-speaking

population of the cities adopted Christianity. It is not probable that

any attempt was made to translate the Christian sacred books into

Phrygian or Lycaonian; there is not even any evidence that

evangelisation in these languages was ever attempted. The Christians

seem to have been all expected to read the Scriptures in Greek. That

fact was sufficient to put the Church, as regards its practical effect

on society, on the same side as the romanising influence; and the

effect was quite independent of any intentional policy. The most

zealous enemy of the imperial Antichrist was none the less effective in

aiding the imperial policy by spreading the official language. In fact,

Christianity did far more thoroughly what the emperors tried to do. It

was really their best ally, if they had recognised the facts of the

case; and the Christian Apologists of the second century are justified

in claiming that their religion was essentially a loyal religion.

(2) The Empire had succeeded in imposing its languages on the central

districts of Asia only so far as education spread. Every one who wrote

or read, wrote and read Greek; but those who could do neither used the

native language. Hence inscriptions were almost universally expressed

in Greek, for even the most illiterate, if they aspired to put an

epitaph on a grave, did so in barbarous (sometimes unintelligible)

Greek; the desire for an epitaph was the first sign of desire for

education and for Greek.

In education lay the most serious deficiency of the imperial policy.

Rome cannot be said to have seriously attempted to found an educational

system either in the provinces or in the metropolis. "The education

imparted on a definite plan by the State did not go beyond instituting

a regular series of amusements, some of a rather brutalising tendency"

(Church in R.E., p. 360). And precisely in this point, Christianity

came in to help the Imperial Government, recognising the duty of

educating, as well as feeding and amusing, the mass of the population.

The theory of universal education for the people has never been more

boldly and thoroughly stated than by Tatian (ibid. p. 345). "The weak

side of the Empire--the cause of the ruin of the first Empire was the

moral deterioration of the lower classes: Christianity, if adopted in

time, might have prevented this result."

Now, the classes where education and work go hand in hand were the

first to come under the influence of the new religion. On the one hand

the uneducated and grossly superstitious rustics were unaffected by it.

On the other hand, there were "not many wise, not many mighty, not many

noble" in the Churches of the first century, i.e., not many

professional teachers of wisdom and philosophy, not many of the

official and governing class, not many of the hereditarily privileged

class. But the working and thinking classes, with the students, if not

the Professors, at the Universities, were attracted to the new

teaching; and it spread among them with a rapidity that seemed to many

modern critics incredible and fabulous, till it was justified by recent

discoveries. The enthusiasm of the period was on the side of the

Christians; its dilettantism, officialism, contentment and

self-satisfaction were against them.

In respect of education Christianity appears as filling a gap in the

imperial policy, supplementing, not opposing it--a position which,

though it earns no gratitude and often provokes hatred, implies no

feeling of opposition in the giver.

(3) Again, the main. effort of Roman policy was directed towards

encouraging a sense of unity and patriotism in the Empire. It

discouraged the old tribal and national divisions, which kept the

subject population in their pre-Roman associations, and substituted new

divisions. Patriotism in ancient time was inseparable from religious

feeling, and Roman policy fostered a new imperial religion in which all

its subjects should unite, viz., the worship of the divine majesty of

Rome incarnate in human form in the series of the emperors and

especially in the reigning emperor. Each province was united in a

formal association for this worship: the association built temples in

the great cities of the province, held festivals and games, and had a

set of officials, who were in a religious point of view priests and in

a political point of view, officers of the imperial service. Everything

that the imperial policy did in the provinces during the first century

was so arranged as to encourage the unity of the entire Roman province;

and the priests of the imperial religion became by insensible degrees a

higher priesthood, exercising a certain influence over the priests of

the other religions of the province. In this way a sort of hierarchy

was created for the province and the empire as a whole; the reigning

emperor being the religious head, the Supreme Pontiff of the State, and

a kind of sacerdotal organisation being grouped under him according to

the political provinces.

As time passed, gradually the Christian Church grouped itself according

to the same forms as the imperial religion,--not indeed through

conscious imitation, but because the Church naturally arranged its

external form according to the existing facts of communication and

interrelation. In Pisidian Antioch a preacher had unique opportunities

for affecting the entire territory whose population resorted to that

great centre (p. 105). So Perga was a centre for Pamphylia, Ephesus for

Asia. But the direct influence of these centres was confined to the

Roman district or province. In this way necessarily and inevitably the

Christian Church was organised around the Roman provincial metropolis

and according to the Roman provincial divisions.

The question then is, when did this organisation of the Church begin? I

can see no reason to doubt that it began with Paul's mission to the

West. It grew out of the circumstances of the country, and there was

more absolute necessity in the first century than later, that, if the

Church was organised at all, it must adapt itself to the political

facts of the time, for these were much stronger in the first century.

The classification adopted in Paul's own letters of the Churches which

he rounded is according to provinces, Achaia, Macedonia, Asia, and

Galatia. The same fact is clearly visible in the narrative of Act,: it

guides and inspires the expression from the time when the Apostles

landed at Perga. At every step any one who knows the country recognises

that the Roman division is implied. There is only one way of avoiding

this conclusion, and that is to make up your mind beforehand that the

thing is impossible, and therefore to refuse to admit any evidence for

it.

The issue of events showed that the Empire had made a mistake in

disregarding so completely the existing lines of demarcation between

tribes and races in making its new political provinces. For a time it

succeeded in establishing them, while the energy of the Empire was

still fresh, and its forward movement continuous and steady. But the

differences of tribal and national character were too great to be

completely set aside; they revived while the energy of the Empire

decayed during the second century. Hence every change in the bounds of

the provinces of Asia Minor from 138 onwards was in the direction of

assimilating them to the old tribal frontiers; and at last in 295 even

the great complex province Asia was broken up after 428 years of

existence, and resolved into the old native districts, Lydia, Caria,

Phrygia, etc.; and the moment that the political unity was dissolved

there remained nothing of the Roman Asia. But the ultimate failure of

the Roman policy must not blind us to the vigour and energy with which

that policy was carried out during the first century. "Asia" and

"Galatia" were only ideas, but they were ideas which the whole efforts

of Roman government aimed at making into realities.

(4) There was another reason why the power of the new religion was

necessarily thrown on the side of the Roman policy. Greek civilisation

was strongly opposed to the social system that was inseparably

connected with the native religion in all its slightly varying forms in

different localities. The opposition is. as old as the landing of the

earliest Greek emigrants on the Asian coasts: the colonists were the

force of education, and progress and freedom, the priests arrayed

against them the elements that made for stagnation and priest-ridden

ignorance and slavery. Throughout Greek history the same opposition

constantly appears. The Phrygian religion was always reckoned as the

antithesis of Hellenism. That is all a matter of history, one might say

a commonplace of history. But the same opposition was necessarily

developed in the Romanisation of the provinces of Asia Minor. The

priests of the great religious centres were inevitably opposed to the

Roman policy; but their power was gone, their vast estates had become

imperial property, and their influence with the population was weakened

by the growth of the Greek spirit. This subject might be discussed at

great length; but I must here content myself with referring to the full

account of the districts in my Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia.

In this conflict there can be no doubt on which side the Christian

influence must tell. When we consider the social system which was

inculcated as a part of the native religion, it is evident that every

word spoken by Paul or Barnabas must tell directly against the

prevalent religion, and consequently on the side of the Roman policy.

It is true that in moral tone the Greek society and religion were low,

and Christianity was necessarily an enemy to them. But Greek religion

was not here present as the enemy. The native religion was the active

enemy; and its character was such that Greek education was pure in

comparison, and the Greek moralists, philosophers, and politicians

inveighed against the Phrygian religion as the worst enemy of the Greek

ideals of life. Greek society and life were at least rounded on

marriage; but the religion of Asia Minor maintained as a central

principle that all organised and settled social life on the basis of

marriage was an outrage on the free unfettered divine life of nature,

the type of which was found in the favourites of the great goddesses,

the wild animals of the field and the mountains. The Greek and Roman

law which recognised as citizens only those born from the legitimate

marriage of two citizens had no existence in Phrygian cities.

Thus in Galatia the Gr�co-Roman education, on the side of freedom,

civilisation and a higher social morality, was contending against the

old native religious centres with their influential priestly colleges,

on the side of ignorance, stagnation, social anarchy, and enslavement

of the people to the priests. Christian influence told against the

latter, and therefore in favour of the former.

In all these ways Christianity, as a force in the social life of the

time, was necessarily arrayed on the side of the Roman imperial policy.

"One of the most remarkable sides of the history of Rome is the growth

of ideas which found their realisation and completion in the Christian

Empire. Universal citizenship, universal equality of rights, universal

religion, a universal Church, all were ideas which the Empire was

slowly working out, but which it could not realise till it merged

itself in Christianity." "The path of development for the Empire lay in

accepting the religion which offered it the possibility of completing

its organisation."

With the instinctive perception of the real nature of the case that

characterises the genius for organisation, Paul from the first directed

his steps in the path which the Church had to tread. He made no false

step, he needed no tentatives before he found the path, he had to

retract nothing (except perhaps the unsuccessful compromise embodied in

the Decree of the Apostolic Council, pp. 172, 182). It is not necessary

to assert or to prove that he consciously anticipated all that was to

take place; but he was beyond all doubt one of those great creative

geniuses whose policy marks out the lines on which history is to move

for generations and even for centuries afterwards.

It is apparent how far removed we are from a view, which has been

widely entertained, "that there was an entire dislocation and

discontinuity in the history of Christianity in Asia Minor at a certain

epoch; that the Apostle of the Gentiles was ignored and his teaching

repudiated, if not anathemarised"; and that this anti-Pauline tendency

found in "Papias a typical representative". Like Lightfoot, whose

summary we quote, we must reject that view. We find in the epitaph of

the second-century Phrygian saint, Avircius Marcellus, a proof of the

deep reverence retained in Asia Minor for St. Paul: when he travelled,

he took Paul everywhere with him as his guide and companion.

These considerations show the extreme importance of the change of plan

that led Paul across Taurus to Pisidian Antioch. So far as it is right

to say that any single event is of outstanding importance, the step

that took Paul away from an outlying corner and put him on the main

line of development at the outset of his work in Asia Minor, was the

most critical step in his history. It is noteworthy that the historian,

who certainly understood its importance, and whose sympathy was deeply

engaged in it, does not attribute it to Divine suggestion, though he

generally records the Divine guidance in the great crises of Paul's

career; and it stands in perfect agreement with this view, that Paul

himself, when he impresses on the Galatian Churches in the strongest

terms his Divine commission to the Gentiles, does not say that the

occasion of his going among them was the Divine guidance, but expressly

mentions that an illness was the cause why he preached among them at

first.

Now, every reader must be struck with the stress that is laid, alike by

Paul and by Luke, throughout their writings, on the Divine guidance.

They both find the justification of all Paul's innovations on

missionary enterprise in the guiding hand of God. We demand that there

should be a clear agreement in the occasions when they discerned that

guidance; and in this case the South Galatian theory enables us to

recognise a marked negative agreement.

Further, there is evidently a marked difference between the looser way

of talking about "the hand of God" that is common in the present day,

and the view entertained by Paul or Luke. Where a great advantage

results from a serious illness, many of us would feel it right to

recognise and acknowledge the "guiding hand of God"; but it is evident

that, when Luke or Paul uses such language as "the Spirit suffered them

not," they refer to some definite and clear manifestation, and not to a

guidance which became apparent only through the results. The superhuman

element is inextricably involved in Luke's history and in Paul's

letters.

All that has just been said is, of course, mere empty verbiage, devoid

of any relation to Paul's work and policy in Galatia, if the Churches

of Galatia were not the active centres of Roman organising effort, such

as the colonies Antioch and Lystra, or busy trading cities like

Claud-Iconium and Claudio-Derbe, but Pessinus and some villages in the

wilderness of the Axylon (as Professor Z�ckler has quite recently

maintained). Lightfoot saw the character of Paul's work, and supposed

him to have gone to the great cities of North Galatia, and specially

the metropolis Ancyra; but the most recent development of the

North-Galatian theory denies that Paul ever saw the Roman central city.

2. THE JEWS IN ASIA AND SOUTH GALATIA.

In Cyprus, Barnabas and Saul had confined themselves within the circle

of the synagogue, until Paul stepped forth from it to address the Roman

proconsul. In entering Galatia Paul was passing from Semitic

surroundings into a province where Greek was the language of all even

moderately educated persons, and where Gr�co-Roman manners and ideas

were being actively disseminated and eagerly assimilated by all active

and progressive and thoughtful persons. How then did Paul, with his

versatility and adaptability, appear among the Galatians, and in what

tone did he address them?

At first he adhered to his invariable custom of addressing such

audience as was found within the synagogue. There was a large Jewish

population in the Phrygian district of Galatia, as well as in Asian

Phrygia (which Paul entered and traversed at a later date XIX 1).

According to Dr. Neubauer (G�ographie du Talmud, p. 315), these Jews

had to a considerable extent lost connection with their country, and

forgotten their language; and they did not participate in the educated

philosophy of the Alexandrian Jews: the baths of Phrygia and its wine

had separated the Ten Tribes from their brethren, as the Talmud

expresses it: hence they were much more readily converted to

Christianity; and the Talmud alludes to the numerous converts.

It is much to be desired that this distinguished scholar should discuss

more fully this subject, which he has merely touched on incidentally.

The impression which he conveys is different from that which one is apt

to take from the narrative in Acts; and one would be glad to have the

evidence on which he relies stated in detail. But my own epigraphic

studies in Phrygia lead me to think that there is much in what Dr.

Neubauer has said; and that we must estimate Luke's account from the

proper point. Luke was profoundly interested in the conflict between

Paul and the Judaising party; and he recounts with great detail the

stages in that conflict. That point of view is natural in one who had

lived through the conflict, before the knot was cut by the destruction

of Jerusalem in A.D. 70; but, though short, the struggle was far more

severe than later scholars, who see how complete was Paul's triumph,

are apt to imagine. Even to a writer of the second century, the

conflict with the Judaisers could not have bulked largely in Church

history. But to Luke that conflict is the great feature in the

development of the Church. Hence he emphasises every point in the

antagonism between Paul and the Judaisers; and his readers are apt to

leave out of notice other aspects of the case. The Jews of Pisidian

Antioch are not represented as opposed to Paul's doctrines, but only to

his placing the Gentiles on an equality with themselves (p. 101, XIII

45). A great multitude of the Iconian Jews believed (XIV 1). The few

Jews of Philippi seem to have been entirely on Paul's side: they were

probably to a great extent settlers who had come, like Lydia, in the

course of trade with Asia Minor. In Berea the Jews in a body were

deeply impressed by Paul's preaching. In Thessalonica, however, the

Jews were almost entirely opposed to him; and in Corinth it was nearly

as bad, though the archisynagogos followed him. In Corinth the Jewish

colony would certainly be in close and direct communication with Syria

and Palestine by sea, more than with the Phrygian Jews of the land

road; and it is probable that the same was the case in Thessalonica,

though no facts are known to prove it.

From the recorded facts, therefore, it would appear that the Jews in

central Asia Minor were less strongly opposed to Pauline Christianity

than they were in Palestine. Further, the Asian and Galatian Jews had

certainly declined from the high and exclusive standard of the

Palestinian Jews, and probably forgotten Hebrew. In Lystra we find a

Jewess married to a Greek, who cannot have come into communion with the

Jews, for the son of the marriage was not submitted to the Jewish law

(XVI 1-3). The marriage of a Jewess to a Gentile is a more serious

thing than that of a Jew, and can hardly have come to pass except

through a marked assimilation of these Jews to their Gentile

neighbours. In Ephesus the sons even of distinguished priests practised

magic, and exorcised demons in the name of Jesus (XIX 14); and Dr.

Sch�rer has shown that gross superstitions were practised by the Jews

of Thyatira. There seems, therefore, to be no real discrepancy between

the evidence of Luke and Dr. Neubauer's inference about the Phrygian

Jews from the Talmud.

Naturally the approximation between Jews and Gentiles in Phrygia had

not been all on one side. An active, intelligent, and prosperous

minority like the Jews must have exercised a strong influence on their

neighbours. Evidence to that effect is not wanting in inscriptions (see

Cities and Bishoprics, Chap. XIV); and we may compare the readiness

with which the Antiochians flocked to the synagogue, XIII 43-4, and at

a later time yielded to the first emissaries of the Judaising party in

the Church (Gal. I 6). The history of the Galatian Churches is in the

closest relation to their surroundings (p. 183).

3. TONE OF PAUL'S ADDRESS TO THE GALATIAN AUDIENCES.

The only recorded sermon of Paul in Galatia was delivered in the

synagogue at Antioch (p. 100). Thereafter he "turned to the Gentiles,"

and appealed direct to the populace of the city. Now Paul was wont to

adapt himself to his hearers (p. 82). Did he address the people of

Antioch as members of a nation (Phrygians, or, as Dr. Z�ckler thinks,

Pisidians), or did he regard them as members of the Roman Empire? We

cannot doubt that his teaching was opposed to the native tendency as

one of mere barbarism and superstition; and that he regarded them as

members of the same Empire of which he was a citizen. Moreover, the

Antiochians claimed to be a Greek foundation of remote time by

Magnesian settlers: that is, doubtless, a fiction (of a type

fashionable in the great cities of Phrygia), but it shows the tendency

to claim Greek origin and to regard national characteristics as vulgar.

Finally, Antioch was now a Roman colony, and its rank and position in

the province belonged to it as the representative of old Greek culture

and modern Roman government amid uncultured rustic Pisidians and

Phrygians. But some North Galatian theorists resolutely maintain that

Paul could never appeal to its population as "men of the province

Galatia," but only as "Pisidians".

We possess a letter which Paul addressed to the Galatian Churches; but

it was addressed to congregations which had existed for five years or

more, and was written on a special occasion to rebuke and repress the

Judaising tendency: it moves in a series of arguments against that

tendency, and gives us little information as to the line Paul would

take in addressing for the first time a pagan audience in one of the

Galatian cities (see Ch. VIII).

In writing to the Corinthian Church Paul mentions that he had adopted a

very simple way of appealing to them, and that his simple message was

by some persons contrasted unfavourably with the more philosophical

style of Apollos and the more ritualistic teaching of the Judaising

Christians. But it is apparent (see p. 252) that Paul made a new

departure in this respect at Corinth; and we must not regard too

exclusively what he says in that letter. Though the main elements of

his message were the same from first to last (Gal. III 1, I Cor. II 2),

yet it is natural and probable that there should be a certain degree of

development in his method; and in trying to recover the tone in which

he first appealed to his Galatic audiences, we are carried back to a

period in his career earlier than any of his extant letters.

The passages in Acts that touch the point are the address to his

worshippers at Lystra, the speech before the Areopagus at Athens, and,

at a later time, the account which the Town-clerk at Ephesus gave of

his attitude as a preacher.

The Town-clerk of Ephesus reminded the rioters that Paul had not been

guilty of disrespect, either in action or in language, towards the

patron and guardian goddess of the city. Chrysostom in the fourth

century remarks that this was a false statement to suit the occasion

and calm the riot; it seemed to him impossible that Paul should refrain

from violent invective against the false goddess, for the later

Christians inveighed in merciless terms against the Greek gods, and (as

every one who tries to understand ancient religion must feel) the

Apologists from the second century onwards give a one-sided picture of

that religion, describing only its worst features, and omitting those

germs of higher ideas which it certainly contained. But we cannot

suppose with Chrysostom that the clerk misrepresented the facts to

soothe the popular tumult. The effect of his speech depended on the

obviousness of the facts which he appealed to; and it would defeat his

purpose, if his audience had listened to speeches in which Paul

inveighed against the goddess. If this speech is taken from real life,

the clerk of Ephesus must be appealing to well-known facts (see p. 281

f.).

Next we turn to the speech at Athens. So far was Paul from inveighing

against the objects of Athenian veneration that he expressly commended

the religious feelings of the people, and identified the God whom he

had come to preach with the god whom they were blindly worshipping. He

did not rebuke or check their religious ideas, but merely tried to

guide them; he distinctly set forth the principle that the pagans were

honestly striving to worship "the God that made the world and all

things therein" (p. 251 f.).

In this speech Paul lays no emphasis on the personality of the God whom

he sets forth: "what ye worship in ignorance, this set I forth unto

you," and "we ought not to think that the Divine nature is like unto

gold or silver or stone, graven by art and device of man". The popular

philosophy inclined towards Pantheism, the popular religion was

Polytheistic; but Paul starts from the simplest platform common to

both--there exists something in the way of a Divine nature which the

religious try to please and the philosophers try to understand. That is

all he seeks as a hypothesis to start from.

At Athens the speech was more philosophical in tone, catching the

spirit of a more educated populace. At Lystra it was more simple,

appealing to the witness they had of the God "who gives from heaven

rain and fruitful seasons, filling your hearts with gladness". But the

attitude is the same in both cases. "God who made the heaven and the

earth in the generations gone by suffered all the nations to walk in

their own ways"; and "we bring you the good news that you should

repent". That is the same tone in which at Athens he said, "The times

of ignorance God overlooked; but now He commandeth men that they should

all everywhere repent"

There is one condition, however, on which Paul insisted from the first,

at Athens and at Lystra and everywhere. The worship of idols and images

was absolutely pernicious, and concealed from the nations the God whom

they were groping after and trying to find: they must turn from these

vain and dead gods to the God that lives. Hence the riot at Ephesus was

got up by the tradesmen who made images of the Goddess Artemis in her

shrine, and whose trade was threatened when the worship of images was

denounced. But the denunciation of images was a commonplace of Greek

philosophy; and the idea that any efficacy resided in images was widely

regarded among the Greeks as a mark of superstition unworthy of the

educated man. Paul stands here on the footing of the philosopher, not

contravening the State laws by introducing new gods, but expounding to

the people the true character of the living God whom they are seeking

after.

Such was the way in which Paul introduced his Good Tidings to the

peoples of the province Galatia. From this he went on step by step, and

his method is summed up by himself, Gal. III 1, "Christ had been

placarded before their eyes". Now was the opportunity granted them;

"through this Man is proclaimed remission of sins" (XIII 38). But if

they despised the opportunity they must beware (XIII 40-1), "inasmuch

as He hath appointed a day in the which He will judge the world" (XVII

31).

Paul's teaching thus was introduced to his pagan audiences in the

language of the purest and simplest theology current among educated

men. He started from those thoughts which were familiar to all who had

imbibed even the elements of Greek education. But even in the more

advanced stage of his teaching he did not cut it off from the

philosophy of the time. He never adopted that attitude of antagonism to

philosophy which became customary in the second century, springing from

the changed circumstances of that period. On the contrary, he says

(Col. IV 5-6, cf. Eph. V 16): "Regulate with wisdom your conduct

towards the outside world, making your market to the full from the

opportunity of this life. Let your conversation be always gracious,

seasoned with the salt and the refinement of delicacy, so as to know

the suitable reply to make to every individual." As Curtius says, with

his own grace and delicacy of perception, the Attic salt is here

introduced into the sphere of Christian ethics. Polished courtesy of

address to all, was valued by Paul as a distinct and important element

in the religious life; and he advised his pupils to learn from the

surrounding world everything that was worthy in it, "making your market

fully from the occasion" (a thought very inadequately expressed in the

English Version, "redeeming the time," Col. IV 6). But it is in Phil.

IV 8 that his spirit is expressed in the fullest and most graceful and

exquisite form, "whatsoever is true, whatsoever is holy, whatsoever is

just, whatsoever is pure, whatsoever is courteous, whatsoever is of

fine expression, all excellence, all merit, take account of these,"

wherever you find these qualities, notice them, consider them, imitate

them.

It is not the Jew who speaks in these and many other sentences; it is

the educated citizen of the Roman world attuned to the most gracious

and polished tone of educated society. We can faintly imagine to

ourselves the electrical effect produced by teaching like this on the

population of the Galatian cities, on a people who were just beginning

to rise from the torpor of oriental peasant life and to appreciate the

beauty of Greek thought and the splendour of Roman power. They found in

Paul no narrow and hard bigot to dash from their lips the cup of

education; they found one who guided into the right channel all their

aspirations after culture and progress, who raised them into a finer

sphere of thought and action, who showed them what wealth of meaning

lay in their simple speculations on the nature of God, who brought

within their grasp all that they were groping after. We can imagine how

sordid and beggarly were the elements that Jewish ritual had to offer

them in comparison; and we can appreciate the tone of Paul's letter to

them, where his argument is to recall to their minds the teaching which

he had given them on his former visit, to contrast with this freedom

and graciousness and progress which he offered them the hard cut and

dry life of Jewish formalism, and to ask who had bewitched them into

preferring the latter before the former. [23]

It is remarkable that, alike at Lystra and Athens, there is nothing in

the reported words of Paul that is overtly Christian, and nothing (with

the possible exception of "the man whom he hath ordained") that several

Greek philosophers might not have said. That is certainly not

accidental; the author of Acts must have been. conscious of it; and it

is a strong proof of their genuineness: no one would invent a speech

for Paul, which was not markedly Christian. That remarkable omission is

explained by some commentators in the speech at Athens (e.g.,

Meyer-Wendt) as due to the fact that the speech was not completed; and

yet they acknowledge that the speech is a rounded whole, and that all

the specially Pauline ideas are touched in it. To look for an addition

naming the Saviour is to ignore the whole character of the speech and

the scene where it was delivered.

The same mark of genuineness occurs in the central episode of the

romance of Thekla, when we disentangle the tale of her trials at

Pisidian Antioch from the incongruous and vulgar additions by which it

is disfigured. In the beautiful story as it was originally written,

probably in the latter part of the first century, Thekla appeared to

the mass of the Antiochian populace to be a devotee of "the God," bound

by a rule of service given her by direct Divine command; and she

commanded their sympathy, in so far as she represented their own cause;

whereas, if she had been seen to be severing herself absolutely from

their life and their religion, their sympathy would be incredible. In

this character lies the proof of its early date: the episode in its

original form is contrary to the tone of the second century.

Incidentally we notice what an anachronism it is to suppose that the

attitude attributed in Acts to Paul could have been conceived by a

second-century author! The tone of these speeches is of the first

century, and not of the time when the Apologists were writing. In the

first century Christianity and the current philosophy alike were

disliked and repressed by the Flavian emperors, as favouring the spirit

of unrest and dissatisfaction. But during the second, the Imperial

Government and the popular philosophy were in league against the

increasing power of the Church; and the tone of the speeches in

incredible in a composition of that time.

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

[23] Curtius's beautiful essay on Paulus in Athen has been constantly

in the writer's mind in this and some other places.

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

CHAPTER VII.

THE APOSTOLIC COUNCIL

1 ORIGIN OF THE COUNCIL.

(XIV 27) WHEN PAUL AND BARNABAS WERE COME TO ANTIOCH AND HAD GATHERED

THE CHURCH TOGETHER, THEY REHEARSED ALL THINGS THAT GOD HAD DONE WITH

THEM, AND HOW THAT HE HAD OPENED A DOOR OF BELIEF UNTO THE NATIONS.

(28) AND THEY TARRIED NO LITTLE TIME WITH THE DISCIPLES. (XV 1) AND

CERTAIN PERSONS CAME DOWN FROM JUDEA, AND TAUGHT THE BRETHREN, THAT

"EXCEPT YE BE CIRCUMCISED, AFTER THE CUSTOM OF MOSES, YE CANNOT BE

SAVED". (2) AND WHEN PAUL AND BARNABAS HAD NO SMALL DISSENSION AND

QUESTIONING WITH THEM, THEY (i.e., the Brethren) APPOINTED THAT PAUL

AND BARNABAS AND CERTAIN OTHER OF THEM SHOULD GO UP TO JERUSALEM ABOUT

THIS QUESTION. (3) THEY, THEREFORE, BEING BROUGHT ON THEIR WAY BY THE

CHURCH, PASSED THROUGH BOTH PHOENICE AND SAMARIA, DECLARING THE

CONVERSION OF THE NATIONS; AND THEY CAUSED GREAT JOY UNTO ALL THE

BRETHREN.

A considerable lapse of time is implied in v.28, during which Paul and

Barnabas resumed their former duties at Antioch (III 1). Luke, as

usual, states the lapse of time very vaguely, and it is impossible to

estimate from his words the interval between Paul's return and the

arrival of the envoys from Jerusalem (V 1). If v. 28 includes only that

interval, the Apostolic Council cannot have occurred before A.D. 50;

but if, as is more likely (p. 256), v. 28 refers to the whole residence

of Paul at Antioch before and after the Council, then probably the

Council took place in the end of 49.

A difficulty (which is described in � 2) occurred at Antioch as to the

obligation of the Gentile members of the Church to come under the full

ceremonial regulations of the Jewish Law; and it was resolved to send

delegates to the governing body of the Church in Jerusalem about this

question. We cannot doubt that this resolution was acquiesced in by

Paul; probably he even proposed it. Now, the resolution clearly

involved the recognition that Jerusalem was the administrative centre

of the Church; and this is an important point in estimating Paul's

views on administration. With the vision of a statesman and organiser,

he saw that the Church as a unified and organised body must have an

administrative centre, and that a Church of separate parts could not be

unified without such a centre, which should be not a governor over

subordinates, but the head among equals; and his whole history shows

that he recognised Jerusalem as necessarily marked out for the centre.

Hence he kept before the attention of his new foundations their

relation and duty to Jerusalem; and he doubtless understood the

solitary injunction given him by the older Apostles on his second visit

to Jerusalem (p. 57), as involving a charge to remember that duty.

Moreover, he had already communicated privately with the recognised

leaders in. Jerusalem, and knew that their sentiments agreed with his

own; and he must have been fully alive to the great step in

organisation which would be made, if Antioch set the example of

referring such a question to authoritative decision in Jerusalem at a

meeting where it was represented by delegates.

In the mission of Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem it is noteworthy that

the Divine action plays no part. The Church in Antioch resolved, and

the Church sent them to Jerusalem, escorting them on their way. This is

not accidental, but expresses the deliberate judgment of Paul and of

Luke. The action that led up to the Council in Jerusalem and the

ineffective Decree did not originate in Divine revelation.

The accepted view is different. There is a practically universal

agreement among critics and commentators of every shade of opinion that

the visit described as the third in Acts XV is the one that Paul

describes as the second in Gal. II 1-10. Scholars who agree in regard

to scarcely any other point of early Christian history are at one in

this. Now, Paul says in his letter to the Galatians that he made his

second visit in accordance with revelation. Lightfoot tries to elude

the difficulty of identifying this second visit by revelation with the

third visit without revelation recorded in Acts XV: he says (Gal., p.

125), "here there is no contradiction. The historian naturally records

the external impulse which led to the mission: the Apostle himself

states his inward motive." He quotes "parallel cases which suggest how

the one motive might supplement the other". But the parallels which he

quotes to support his view seem merely to prove how improbable it is.

(1) He says that in Acts XIII 2, 4, Barnabas and Paul were sent forth

by the Holy Spirit through a direct command; while in XIII 3 they are

sent away by the Church of Antioch. But that is not the proper force of

XIII 3 (p. 67 f.): the Church merely gave Barnabas and Saul freedom

from their duties and leave to depart, while the Spirit "sent them

out". In XV 3, on the contrary, the Church is said to have initiated

and completed the action. (2) He founds another parallel on the

mistaken idea that XXII 17 and IX 29 f. refer to the same visit (p.

62).

The journey to Jerusalem occupied some time; for in Phoenice and in

Samaria the envoys took the opportunity of "describing in detail the

turning of the Nations to God". Here, evidently, the newly accomplished

step, "the opening of the door of faith to the Nations," is meant. The

recital of the circumstances and results of the new step caused great

joy. Now, Luke pointedly omits Judea; and his silence is, as often

elsewhere, eloquent: the recital would cause no joy in Judea.

Accordingly, we are not to suppose that the joy was merely caused by

sympathy with the spread of Christianity, in which the Judean Brethren

would doubtless rejoice as much as any. The joy of the people of

Phoenice and Samaria was due to the news of free acceptance of Gentile

converts: Paul, as he went, preached freely to all and invited all.

When he did this in Phoenice and Samaria, it follows that he had been

doing the same in Antioch since his return from Galatia: the door which

had once been opened, XIV 27, remained permanently open.

2. THE DISPUTE IN ANTIOCH.

The new departure in Galatia and Antioch--the opening of the door of

faith to the Nations--forced into prominence the question of the

relations of Gentile to Jewish Christians.

There had already been some prospect that this question would be opened

up during Paul's second visit to Jerusalem (p. 56 f.); but for the

moment the difficulty did not become acute. The older Antiochian

converts, as we have seen, had all entered through the door of the

synagogue; and had necessarily accepted certain prohibitions as a rule

of life. But the newly rounded Galatian Churches contained large

numbers who had joined Paul directly, without any connection with the

synagogue; in the face of Luke's silence on such a crucial point we

cannot think that Paul imposed on them any preliminary conditions of

compliance with Jewish rules; and, if so, we must understand that the

same interpretation of "the open door" characterised his action in

Antioch, Phoenice and Samaria.

The Jews who had been settled for generations in the cities of Syria

and Asia Minor had lost much of their exclusiveness in ordinary life

(p. 143). Moreover, the development of events in Antioch had been

gradual; and no difficulty seems to have been caused there at first by

this last step. We learn from Paul himself (Gal. II 12 f.) that even

Peter, already prepared to some extent by his own bold action in the

case of Cornelius, had no scruple in associating freely with the

Antiochian Christians in general. But the Jews of Jerusalem were far

more rigid and narrow; and when some of them came down on a mission to

Antioch from the Church in Jerusalem, they were shocked by the state of

things which they found there. They could not well take the ground that

one Christian should not associate with another; they put their

argument in a more subtle form, and declared that no one could become

in the full sense a member of the Church, unless he came under the

Jewish Law, and admitted on his body its sign and seal: the Nations

could be received into the Church, but in the reception they must

conform to the Law (XV 2). The question, it must be clearly observed,

was not whether non-Jews could be saved, for it was admitted by all

parties that they could, but how they were saved: did the path of

belief lie through the gate of the Law alone, or was there a path of

belief that did not lead through that gate? Had God made another door

to Himself outside of the Law of Moses? Had He practically set aside

that Law, and declared it of no avail, by admitting as freely them that

disregarded it as them that believed and followed it?

When the question was put in this clear and logical form, we can well

believe that Jews as a rule shrank from all the consequences that

followed from free admission of the Nations. We can imagine that some

who had answered practically by associating with the Gentile

Christians, repented of their action when its full consequences were

brought before them. Only rare and exceptional natures could have risen

unaided above the prejudices and the pride of generations, and have

sacrificed their Law to their advancing experience. The record confirms

what we see to be natural in the circumstances. Paul stood immovably

firm; and he carried with him, after some wavering, the leaders (but

not the mass) of the Jewish Christians. This point requires careful

study.

The occasion of the dissension at Antioch is thus described by our

three authorities,--Luke, the Apostles at Jerusalem, and Paul himself.

Acts XV 1. Acts XV 24. Gal. II 12.

CERTAIN PERSONS CAME DOWN FROM JUDEA AND TAUGHT THE BRETHREN, THAT "IF

YE BE NOT CIRCUMCISED AFTER THE MANNER OF MOSES, YE CANNOT BE SAVED WE

HAVE HEARD THAT CERTAIN PERSONS WHICH WENT FORTH FROM US HAVE TROUBLED

YOU WITH WORDS, SUBVERTING YOUR SOULS [AND (as v. 28 implies) LAYING ON

YOU GREATER BURDEN THAN THE FOUR NECESSARY POINTS OF RITUAL]. BEFORE

THAT CERTAIN PERSONS CAME FROM JAMES, PETER USED TO EAT WITH THE

GENTILES; BUT, WHEN THEY CAME, HE BEGAN TO DRAW BACK AND SEPARATE

HIMSELF, FEARING THE CHAMPIONS OF CIRCUMCISION. (14) BUT I SAID UNTO

CEPHAS BEFORE THEM ALL, "HOW COMPELLEST THOU THE NATIONS TO CONFORM TO

JEWISH CEREMONIAL?"

It is noteworthy that Luke used the vague expression that "persons came

down from Judea," which is made more definite in v. 24: the champions

of circumcision who caused the dissension in Antioch had come on a

mission from the Apostles in Jerusalem. Luke pointedly avoids any

expression that would connect the leading Apostles with the action of

these emissaries. They had been sent from Jerusalem: but in v. 24 the

Apostles disclaim all responsibility for their action. While Luke gives

all the materials for judging, the substitution of Judea for Jerusalem

in his narrative is very significant of his carefulness in the minuti�

of expression. It is in no sense incorrect (it puts the general name of

the whole land in place of the city name), and it guards against a

probable misconception in the briefest way.

The incidents described in Gal. II 11-1 are not usually referred to

this period; and it is therefore advisable to elicit from the words of

Paul the precise situation as he conceives it. Certain persons had come

to Antioch from James: James, the head of the Church in Jerusalem, here

stands alone as "the local representative" of that Church (to borrow a

phrase from Lightfoot, Ed. Gal., p. 365). These persons had found in

Antioch a situation that shocked them, and they expressed their

disapproval so strongly and effectively, that Peter shrank from

continuing the free intercourse with Gentile Christians which he had

been practising. What do we learn from the context as to their

attitude? They are styled "they of the circumcision"; and this phrase

(as distinguished from the mere general expression of disagreement and

dislike used about persons of the same class in Gal. II 4) implies that

they actively championed that cause against Peter. The exact form of

the argument which moved Peter is not stated explicitly by Paul in his

hurried and impassioned narrative; but we gather what it was from the

terms of his expostulation with Peter. He said to him in public: "how

compellest thou the Nations to Judaise? "The words have no force unless

Peter, convinced by the Judaistic envoys, had begun to declare that

compliance with the Law was compulsory, before Gentiles could become

members of the Church fully entitled to communion with it.

Accordingly, the situation described in (Gal. II 11-14 is that which

existed in Antioch after Paul's return from the Galatian Churches. In

the first part of his letter to the Galatians, Paul recapitulates the

chief stages in the development of the controversy between the

Judaising party in the Church, the premonitory signs on his second

visit to Jerusalem, and the subsequent open dispute with Peter in

Antioch. The dispute occurred after Paul's second, but before his

third, visit to Jerusalem, i.e., either between Acts XII 25 and XIII 1,

or between XIV 26 and XV 4. Now in XV 1 (cp. v. 24) envoys from James

caused strife in Antioch; and we can hardly think that envoys also came

from James after XII 25, and caused exactly similar strife, which was

omitted by Luke but recorded in Gal. II 12.

When the question was put distinctly in all its bearings and

consequences before Peter, he was unable to resist the argument that

Christians ought to observe the Law, as Christ had done, and as the

Twelve did. On one or two occasions, indeed, Christ had been taunted

with permitting breaches of the Law; but His actions could be so

construed only by captious hypercriticism. It is quite clear that Peter

and the older Apostles did not for a time grasp the full import of

Christ's teaching on this subject: the actual fact that He and they

were Jews, and lived as such, made more impression on them than mere

theoretical teaching. Barnabas, even, was carried away by the example

of Peter, and admitted the argument that the Gentile Christians ought

"to live as do the Jews". Paul alone stood firm. The issue of the

situation is not described by Paul; he had now brought down his

narrative to the situation in which the Galatian defection arose; and

his retrospect therefore came to an end, when he reached the familiar

facts (p. 185 f.). We must estimate from the context the general

argument and what was the issue. Obviously, the rebuke which Paul gave

must have been successful in the case of Peter and Barnabas; the

immediate success of his appeal to their better feelings constitutes

the whole force of his argument to the Galatians. The power of his

letter to them lies in this, that the mere statement of the earlier

stages of the controversy is sufficient to show the impregnability of

his position and the necessity of his free and generous policy: the

narrow Judaising tyranny was self-condemned; Peter was wholly with him,

and so was Barnabas; but the victory had been gained, not by listening

to the older Apostles, but by obeying "the good pleasure of God, who

called me by His grace to preach Him among the Gentiles". If the

hesitation of Peter and Barnabas had resulted in an unreconciled

dispute, the force of Paul's argument is gone: he has urged at great

length that the older Apostles were in agreement with him, and accepted

him as the Apostle called to the Foreign Mission, as they were to the

Jewish Mission; and, as the climax of his argument for equality of

privilege, he says: "Peter and even Barnabas wavered for a moment from

their course, when the gravity of its consequences, viz., the

supersession of the Judaic Law, was set plainly before them by some of

their friends; but I pointed out Peter's error in one brief appeal from

his present wavering to his own past action".

From this analysis we see that the issue of the situation implied in

Gal. II 11-14 is described in Acts XV 2, 7: Barnabas joined Paul in

combating the Judaising party, and Peter championed the cause in

emphatic and noble terms at the subsequent Council in Jerusalem. That

follows naturally on the interrupted narrative of the Epistle: the

history as related in Acts completes and explains the Epistle, and

enables us to appreciate the force of Paul's argument and its

instantaneous effect on the Galatian Churches.

It is an interesting point, that Peter used at the Council the argument

in favour of freedom with which Paul had pressed him in Antioch. Paul

said to him, "In practice thou, a Jew, livest as do the Gentiles; how

then compellest thou the Gentiles to act according to the Jewish Law?

"Struck with this argument, Peter puts it in a more general form to the

Council, "Why put a yoke on them which neither we nor our fathers could

bear? "It is true to nature that he should employ to others the

argument that had convinced himself.

It must, however, be confessed that while Galatians leads up

excellently to Acts, and gains greatly in force from the additional

facts mentioned there, Acts is silent about the facts narrated in

Galatians. The eyewitness's narrative gains from the historian and

stands out in new beauty from the comparison; but here Acts seems to

lose by being brought into juxtaposition with the narrative of the

eye-witness. To our conception the omission of all reference to the

wavering of Barnabas and Peter appears almost like the sacrifice of

historic truth, and certainly loses a picturesque detail. But the

difference of attitude and object, I think, fully explains the

historian's selection amid the incidents of the controversy. For him

picturesque details had no attraction; and the swerving of all the Jews

except Paul from the right path seemed to him an unessential fact, like

hundreds and thousands of others which he had to leave unnoticed. The

essential fact which he had to record was that the controversy raged,

and that Paul and Barnabas championed the cause of freedom.

But, it may be objected, Barnabas had wavered, and it is not accurate

to represent him as a champion along with Paul. We reply that Paul does

not make it clear how far Barnabas had gone with the tide: the matter

was one of tendency, more than of complete separation. Peter began to

withdraw and separate himself [24] from familiar communion with the

Gentile Christian: the resident Jews joined him in concealing their

real sentiment and their ordinary conduct towards the non-Jewish

members of the Church: even Barnabas was carried off his feet by the

tide of dissembling. These words would be correct, if Barnabas had

merely wavered, and been confirmed by Paul's arguments in private.

Paul's public rebuke was not addressed to Barnabas, but only to Peter.

There is a certain difficulty in the record; but I confess that, after

trying honestly to give full emphasis to the difficulty, I see no

reason why we should not, as the issue of the facts in Gal. II 11-14

conceive Barnabas to have come forward as a thorough-going advocate of

the Pauline doctrine and practice.

Moreover, the difficulty remains, and becomes far more serious, on the

ordinary view that the incidents of Gal. II 11-14 occurred after the

Council in Jerusalem. According to that view, Barnabas, when delegates

came from Jerusalem (Acts XV 2, 24), resisted them strenuously,

represented the cause of freedom as an envoy to Jerusalem, and obtained

an authoritative Decree from the Apostles disowning the action of the

delegates, and emphatically condemning it as "subverting your souls"

thereafter delegates came again from James, the same Apostle that had

taken the foremost part in formulating the recent Decree; [25] but this

time Barnabas, instead of resisting, weakly yielded to their arguments.

Worse, almost, is the conduct of Peter in that view. When the ease came

up before the Council to be considered in all its bearings and solemnly

decided, he, "after there had been much discussion" (in which we may be

sure that the consequences were fully emphasised by the Judaising

party), appeared as the most outspoken advocate of freedom, and

declared that "we must not demand from them what we ourselves have been

unable to endure" Shortly after the Council (on that view), Peter went

to Antioch and put in practice the principle of freedom for which he

had contended at the Council. But "certain persons came from James" the

same Apostle that had supported him in the Council; these persons

reopened the controversy; and Peter abandoned his publicly expressed

conviction, which in a formal letter was declared with his approval to

be the word of the Holy Spirit.

We are asked to accept as a credible narrative this recital of

meaningless tergiversation, which attributes to Peter and to Barnabas,

not ordinary human weakness and inability to answer a grave issue at

the first moment when it is presented to them, but conduct devoid of

reason or sanity. Who can wonder that many who are asked to accept this

as history, reply that one of the two authors responsible for the two

halves of the recital has erred and is untrustworthy? For the truth of

history itself one must on that theory distrust one of the two

documents. That is not the faith, that is not the conduct, which

conquered the world! The only possible supposition would be that the

Apostles were men unusually weak, ignorant, and inconstant, who

continually went wrong, except where the Divine guidance interposed to

keep them right. That theory has been and is still held by some; but it

removes the whole development of Christianity out of the sphere of

history into the sphere of the supernatural and the marvellous, whereas

the hypothesis on which this investigation is based is that it was a

process intelligible according to ordinary human nature, and a proper

subject for the modern historian.

It is true that Peter once before denied his own affirmed principles,

but that was when he was younger, when he was a mere pupil, when a

terrible strain was put on him; but this denial is supposed to have

been made when he was in the maturity of his power, after he had

experienced the quickening sense of responsibility as a leader of the

Church for many years, and after his mind and will had been enlarged

and strengthened at the great Pentecost (see p. 365).

Further, according to the view stated by Lightfoot, the feeble action

of Peter and Barnabas in Antioch produced lasting consequences: it "may

have prepared the way for the dissension between Paul and Barnabas

which shortly afterwards led to their separation. From this time

forward they never appear again associated together." If it was so

serious, the total omission of it by Luke becomes harder to understand

and reconcile with the duty of a historian; whereas, if it was (as we

suppose) a mere hesitation when the question was first put explicitly,

it was not of sufficient consequence to demand a place in his history.

Peter's visit to Antioch was not of the same character as his visits to

Samaria and other Churches at an earlier time, in which he was giving

the Apostolic approval to the congregations established there. The

first visit of Barnabas to Antioch, followed by the Antiochian

delegation to Jerusalem (XI 28, XII 25), and the recognition of Paul

and Barnabas as Apostles (Gal. II 9), had placed Antioch on a

recognised and independent basis (XIII 1). In Luke's view, therefore,

as in Paul's, Peter's visit was not a step in the development of the

Church in Antioch, as Barnabas's had been.

3. THE COUNCIL.

(XV 4) AND WHEN THEY WERE COME TO JERUSALEM, THEY WERE RECEIVED BY THE

CHURCH AND THE APOSTLES AND THE ELDERS, AND THEY REHEARSED ALL THINGS

THAT GOD HAD DONE WITH THEM. (5) BUT THERE ROSE UP CERTAIN OF THE SECT

OF THE PHARISEES WHO BELIEVED, SAYING, "IT IS NEEDFUL TO CIRCUMCISE

THEM, AND TO CHARGE THEM TO KEEP THE LAW OF MOSES". (6) AND THE

APOSTLES AND THE ELDERS WERE GATHERED TOGETHER TO CONSIDER OF THIS

MATTER. (7) AND WHEN THERE HAD BEEN MUCH DISCUSSION, PETER ROSE AND

SPOKE. (12) AND ALL THE MULTITUDE KEPT SILENCE; AND THEY HEARKENED UNTO

BARNABAS AND PAUL, WHO REHEARSED WHAT SIGNS AND WONDERS GOD HAD WROUGHT

AMONG THE NATIONS BY THEM. (13) AND AFTER THEY HAD CEASED, JAMES SPOKE.

At Jerusalem there occurred in the first place a general meeting of the

Church as a whole to receive and welcome the delegates. The Apostles

and the Elders are specified as taking part in the meeting; and the

separate article before each name implies distinct action of each body.

At this meeting the delegates explained the circumstances which had

caused their mission; and the extreme members of the Judaising party,

who are described here as Pharisees, stated their view forthwith.

A mark of the developed situation since Paul's last visit must be noted

in v. 4. Paul and Barnabas now expound in a formal and public way all

their missionary experience; but on their previous visit, Paul

privately submitted to the leaders of the Church his views as to

missionary enterprise.

Thereupon, a special meeting of the Apostles and the Elders was held to

consider the matter, and a long discussion took place. Peter delivered

a speech in favour of complete freedom for the new converts; and the

effect which he produced was shown by the patient hearing accorded to

Barnabas and to Paul, as they recounted the proofs of Divine grace and

Divine action in the test that God was with them. Thus, the course of

the meeting was very similar to the discussion that followed after the

conversion of Cornelius (XI 1-18. The general sense was clearly against

the claim of the extreme Judaistic party (called "them of the

circumcision" XI 2, Gal. II 12).

But, while the champions of circumcision were clearly in the minority,

apparently a decided feeling was manifest in favour of some concessions

to the Jewish feeling and practice: the Nations were to be received

into the Church, but the widened Church was not to be apart from and

independent of the old Jewish community: it was to be "a rebuilding of

the tabernacle of David". To render possible a real unanimity of

feeling, the Nations must accept the fundamental regulations of purity.

The chairman's speech summed up the sense of the meeting in a way that

was universally accepted. James, the recognised head of the Church in

Jerusalem, said:--

(XV 14) SYMEON HATH REHEARSED HOW FIRST GOD TOOK CARE TO GATHER FROM

AMONG THE NATIONS A PEOPLE FOR HIS NAME. (15) AND TO THIS AGREE THE

WORDS OF THE PROPHETS: AS IT IS WRITTEN, (16) "I WILL BUILD AGAIN THE

TABERNACLE OF DAVID, (17) THAT THE RESIDUE OF MEN MAY SEEK AFTER THE

LORD, AND ALL THE NATIONS, OVER WHOM MY NAME IS PRONOUNCED," SAITH THE

LORD, WHO MAKETH THESE THINGS (18) KNOWN FROM THE BEGINNING OF TIME.

[26] (19) WHEREFORE MY VOICE IS THAT WE TROUBLE NOT THEM WHICH FROM

AMONG THE NATIONS TURN TO GOD; (20) BUT SEND INSTRUCTIONS TO THEM TO

ABSTAIN FROM THE POLLUTIONS OF IDOLS AND FROM MARRIAGE WITHIN THE

DEGREES FORBIDDEN BY THE LAW, AND FROM WHAT IS STRANGLED, AND FROM the

use of BLOOD as food. (21) FOR MOSES FROM ANCIENT GENERATIONS HATH IN

EVERY CITY THEM THAT PREACH HIM, AS HE IS READ IN THE SYNAGOGUES EVERY

SABBATH.

James grounds his advice for partial conformity on the fact, v. 21,

that the Mosaic Law had already spread widely over the cities of the

empire, and that the existing facts which facilitated intercourse

between Jews and "God-fearing" pagans should be continued. He grounds

his advice for freedom from the rest of the Law on the declared will of

God, first by prophecy in time long past, and afterwards by revelation

to Peter, that the Nations should be admitted to the tabernacle of

David, from which he infers that their own duty is to make admission

easy.

Incidentally we observe that James used the Septuagint Version, quoting

loosely from Amos IX 11, 12, passage where the telling point for his

purpose occurs only in the Greek and not in the Hebrew Version.

Another point of development since Paul's second visit to Jerusalem

must be noticed here. On the second visit, as Paul declares, the

recognised leaders in Jerusalem gave him no advice and no instruction,

except to remember the poverty of the brethren there. It would. be hard

to put that in more emphatic terms than he uses (p. 56). But on the

third visit, the delegates bring a question for settlement, and receive

from the recognised leaders in Jerusalem an authoritative response,

giving a weighty decision in a serious matter of practical work. a

decision that would have been epoch-making, if it had been permanently

carried into effect. On the second visit the difficulty could be

foreseen; between the second and third visit it became acute; at the

third visit it was settled in a way that was a distinct rebuff to the

Judaising party, but not a complete triumph for the party of freedom.

It would not be honest to use the words of Gal. II 10 about the visit

described in Acts XV.

Another contrast between the second and the third visit must be

observed. The Church sent forth several delegates along with Paul and

Barnabas on the third journey; but on the second they were the sole

delegates. The common view, which identifies the second visit of Gal.

II 1-10 with the third visit of Acts XV, is defended by its supporters

on the ground that Titus, who went along with Paul (Gal. II 1), was one

of the additional delegates mentioned, XV 2. This argument sins against

the facts. In Gal. II 1 Titus is defined as a subordinate, and not as

one of the delegates; [27] we have no reason to think that any

subordinates went up to the Council, whereas it was necessary for the

work of the second visit to use assistants. Moreover, we may be certain

that, if Paul did take any subordinates with him to the Council, he was

too prudent and diplomatic to envenom a situation already serious and

difficult by taking. an uncircumcised Greek with him. It was different

on a later visit, when the authoritative decree had decided against

circumcision, or on an earlier visit, before the question was raised;

but when that question was under discussion, it would have been a harsh

and heedless hurt to the susceptibilities of the other party, to take

Titus with him; and Paul never was guilty of such an act. The example

of Timothy shows how far he went about this time in avoiding any chance

of hurting Jewish feeling.

4. THE DECREE.

(XV 22) THEN IT SEEMED GOOD TO THE APOSTLES AND ELDERS, WITH THE WHOLE

CHURCH, TO CHOOSE MEN OUT OF THEIR COMPANY, AND SEND THEM TO ANTIOCH

WITH PAUL AND BARNABAS, namely, JUDAS CALLED BARSABAS, AND SILAS, CHIEF

MEN AMONG THE BRETHREN. (23) AND THEY SENT A LETTER BY THEIR MEANS:

"THE APOSTLES AND THE ELDERS [BRETHREN] [28] UNTO THE BRETHREN WHICH

ARE OF THE NATIONS IN ANTIOCH AND SYRIA AND CILICIA, GREETING. (24)

FORASMUCH AS WE HAVE HEARD THAT CERTAIN WHICH WENT OUT FROM US HAVE

TROUBLED YOU WITH WORDS, SUBVERTING YOUR SOULS; TO WHOM WE GAVE NO

COMMANDMENT; (25) IT SEEMED GOOD UNTO US, HAVING COME TO ONE ACCORD, TO

CHOOSE OUT MEN AND SEND THEM UNTO YOU WITH OUR BELOVED BARNABAS AND

PAUL, (26) MEN THAT HAVE HAZARDED THEIR LIVES FOR THE NAME OF OUR LORD

JESUS CHRIST. (27) WE HAVE SENT THEREFORE JUDAS AND SILAS, WHO

THEMSELVES ALSO SHALL TELL YOU THE SAME THINGS BY WORD OF MOUTH. (28)

FOR IT SEEMED GOOD TO THE HOLY SPIRIT, AND TO US, TO LAY UPON YOU NO

GREATER BURDEN THAN THESE NECESSARY THINGS. (29) THAT YE ABSTAIN FROM

THINGS SACRIFICED TO IDOLS, AND FROM BLOOD, AND FROM THINGS STRANGLED,

AND FROM MARRIAGE WITHIN THE DEGREES; FROM WHICH YE KEEP YOURSELVES, IT

SHALL BE WELL WITH YOU. FARE YE WELL."

The Decree is, as Lightfoot says, a compromise. On the one hand the

extreme Judaising party is entirely disowned and emphatically

condemned, as "subverting the souls" of the Gentiles. But, on the other

hand, part of the Law is declared to be obligatory; and the word

selected is very emphatic (epanankes). If this word be taken in its

full sense, the Decree lacks unity of purpose and definiteness of

principle; it passes lamely from side to side. Now it seems impossible

to suppose that Paul could have accepted a Decree which declared mere

points of ritual to be compulsory; and one of them he afterwards

emphatically declared to be not compulsory (I Cor. VIII 4 f.). But

those who had listened to the speeches of Peter and James, and were

familiar with the situation in which the question had emerged, were

prepared to look specially at the exordium with its emphatic

condemnation of the Judaising party; and thereafter, doubtless, they

took the concluding part as a recommendation, and regarded the four

points as strongly advised in the interests of peace and unity.

But the real power of a law lies in its positive enactment; and most

people would look only to what the Decree ordered. Now, whether or not

the last sentences must bear the sense, they certainly may naturally

bear the sense, that part of the Law was absolutely compulsory for

salvation, and that the Nations were released from the rest as a

concession to their weakness: "we lay on you no greater burden than

these necessary conditions". This seemed to create two grades of

Christians: a lower class of weaker persons, who could not observe the

whole Law, but only the compulsory parts of it, and a higher class, who

were strong enough to obey the whole Law. The Gentile Christians were

familiar in the pagan religions with distinctions of grade; for stages

of initiation into the Mysteries existed everywhere. It was almost

inevitable that a Decree, which lays down no clear and formal principle

of freedom, should in practice be taken as making a distinction between

strong and weak, between more and less advanced Christians; and it is

certain that it was soon taken in that sense.

The question is often asked, why this letter was not addressed also to

the Churches of Galatia; and several answers are suggested. But the

answer which seems obvious from our point of view is that the letter

was addressed only to those who asked the question. The provincial

organisation of the Church began through the compulsion of

circumstances (p. 135): there must either be a provincial organisation

or no organisation. The principle, when it has been once stated, is

self-evident. Circumstances made Antioch the centre of the Church in

the province Syria and Cilicia; and the address of this letter attests

the recognition of that fact and its consequences.

Hence, when Paul went forth on his next journey, he did not communicate

the Decree to the Churches in Syria and Cilicia, XV 41, because they

had already received it, when it was first sent out. But, when he and

Silas reached Galatia, "they delivered them the decrees for to keep,

which had been ordained of the Apostles and Elders," XVI 4. But the

Bezan Reviser, not understanding this delicate distinction,

interpolated the statement in XV 41, that Paul and Silas "delivered the

instructions of the Apostles and Elders".

5. THE RETURN TO ANTIOCH.

(XV 30) SO THEY, BEING SET FREE TO DEPART, CAME DOWN TO ANTIOCH; AND

HAVING GATHERED THE MULTITUDE TOGETHER, THEY DELIVERED THE LETTER. (31)

AND WHEN THEY HAD READ IT, THEY REJOICED AT THE ENCOURAGEMENT. (32) AND

JUDAS AND SILAS ON THEIR OWN ACCOUNT ALSO, INASMUCH AS THEY WERE

PROPHETS, ENCOURAGED THE BRETHREN AT GREAT LENGTH, AND CONFIRMED THEM.

(33) AND AFTER THEY HAD SPENT SOME TIME, THEY WERE SET FREE BY THE

BRETHREN TO DEPART IN PEACE TO THEM THAT SENT THEM FORTH; (34) But it

pleased Silas to abide there still. (35) AND PAUL AND BARNABAS TARRIED

IN ANTIOCH, TEACHING AND PREACHING THE WORD OF THE LORD, WITH MANY

OTHERS ALSO. (36) AND AFTER CERTAIN DAYS PAUL SAID . . .

As in XI 24, so here, v. 32, the qualification of Judas and Silas for

exhorting the congregation is carefully stated. Luke lays such evident

stress on proper qualification, that he seems to have considered Divine

gifts necessary in any one that was to address a congregation (p. 45).

After the Council, Paul and Barnabas returned to their ordinary duties

in Antioch, where the number of qualified prophets and teachers was now

larger than in XIII 1. They remained there a short time (v. 36, cp. IX

19, 23. The second journey began probably in the spring of the year 50.

At some period v. 34 was deliberately omitted from the next, from the

mistaken idea that v. 33, declared the actual departure of Judas and

Silas: but the officials of the Church in Antioch (the Elders?) simply

informed Judas and Silas that their duties were concluded and they were

free to return home, and Silas did not avail himself of the permission.

Considering how XII 25 prepares the way for XIII 5, we must hold that

XV 34 is genuine and prepares for XV 40; and the fact that the Bezan

Reviser found 34 is the text and added to it the comment "and Judas

went alone," constitutes a distinct proof of its genuineness. It is not

that any difficulty need be found in Paul selecting Silas from

Jerusalem, for Barnabas here takes Mark from Jerusalem (XIII 13). But

it is one of the points of Luke's style to furnish the material for

understanding a new departure, and the very marked statement that Silas

voluntarily remained, when his official duty was declared to be at an

end, makes the next event much more intelligible (p. 176). There is in

the sequence of thought 33-4a certain harshness (characteristic of Luke

when he wants to draw attention to a point); and this led to the

omission of 34 in the great MSS. and by many modern editors.

6. THE SEPARATION OF PAUL AND BARNABAS.

(v 36) AND AFTER SOME DAYS PAUL SAID UNTO BARNABAS, "LET US RETURN NOW

AND VISIT THE BRETHREN IN EVERY CITY WHEREIN WE PROCLAIMED THE WORD OF

THE LORD, HOW THEY FARE". (37) AND BARNABAS WAS MINDED TO TAKE WITH

THEM JOHN ALSO, WHO WAS CALLED MARK. (38) BUT PAUL THOUGHT NOT GOOD TO

TAKE WITH THEM HIM THAT WITHDREW FROM THEM FROM PAMPHYLIA AND WENT NOT

WITH THEM TO THE WORK. (39) AND THERE AROSE A SHARP CONTENTION, SO THAT

THEY PARTED ASUNDER ONE FROM THE OTHER; AND BARNABAS TOOK MARK WITH

HIM, AND SAILED AWAY UNTO CYPRUS; (40) BUT PAUL CHOSE SILAS AND WENT

FORTH, BEING COMMENDED BY THE BRETHREN TO THE GRACE OF THE LORD: AND HE

WENT THROUGH SYRIA AND CILICIA, CONFIRMING THE CHURCHES.

Barnabas here passes out of this history. The tradition, as stated in

the apocryphal Periodoi Barnab�, a very late work, was that he remained

in Cyprus till his death; and the fact that Mark reappears at a later

stage without Barnabas, is in agreement. At any rate his work, wherever

it was carried on, did not, in Luke's estimation, contribute to work

out the idea of the organised and unified Church. That idea was

elaborated in Paul's work; and the history is guided by Paul's activity

from the moment when he began to be fully conscious of the true nature

of his work. Others contributed to the earlier stages, but, as it

proceeded, all the other personages became secondary, and Paul more and

more the single moving genius.

The choice of Silas was, of course, due to his special fitness for the

work, which had been recognised during his ministration in Antioch.

Doubtless he had shown tact and sympathy in managing the questions

arising from the relations of the Gentile Christians to the Jews. His

sympathies had also been shown by his preferring to remain in the mixed

and freer congregation in Antioch, when he had been at liberty to

return to Jerusalem.

The name Silas is a familiar diminutive of Silvanus; and the full and

more dignified form is employed in the superscription of the two

letters to the Thessalonians. Silvanus is a Latin name; and Silas is

implied in XVI 37 to have been a Roman citizen. It may, however, be

looked on as certain that he was a Hebrew, for only a Hebrew would have

been a leading man among the Brethren at Jerusalem (XV 22). His double

character, Hebrew and Roman, was in itself a qualification for a

coadjutor of Paul; and, doubtless, the Roman side of his character

caused that freedom from narrow Judaistic prejudice which shines

through his action.

It appears from the term employed in v. 40 that Silas took the place of

Barnabas, not of Mark. The latter was a mere unofficial companion in

every case, as is shown by the word used. [29] The verbs in the next

few verses are all singular; though it is clear that Silas is concerned

in many of the actions. The singular was preferred by Luke because

certain of the actions were special to Paul, the choosing of Silas and

of Timothy. There is a decided harshness in the narrative that follows,

owing to the variation between the singular and the plural. At some

points in the action Paul monopolises the author's attention; and

probably the expression, harsh though it be grammatically, corresponds

to the facts. At the opening of the journey Paul alone is the subject:

now at the opening the new comrade was untrained to the work. After a

time the plural begins, XVI 4, and, wherever travelling is described,

it is employed; but, when the direction given to missionary work is

alluded to, Silas disappears, and Paul alone is the subject, XVII 2.

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

[24] Imperfects, not aorists.

[25] "The Apostolic letter seems to have been drawn up by him"

(Lightfoot, Ed. Gal., p. 112, II 12).

[26] The Bezan Text, and many other authorities, have "saith the Lord

who doeth this. (18) Known to the Lord from the beginning of time is

His work.

[27] sumparalabon, cp. XII 25 and pp. 59, 71, 177.

[28] Dr. Blass's explanation of this word as an accidental corruption

is highly probable.

[29] sumparalambeno XII 25, XV 37, p. 170/

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

CHAPTER VIII.

HISTORY OF THE CHURCHES OF GALATIA

1. THE VISIT OF PAUL AND SILAS.

(XVI 1) AND HE CAME ALSO TO DERBE AND TO LYSTRA; AND BEHOLD A CERTAIN

DISCIPLE WAS THERE NAMED TIMOTHY, THE SON OF A JEWESS WHICH BELIEVED;

BUT HIS FATHER WAS A GREEK. (2) THE SAME HAD A GOOD REPUTATION AMONG

THE BRETHREN THAT WERE IN LYSTRA AND ICONIUM. (3) HIM WOULD PAUL HAVE

TO GO FORTH WITH HIM; AND HE TOOK AND CIRCUMCISED HIM BECAUSE OF THE

JEWS THAT WERE IN THOSE PARTS, FOR THEY ALL KNEW THAT HIS FATHER WAS A

GREEK. (4) AND AS THEY WERE PASSING THROUGH THE CITIES, THEY in each

DELIVERED THEM THE DECREES FOR TO KEEP, WHICH HAD BEEN ORDAINED OF THE

APOSTLES AND ELDERS THAT WERE AT JERUSALEM. (5) THE CHURCHES THEN WERE

STRENGTHENED IN THE FAITH, AND INCREASED IN NUMBER DAILY. (6) AND THEY

MADE A MISSIONARY PROGRESS THROUGH THE PHRYGIAN REGION OF the province

GALATIA (the Phrygo-Galatic Region.)

In v. 1 it is implied that Derbe and Lystra are a pair, constituting a

district (p. 110). The work of this journey is divided according to

districts: (1) Syria and Cilicia, a single Roman province; (2) Derbe

and Lystra, a region of the province Galatia, which is here indicated

by its two cities as the most convenient way, because in one. of them a

considerable halt had to be described; (3) the Phrygian region of the

province Galatia; (4) Asia, where preaching was forbidden, was

traversed transversely to its northwestern point after an unsuccessful

effort to enter the province Bithynia for missionary purposes. Between

Cilicia and Derbe the great realm of Antiochus is omitted from the

narrative, as being a non-Roman territory and out of Paul's plans.

Derbe and Lystra are grouped together as a Region, but the author

dwells only on Lystra. The only reason why they are grouped together

and separated from the districts that precede and follow, lies in the

Roman classification, which made them a group. But in order to mark

that Lystra alone is referred to in the sequel, the historian repeats

the preposition before it: "he came to Derbe and to Lystra".

In v. 2 Lystra and Iconium are grouped together as the district where

Timothy was well known. It is implied that he was not known at Derbe.

This again is true to the facts of commerce and intercourse. Lystra is

much nearer Iconium than it is to Derbe; and geographically, Lystra

goes along with Iconium, while Derbe goes with Laranda and that part of

Lycaonia. Neither blood nor Roman classification could prevent commerce

from running in its natural channels (XIV 19). The nearest city to

Iconium was Lystra, and the nearest to Lystra was Iconium; and the

relations between them must always be close.

The historian is careful to add in this case, as he does about the

Seven Deacons (VI 3), about Cornelius (X 22, cp. 2), and as Paul does

about Ananias (XXII 12), and as is implied in I 21, that Timothy had so

lived as to bear a good character in the district where he was known.

It is not meant that Paul went about taking the opinion of Lystra and

Iconium about Timothy, any more than it is meant in X 22 that

Cornelius's messengers went collecting evidence about him all over

Palestine: we may be sure that in such a selection Paul depended on his

own insight, guided perhaps by Divine approval. The author adds this

information about the good repute of Timothy, because he considered

good repute one of the conditions of appointment to any office however

humble in the Church. He is interested in all questions of

organisation, and we may compare what he says about the qualification

of preachers (pp. 45, 174). As a point of literary style we note that

the event of a new and important character is marked by an unusually

detailed account of him.

We infer from the expression that in vv. 1-3 Paul and Silas have not

gone beyond Lystra; and that it is a misconception to think that in v.

2 Paul is in Iconium. At Lystra Paul felt that, along the route which

he intended to take, the Jews knew Timothy's father to be a Greek: he

was going along a frequented route of trade, on which were colonies of

Jews in communication with each other, for there can be no doubt that

his plan was to go by Iconium and Antioch into Asia. The opinion has

sometimes been held that at this point Paul abandoned the visitation of

his Churches as contemplated in XV 36; and that "the fact that God put

this companion in his way served as a warning to him to go direct from

Lykaonia to a new mission-field" (see Weiss's note on XVI 2). But, on

the contrary, our view is that, when Luke records any deliberately

formed intention on Paul's part, he leaves us to understand that it was

carried out, if no intimation to the contrary is given (p. 342); and

that Timothy here was taken as companion for the route as first

planned, to fill the place of John Mark on the previous journey. There

seems no reason to think (as Blass does) that one or more subordinates

accompanied Paul from Syrian Antioch. It is not improbable that Paul,

owing to previous experience, thought of Timothy as a companion even

before he left Antioch.

Paul then proceeded on his intended route through the Phrygian Region

of the province, whose two cities visited on the previous journey were

Iconium and Pisidian Antioch. The cities are not specially named, as

nothing striking or important occurred in either. It is implied that no

Church had been rounded on the former journey in Pisidia or Pamphylia;

and hence Paul had no Churches to review and confirm there. The

reference to Pisidia (a Region of the province Galatia) in XIV 24 does

not suggest that any success was attained there; and we may find in the

list of I Peter I 1 a clear proof that there was no Church in Pamphylia

at a date considerably later. That list is clearly intended to exhaust

the Church in Asia Minor; and it mentions every province except Lycia

and Pamphylia (which, therefore, did not yet contain any Churches, and

seem to have long resisted Christianity), and Cilicia, which was part

of Syria. The list, incidentally, shows that already in the first

century a certain coherence was perceptible between the various

Churches of Asia Minor, as distinguished from Syria and Cilicia. That

springs naturally from the political conditions, and it grew stronger

as time passed, until the two divisions became the patriarchates of

Constantinople and of Antioch.

At this point Luke inserts an account of Paul's action in the cities

through which he was making his way. It is in his style to put this

account near the beginning and expect the reader to apply it in all

subsequent cases (p. 72). It does not apply to Cilicia (p. 173), and

could not therefore be given sooner. In each city Paul and Silas

delivered the Decree, and urged the Gentile converts to observe the

necessary points of Jewish ritual; and everywhere the congregations

were vigorous and growing. We cannot mistake the emphasis laid by the

historian on Paul's loyal determination to carry out the Apostolic

Decree. and his anxiety to go as far as was honestly possible in the

way of conciliating the Jews: that is in keeping with his view that the

entire blame for the rupture between Paul and the Jews lay with the

latter. But, if Paul was so anxious at this time to recommend the

Decree to his converts, why does he never refer to it in any of his

subsequent letters, even where he touches on points that were formally

dealt with in the Decree, and why does he give advice to the

Corinthians about meat offered to idols, which certainly strains the

Decree to the utmost, if it be not actually inconsistent with it? The

explanation lies in the immediate consequences of his action in the

Galatian Churches.

2. THE DESERTION OF GALATIANS.

Soon after Paul left the province Galatia, there came to it

missionaries of the Judaising party, who taught the Galatian Churches

to take that view of the Apostolic Decree which we have described on p.

172 f. They pointed out that Paul himself recognised the principle that

circumcision was needed for the higher grade of Christian service; for

when he selected Timothy for a position of responsibility in the

Church, he, as a preliminary, performed the rite on him; and they

declared that thereby he was, in effect, "preaching circumcision" (Gal.

V 11). Further, they threw doubt on his sincerity in this act; and

insinuated that he was reluctantly complying with necessity, in order

to "conciliate and ingratiate himself with" the mass of the Church (see

Lightfoot on Gal. I 10). Above all they insisted on the existence of

the two grades of Christians; they pointed out that Paul had himself

delivered and recommended the Apostolic Decree which recognised the

distinction of weaker and stronger Brethren; and they urged the

Galatians to strive to attain to the higher, and not rest content with

the lower grade, which was a mere concession to weakness.

Such teaching found a ready response in the minds of the Galatian

Christians. Many of them had first heard Paul preaching in the

synagogue, many had come under the influence of Judaism to some extent

even before Paul entered Galatia; all were ready to accept the belief

that, as the Jews were always the first in Paul's own plans, and as

Christianity came from the Jews, therefore it was right to imitate the

Jews (p. 144). It was precisely the most enthusiastic and devoted, who

would be eager to rise to the highest and most difficult stage of

Christian life.

Further, the Judaistic emissaries urged that Paul was merely the

messenger and subordinate of the Twelve, that these original Apostles

and leaders of the Church must be accepted as the ultimate guides. and

that where Paul swerved from their teaching he was in error; and they

claimed likewise to be the messengers come direct from the Twelve to

communicate their latest views. Paul had recently delivered the Decree

of the older Apostles; and now later messengers supplemented and

elucidated the Decree.

3. LETTER TO THE CHURCHES OF GALATIA.

Paul saw that his vision of the Church that should unite the civilised

world was a vain dream, if it were to be bound by the fetters of

Judaism; and he felt, as soon as he heard of this defection, that it

must be met at once. If these Churches, his first foundations towards

the west, were to pass under the party of slavery, his work was ruined

at its inception: the blow to his policy and his influence was ruinous.

One of the arguments by which the change had been produced was

especially galling to him: his efforts at conciliation were taken

advantage of to distort his motives, and to represent him as

inconsistent and temporising, and his attempts to soothe the prejudices

of the Judaistic party were treated as attempts at compromise. Hence he

bursts forth at the outset in a strain of terrific vehemence (which I

purposely give as far as possible in Lightfoot's language): "Though we

(i.e., Silas and I), or an angel from heaven, should preach unto you

any gospel other than that which we preached unto you, let him be

accursed. As we have told you before, so now once more I say, if any

man preacheth unto you any gospel other than that which ye received,

let him be anathema. What! does my boldness startle you? Is this, I

ask, the language of a time-server? Will any one say now that, careless

of winning the favour of God, I seek to conciliate men, to ingratiate

myself with men? I speak thus strongly, for my language shall not be

misconstrued, shall wear no semblance of compromise" (Gal. I 8-10). And

towards the end of his letter he returns to the same point: "What! do I

who have incurred the deadly hatred of the Judaisers, who am exposed to

continual persecution from them, do I preach circumcision? If so, why

do they persecute me? Surety what scandalises them in my teaching, the

crucifixion with its atonement for sin, has been done away with, if I

have, as they say, taken to their method, and begun to preach

circumcision" (V 11).

Satisfied with the vehemence of the first outburst, and the sarcasm of

the second, Paul wastes no argument to prove that he has been

consistent throughout. He knows that the Galatic Churches cannot really

believe that part of his adversaries' arguments: they feel in their

hearts that he has always been true to the first Gospel; and he

proceeds to remind them of its origin and its hold on them, in order to

enforce the conclusion that they must cling to the first Gospel,

whoever it be that preaches any other. His argument, therefore, is

directed to show that he came among them in the beginning with a

message direct from God: "the Gospel which was preached by me is not

after man" (I 11): "it came to me through revelation of Jesus". Then he

proceeds to show, by appealing to the facts, that he had not had the

opportunity of learning anything from the recognised pillars of the

Church. When it pleased God to reveal Jesus in him, bitter enemy of the

Church as he was, he "conferred not with flesh and blood," but went

away for solitary meditation into Arabia. He was made by God His

Apostle to the Nations years before he conferred with any of the

Apostles. Twice at a later date did he go up to Jerusalem, in one case

remaining fifteen days and seeing only Peter and James, in the second

going up at the Divine command to help the poor at Jerusalem (II

10)--on which occasion, as a matter of fact, no injunction was laid on

his Greek assistant Titus to accept the Judaic rite--and receiving the

recognition of his Apostleship, but no instruction, from the heads of

the Church (p. 56 f.).

Here in passing let us ask the question, Did Paul in this

autobiographical sketch, given in such solemn yet vehement style, with

the oath by God that he is not deceiving them--did Paul, I say, omit to

mention that he had paid another visit to Jerusalem between the two

that he describes? The question seems almost an insult; yet many

scholars of the highest order consider that he here leaves out of sight

the visit described by Luke, XI 28-30, and XII 25. I confess that,

after studying all that the orthodox scholars say on this point I find

a higher conception of Paul's character and truthfulness in the

position of the critics who conclude that Luke utterly misconceived the

sequence of events in early Christian history and interpolated an

intermediate visit where no visit occurred, than in Bishop Lightfoot's

position that "of this visit Paul makes no mention here". Paul 's

argument is rounded on the rarity of his visits, and his aim is to show

that on these visits he received no charge from the Twelve. Reason and

truth rebel against the idea that he left out the middle visit. If he

passed over part of the facts here, what situation can be imagined in

which he would feel obliged to tell all the facts? And on that

supposition, that Paul omitted a fact so essential to his purpose and

to honest autobiography, the entire body of orthodox scholars have

built up their theory of early Church history! It cannot be! Luke's

second visit must be Paul's second visit; and when we build boldly on

that plain foundation, the history rises before us in order and

symmetry.

But further, it is obvious that Paul appeals with absolute confidence

to this second visit as proving his ease: he evidently conceives that

he has merely to recall the facts to the Galatians in order to make all

clear. Now, there is one situation in which a man is obviously not

receiving from others, and that is when he is actually giving to them:

that was the situation on the second visit according to Luke, and that

explains Paul's confidence in appealing to his second visit.

Again, Paul knew that he had clever and skillful arguers to contend

against. How could he expose himself to the retort that he was missing

out the intermediate visit to Jerusalem? How could he feel confident

that the Galatians, who had already shown themselves so liable to be

deceived by specious arguments, would be able at once to reply to that

obvious retort?

Finally, Paul, as an honest and rational man, could not appeal to the

events of the third visit according to Luke, as proving beyond question

that he received on that occasion no charge from the Apostles. He did

receive a charge then, and he delivered that charge to the Churches.

Why, then, it may be objected, does Paul not mention his third visit?

The answer is obvious. He is engaged in proving that, when he gave his

first message to the Churches of Galatia, he had never received any

charge from the older Apostles. His whole point is: "Cleave to my first

message, which came direct from God: if Silas and I afterwards said

anything inconsistent with that message, we are accursed". The third

visit to Jerusalem did not take place until after the Galatian Churches

were rounded, and therefore it could find no place in the

autobiographical retrospect of I 12-II 10; but it is clearly implied in

the scornful and impetuous sentence, I 8: "Even if Silas and I (as

these emissaries have been telling you), if an angel from heaven,

should preach to you a Gospel contrary to that which we originally

preached to you, a curse be upon us".

After this autobiographical sketch, Paul refers to an instance which

showed very strongly his independence in face of the leading Apostle

Peter, and then passes on to the third and main argument of his

adversaries, rounded on the supposed grades in Christian life. His line

of reply is to bring out in various ways the truth that the Judaistic

form is the lower stage, and the Gospel of freedom which had been

delivered to the Galatians the higher stage. The Law alone was not

sufficient for salvation, inasmuch as Christ had died to supplement its

deficiency; therefore life according to the Law could not be the

highest stage of Christian life. How could the Galatians be so foolish

as to think that, having begun in the Spirit, their higher stage of

development would be in the flesh (III 3)? The Christians who have

entered through the Spirit are the children of the free woman, but the

Judaistic Christians are the children of the bond woman and lower in

rank (IV 31). The latter may rise to be free, but, if the former sink

under bondage to the Law, they sacrifice their Christianity. The

Judaistic Christians are children under care of a pedagogue, who have

to be raised by Christ to the full growth and freedom (III 23-4). In a

variety of other striking and impressive figures the superiority of the

free to the Judaistic Christians is illustrated. It cannot be said that

there is any reasoning or argument: illustrations are used to bring the

Galatians to a clear consciousness of what they have in their own

minds. Argument is too external a process; Paul merely points out to

the Galatians that "they already know".

As a whole, the letter is an eloquent and powerful claim for freedom of

life, freedom of thought, freedom of the individual from external

restrictions and regulations, freedom for all to work out their own

salvation and develop their own nature: "Ye were called for freedom" (V

13). And towards the conclusion this turns to a glorification of love.

Their freedom is freedom to do right, not freedom to do everything;

"the whole Law is fulfilled in one word, even in this: Thou shalt love

thy neighbour as thyself" (V 14). Selfishness, i.e., "the flesh," is

the absolute antithesis of love, i.e., "the Spirit "; and the receiving

of Christ is "crucifying the flesh with the passions thereof" (V 24).

The essence of the true life lies neither in observing the Law nor in

being above the Law, but in building anew one's nature (VI 15).

4. THE DATE OF THE GALATIAN EPISTLE

The date of the Galatian Epistle, though out of chronological order,

may be considered here. The defection of the Galatians occurred shortly

after Paul's second visit (not shortly after his first visit, as

Lightfoot strangely takes it, I 6, p. 42). He spent the summer of 50

among them; and the Judaie emissaries may have come in the summer of 51

or 52. But, amid the sudden changes of plan on his journey, Paul could

not receive many letters from Galatia. Moreover, his epistle seems to

imply the possession of full knowledge, such as could not be gained

from a mere letter: if the Galatians wrote to him, it is most

improbable that they explained their changed attitude and all the

reasons for it. No! Paul's information comes from the personal report

of a trusty messenger; and the obvious suitability of Timothy for the

duty occurs at once to one's mind. Further, it is clear that Timothy

was with Paul during a considerable part of the stay in Corinth, for he

joined in the greeting at the opening of both letters to Thessalonica.

It is therefore hardly possible that he could have gone home, visited

his friends, satisfied himself as to the condition of the Churches, and

returned to Corinth before Paul left that city. Moreover, if Paul heard

at that time, it is not probable that he would have spent so much time

on a voyage to Jerusalem and a visit to Syrian Antioch before visiting

personally the wavering Churches.

We conclude, then, that Timothy went to pay a visit to his friends, not

before the latter part of Paul's stay in Corinth; and, when he found

out the real state of affairs in South Galatia, he went to meet Paul

with the news. Owing to Paul's movements, there are only two places

where Timothy could have met him,--Ephesus and Syrian Antioch. The

former is most unlikely, for, if Timothy left Corinth some months

before Paul, he could have no assurance of meeting him there, where he

merely called in passing. It is probable, then, that he brought his

report to Paul at Syrian Antioch after the fourth visit to Jerusalem

(p. 265). With the entire want of definite evidence, we cannot get

beyond this estimate of probabilities; and it is most likely that

Timothy stayed with Paul during the whole of his residence at Corinth,

sailed with him as far as Ephesus, and landed there in order to go home

on a visit to his friends, while Paul went on to Jerusalem. We shall at

a later stage find that Paul often sent deputies to inspect his

Churches; and their reports often drew forth an Epistle to correct an

erring Church (pp. 275, 284).

In this way, when Paul reached Syrian Antioch, or immediately after he

reached it, at the end of his visit to C�sareia and Jerusalem, he found

Timothy waiting with the disheartening news, in the summer of 53: and

at once he sat down and wrote the letter which has been preserved to

us.

One question remains. Why was Paul content with writing? Why did he not

start at once himself? Personal intervention is always more effective

in such cases. But, in the first place, a letter would certainly travel

faster than Paul could get over the ground; and he would not lose a

moment in letting the Galatians hear what he thought. In the second

place, he could hardly sacrifice the opportunity of reviewing the

Churches in Syria and Cilicia that lay on his way: everywhere he would

be besieged with entreaties to stay for a little, and he could not well

hurry past them without at least a brief stay of one or two days in

each. Finally there are frequently reasons which make it impossible to

hurry away on a serious journey like that from Syria to South Galatia.

Paul was only human.

When Paul wrote the letter he must, on our view, have been intending to

arrive very soon after his letter. It may be asked why he makes no

reference to this intention. But we should rather ask, if, according to

the ordinary view, he were not coming immediately, why he did not make

some explanatory statement of the reasons that compelled him at such a

crisis to be content with a letter and to do without a visit (p. 275

f.). The messenger who carried the letter carried also the news that

Paul was following close after, as fast as his necessary detentions at

Antioch and other cities on the way permitted; and part of the effect

of the letter lay in the fact that the writer was going to be present

in person very soon.

The Epistle to the Galatians, therefore, belongs to A.D. 53, and was

written just when he was starting on his third journey, but before he

had begun that scheme of a general contribution among all his new

Churches which is so prominent in the three following letters, I, II

Cor. and Rom.

To this date one objection may perhaps be urged: in IV 10, Paul asks,

"Are ye observing days and months and seasons and years?" It has been

urged that this implies that the Sabbatical year 54-55 was observed by

the Galatians when the letter was written. But Lightfoot has rightly

rejected this argument: Paul asks in sarcasm: "Are ye observing the

whole series of institutions? are ye taking up anew a ritual like that

of paganism from which you were set free?"

5. THE LATER HISTORY OF THE CHURCHES OF GALATIA

The later history of the churches of Galatia is obscure. They took part

in the contribution raised by the Pauline Churches for the poor

brethren at Jerusalem (p. 286 f.), and were represented in the

delegation that carried it to Jerusalem. Thereafter history ends, and

tradition alone preserves some scraps of information about Antioch,

Iconium and Lystra. Derbe alone is not mentioned either in the

tradition (so far as my knowledge extends) or in the history of the

Church until we come down to A.D. 381, when its bishop Daphnus was

present at the Council of Constantinople. The only hope of further

information about the four Churches lies in arch�ology; but unless the

spade can be brought to supplement the too scanty records that remain

above ground, little can be hoped for. [30]

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

[30] The Christian antiquities of Antioch and Iconium will be discussed

at some length in my Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia. If my dream of

excavating the deserted sites of Derbe and Lystra be ever realised,

they would form the subject of a special treatise.

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

CHAPTER IX.

THE COMING OF LUKE AND THE CALL INTO MACEDONIA

1. ACROSS ASIA.

(XVI 6) AND THEY, HAVING MADE PROGRESS THROUGH THE PHRYGIAN REGION OF

the province GALATIA, AND HAVING BEEN PREVENTED BY THE HOLY SPIRIT FROM

SPEAKING THE WORD IN the Province ASIA, (7) AND HAVING REACHED A POINT

OVER AGAINST MYSIA (or perhaps, on the skirts of Mysia), WERE

ATTEMPTING TO MAKE THEIR WAY INTO the province BITHYNIA; AND THE SPIRIT

OF JESUS SUFFERED THEM NOT; (8) AND, NEGLECTING MYSIA, THEY CAME DOWN

TO the harbour TROAS. (9) AND A VISION APPEARED TO PAUL BY NIGHT: THERE

WAS A CERTAIN MAN, A MACEDONIAN, STANDING, AND EXHORTING HIM AND

SAYING, "COME OVER TO MACEDONIA, AND HELP US". (10) AND WHEN HE SAW THE

VISION, IMMEDIATELY WE SOUGHT TO GO OUT from Asia INTO the province

MACEDONIA, ASSUREDLY GATHERING THAT "GOD HAS SUMMONED US TO BRING THE

GOOD NEWS TO THEM".

Paul and his companions made a missionary progress through the Phrygian

Region of the province Galatia [31] , and then crossed the frontier of

the province Asia: but here they were prevented from preaching, and the

prohibition was made absolute for the entire province. They therefore

kept to the north across Asian Phrygia with the intention of entering

the adjoining Roman province Bithynia; but when they came opposite

Mysia, and were attempting to go out of Asia into Bithynia, the Spirit

of Jesus suffered them not. They therefore kept on towards the west

through Mysia, without preaching in it (as it was part of Asia), until

they came out on its western coast at the great harbour of Alexandria

Troas.

The expression marks clearly the distinction between the prohibition to

preach in Asia, while they were actually in it, and the prohibition

even to set foot in Bithynia. It was necessary for them to cross Asia

in order to fulfill the purpose. for which they were about to be

called.

The geographical facts of this paragraph are stated with great

clearness in the text followed by the Authorised Version and the older

editions; but the reading which they give is rounded on Manuscripts of

an inferior class (while the great MSS. have a different text), and is

characterised by the sequence of three participial clauses, a sequence

almost unique in Luke's writings, and therefore suspected and altered.

But the strange form of construction by a succession of participles

suits so perfectly the strange and unique character, the hurry, and the

deep-lying emotion of the passage (see � 2) that, as Lightfoot's

judgment, Bibl Essays, p. 237,perceived, the inferior MSS. must here be

followed. The text of the great MSS., though it does not quite conceal

the feeling of the passage, yet obscures it a little, and, by

approximating more to Luke's ordinary form of sentence, loses that

perfect adaptation of form to sense, which so often strikes us in this

history. We have already noticed, p. 115, that Luke loves the triple

iteration of successive words or clauses to produce a certain effect in

arresting attention.

The reading of the inferior MSS. suits the South-Galatian theory

admirably; but that fact never weighed with me for a moment in the

choice. As long as the question between the two theories was alone

concerned, the thought of following the inferior MSS. did not even

present itself: I followed the great MSS. and interpreted them in the

best way possible, neither looking aside nor feeling the slightest wish

to adopt the rival text. But when the question of literary feeling came

up, after the delicate adaptation of expression to emotion throughout

Acts gradually revealed itself, it became clear that here the choice

lay between a cast of sentence unusual in this author, and one that was

quite in his ordinary style, in a place where the feeling and the facts

were strange and unique: hesitation was then impossible: the unusual

emotion demanded the unusual expression. [32]

In this passage the distinction observed by Luke between Roman

provincial designations and the older national names is specially

clear. Wherever he mentions districts of mission work, he classifies

according to the existing political (Roman) divisions (as here, the

Phrygo-Galatic Region, Asia, Bithynia, Macedonia); but where he is

simply giving geographical information, he either uses the pre-Roman

names of lands (e.g., Mysia), or omits the land from his narrative.

The "neglecting" of Mysia is a remarkable expression, one of those by

which Luke compels attention at a critical point. As a rule he simply

omits a country where no preaching occurred (p. 90 f.); but here he

accumulates devices to arrest the reader. His effects are always

attained, not by rhetorical devices, but by order and marshalling of

facts; and here, in a missionary tour, the "neglecting" of a great

country is a fact that no one can pass over. Not catching the

intention, many understand "passing without entering" (parelthontes):

Dr. Blass rightly sees that a traveller cannot reach Troas without

crossing Mysia; but he goes on to alter the text, following the Bezan

reading (dielthontes; see p. 235).

The journey across Mysia led naturally down the course of the river

Rhyndacos, and past the south shore of the great lakes. A tradition

that Paul had travelled by the sacred town of the goddess Artemis at

the hot springs of the river Aisepos can be traced as early as the

second century, accompanied with the legend that he had rounded a

chapel in the neighbourhood. If he went down the Rhyndacos, it is

practically certain that he must have passed close to, or through,

Artemaia on his way to the great harbour. Under the influence of this

tradition, the Bezan Reviser changed the text of v. 8, reading "making

a progress through Mysia". But evangelisation on the journey across

Mysia was forbidden, v. 6. The tradition, however, is interesting, and

there is further trace of very early foundations in this quarter, which

will be treated elsewhere.

The rapid sweep of narrative, hurrying on from country to country, is

the marked feature of this paragraph; yet it merely places before us

the facts, as Paul's missionary aims found no opening, and he was

driven on and on. But. on the current North-Galatian theory, this

effect, which is obviously intended, is got, not by simply stating

facts, but by slurring over one of Paul's greatest enterprises, the

evangelisation of North Galatia and the rounding of several Churches in

a new mission district. But the first words of v. 6 describe a progress

marked by no great events, a steady continuance of a process fully

described in the context (p. 72).

2. THE CALL INTO MACEDONIA.

This is in many respects the most remarkable paragraph in Acts. In the

first place the Divine action is introduced three times in four verses,

marking and justifying the new and great step which is made at this

point. In XIII 1-11 also the Divine action is mentioned three times,

leading up to the important development which the author defines as

"opening the door of belief to the Nations"; but in that case there

were only two actual manifestations of the Divine guidance and power.

Here on three distinct occasions the guidance of God was manifested in

three different ways--the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of Jesus, and the

Vision--and the three manifestations all lead up to one end, first

forbidding Paul's purpose of preaching in Asia, then forbidding his

purpose of entering Bithynia, and finally calling him forward into

Macedonia. Now, amid "the multitude of the revelations" (II Cor. XII 7)

granted to Paul, Luke selects only those which have a distinct bearing

on his own purpose as an historian, and omits the vast majority, which

were all important in their influence on Paul's conduct and character.

What is the reason for his insistence in this case?

It is not easy to account on strictly historical grounds for the

emphasis laid on the passage to Macedonia. Lightfoot, in his fine essay

on "the Churches of Macedonia," recognises with his usual insight that

it is necessary to acknowledge and to explain that emphasis; but his

attempt cannot be called successful. As he himself acknowledges, the

narrative gives no ground to think that the passage from Troas to

Philippi was ever thought of by Luke as a passage from Continent to

Continent. A broad distinction between the two opposite sides of the

Hellespont as belonging to two different Continents, had no existence

in the thought of those who lived in the �gean lands, and regarded the

sea as the path connecting the �gean countries with each other; and the

distinction had no more existence in a political point of view, for

Macedonia and Asia were merely two provinces of the Roman Empire,

closely united by common language and character, and divided from the

Latin-speaking provinces further west.

After an inaccurate statement that Macedonia was "the natural highroad

between the East and the West" (the �gean was the real highroad, and

Corinth was "on the way of them that are being slain to God," Church in

R. E., p. 318 f.), Lightfoot finds in Alexander the Great the proof of

the greatness of the step which Luke here records in Paul's work, and

even says that "each successive station at which he halted might have

reminded the Apostle of the great services rendered by Macedonia as the

pioneer of the Gospel!" That is mere riot of pseudo-historical fancy;

and it is hardly possible to believe that Lightfoot ever composed it in

the form and with the suggestion that it has in this essay. This is one

of not a few places in his Biblical Essays in which the expansion of

his own "briefest summary" by the aid of notes of his oral lectures

taken by pupils has not been thoroughly successful. The pages of the

essay amount to a practical demonstration that, on mere grounds of

historical geography alone, one cannot explain the marked emphasis laid

on this new departure.

In the second place, the sweep and rush of the narrative is unique in

Acts: point after point, province after province are hurried over. The

natural development of Paul's work along the great central route of the

Empire was forbidden, and the next alternative that rose in his mind

was forbidden: he was led across Asia from the extreme south-east to

the extreme north-west corner, and yet prevented from preaching in it;

everything seemed dark and perplexing, until at last a vision in Troas

explained the purpose of this strange journey. As before (p. 104), we

cannot but be struck with the fact, that in this paragraph the idea

seems to clothe itself in the natural words, and not to have been

laboriously expressed by a foreign mind. And the origin of the words

becomes clear when we look at the concluding sentence: "immediately we

sought to go forth into Macedonia, assuredly gathering that God has

called us for to preach the Gospel unto them'". The author was with

Paul in Troas; and the intensity of this paragraph is due to his

recollection of the words in which Paul had recounted the vision, and

explained the whole Divine plan that had guided him through his

perplexing wanderings. The words derive their vivid and striking

character from Paul, and they remained indelibly imprinted on Luke's

memory.

3. THE COMING OF LUKE.

The introduction of the first person at this striking point in the

narrative must be intentional. This is no general statement like XIV 22

(though even there the first person has a marked effect, p. 123). Every

one recognises here a distinct assertion that the author was present.

Now the paragraph as a whole is carefully studied, and the sudden

change from third to first person is a telling element in the total

effect: if there is any passage in Acts which can be pressed close, it

is this. It is almost universally recognised that the use of the first

person in the sequel is intentional, marking that the author remained

in Philippi when Paul went on, and that he rejoined the Apostle some

years later on his return to Philippi. We must add that the precise

point at which the first-personal form of narrative begins is also

intentional; for, if Luke changes here at random from third to first

person, it would be absurd to look for purpose in anything he says. The

first person, when used in the narrative of XVI, XX, XXI, XXVII,

XXVIII, marks the companionship of Luke and Paul; and, when we carry

out this principle of interpretation consistently and minutely, it will

prove an instructive guide. This is the nearest approach to personal

reference that Luke permits himself; and he makes it subservient to his

historical purpose by using it as a criterion of personal witness.

Luke, therefore, entered into the drama of the Acts at Troas. Now it is

clear that the coming of Paul to Troas was unforeseen and

unforeseeable; the whole point of the paragraph is that Paul was driven

on against his own judgment and intention to that city. The meeting,

therefore, was not, as has sometimes been maintained, pre-arranged.

Luke entered on the stage of this history at a point, where Paul found

himself he knew not why. On the ordinary principles of interpreting

literature, we must infer that this meeting, which is so skillfully and

so pointedly represented as unforeseen, was between two strangers: Luke

became known to Paul here for the first time. Let us, then, scrutinise

more closely the circumstances. The narrative pointedly brings together

the dream and the introduction of the first-personal element, "when he

saw the vision, straightway we sought to go"; and collocation is

everywhere one of the most telling points in Luke's style.

When we examine the dream, we observe that in it "a certain man of

Macedonia" was seen by Paul. Paul did not infer his Macedonian origin

from his words, but recognised him as a Macedonian by sight. Now, there

was nothing distinctive in the appearance or dress of a Macedonian to

mark him out from the rest of the world. On the contrary, the

Macedonians rather made a point of their claim to be Greeks; and

undoubtedly they dressed in the customary Greek style of the �gean

cities. There was, therefore, only one way in which Paul could know the

man by sight to be a Macedonian--the man in the dream was personally

known to him; and, in fact, the Greek implies that it was a certain

definite person who appeared (aner tis, Latin quidam, very often

followed by the person's name; V 1, VIII 9, IX 10, 33, 36, X 1, etc.).

In the vision, then, a certain Macedonian, who was personally known to

Paul, appeared, and called him over into Macedonia. Now, it has been

generally recognised that Luke must have had some connection with

Philippi; and we shall find reason to think that he had personal

knowledge of the city. Further, Paul, whose life had been spent in the

eastern countries, and who had come so far west only a few days past,

was not likely to be personally acquainted with natives of Macedonia.

The idea then suggests itself at once, that Luke himself was the man

seen in the vision; and, when one reads the paragraph with that idea,

it acquires new meaning and increased beauty. As always, Luke seeks no

effect from artifices of style. He tells nothing but the bare facts in

their simplest form; and leaves the reader to catch the causal

connection between them. But we can imagine how Paul came to Troas in

doubt as to what should be done. As a harbour, it formed the link

between Asia and Macedonia. Here he met the Macedonian Luke; and with

his view turned onwards he slept, and beheld in a vision his Macedonian

acquaintance beckoning him onward to his own country.

Beyond this we cannot penetrate through the veil in which Luke has

enveloped himself. Was he already a Christian, or did he come under the

influence of Christianity through meeting Paul here? for the

prohibition against preaching in Asia would not preclude Paul from

using the opportunity to convert an individual who was brought in

contact with him. No evidence remains; "something sealed the lips of

that evangelist," so far as he himself is concerned. But we have

gathered from the drift of the passage that they met as strangers; and

in that case there can be no doubt where the probability lies. The

inference that they met accidentally as strangers is confirmed by the

fact that Luke was a stranger to the Levant (p. 317). In one of the

many ways in which men come across one another in travelling, they were

brought into contact at Troas: Luke was attracted to Paul; and the

vision was taken by Luke, as well as by Paul, for a sign. He left all,

and followed his master.

All this he suggests to us only by the same kind of delicate and subtle

literary devices, consisting merely in collocation of facts, order of

words, and slight changes of form, by which he suggested the

development of Paul's method and the change in his relation to Barnabas

(p. 82 f.). Luke always expects a great deal from his readers, but some

critics give too little attention to literary effect. These will ask me

for proofs; but proofs there are none. I can only point to the facts:

they that have eyes to see them know; they that have not eyes to see

them will treat this section (and others) as moonstruck fancy. All that

can be said is that, if you read the book carefully, observing these

devices, you recognise a great work; if you don't, and follow your

denial to its logical consequences, you will find only an assortment of

scraps. Probably there will always be those who prefer the scraps.

It is quite in Luke's style to omit to mention that Paul related the

vision to his companions. So also he omitted in XIII 7, 8, to mention

that Paul expounded the doctrine to the proconsul. Luke always expects

a great deal from his readers. But here the Bezan Reviser inserts the

missing detail, as he so often does (e.g., XIII 9).

While there is no authority for the circumstances of the meeting,

conjecture is tempting and perhaps permissible. It will appear that

Luke, though evidently acquainted with Philippi and looking to it as

his city, had no home there. His meeting with Paul, then, did not take

place merely on an excursion from Philippi; and he was probably one of

the many Greeks in all ages who have sought their fortune away from

home. His acquaintance with medicine is certain from the words of Paul

himself, "Luke, the beloved physician" (Col. IV 14), and from the cast

of his language in many places; [33] and it is quite natural and

probable that the meeting might have been sought by Paul on that

account, if Luke was resident in Troas and well known there.

4. THE ENTRANCE INTO MACEDONIA.

(XVI 1l) WE SET SAIL THEN FROM TROAS, AND MADE A STRAIGHT RUN TO

SAMOTHRACE; AND THE DAY FOLLOWING we came TO the harbour NEAPOLIS, (12)

AND THENCE TO PHILIPPI, WHICH IS THE LEADING CITY OF ITS DIVISION OF

MACEDONIA, AND having the rank of A ROMAN COLONY: AND WE WERE IN THIS

CITY TARRYING CERTAIN DAYS.

It is remarkable with what interest Luke records the incidents from

harbour to harbour. He has the true Greek feeling for the sea, a

feeling that must develop in every race possessing any capacity for

development, and any sensitiveness to the influences of nature, when

settled round the �gean coasts; for the �gean sea is so tempting, with

its regular winds and regular sunset calm, when the water lies dead,

with a surface which looks like oil, dense and glistening and dark,

that it seems to invite one to walk upon it.

To a certain extent the wealth of maritime details might be accounted

for by the loving interest with which Luke dwelt on his journeys in

company with Paul; but caution that the author recognises as needful.

this does not fully explain the facts. Every one who compares Luke's

account of the journey from C�sareia to Jerusalem (which might be

expected to live in his memory beyond others), or from Puteoli to Rome,

with his account of any of the voyages, must be struck by the

difference between the scanty matter-of-fact details in the land

journeys, and the love that notes the voyage, the winds, the runs, the

appearance of the shores, Cyprus rising out of the sea, the Cretan

coast close in by the ship's side, the mountains towering above it from

which the blast strikes down. At the same time, it is quite clear that,

though he reported nautical matters with accuracy, he was not a trained

and practised sailor. His interest for the sea sprang from his natural

and national character, and not from his occupation.

Philippi was an inland city, and Neapolis was its harbour. Having once

mentioned the port, Luke leaves it to be understood in XX 6. As usual,

Paul goes on to the great city, and does not preach in the port (cp.

XIV 26, XVIII 18).

The description of the dignity and rank of Philippi is unique in Acts;

nor can it be explained as strictly requisite for the historian's

proper purpose. Here again the explanation lies in the character of the

author, who was specially interested in Philippi, and had the true

Greek pride in his own city. Perhaps he even exaggerates a little the

dignity of Philippi, which was still only in process of growth, to

become at a later date the great city of its division. Of old

Amphipolis had been the chief city of the division, to which both

belonged. Afterwards Philippi quite outstripped its rival; but it was

at that time in such a position, that Amphipolis was ranked first by

general consent, Philippi first by its own consent. These cases of

rivalry between two or even three cities for the dignity and title of

"First" are familiar to every student of the history of the Greek

cities; and though no other evidence is known to show that Philippi had

as yet began to claim the title, yet this single passage is conclusive.

The descriptive phrase is like a lightning flash amid the darkness of

local history, revealing in startling clearness the whole situation to

those whose eyes are trained to catch the character of Greek

city-history and city-jealousies.

It is an interesting fact that Luke, who hides himself so completely in

his history, cannot hide his local feeling; and there every one who

knows the Greek people recognises the true Greek! There lies the

strength, and also the weakness, of the Greek peoples; and that quality

beyond all others has determined their history, has given them their

strength against the foreigner, and their weakness as a united country.

Nationality is more conspicuous in the foibles and weaknesses of

mankind, whereas great virtues and great vices have a common character

in all nations. Luke shows himself the Greek when he talks of the

Maltese as "the barbarians"; when he regards the journey to Jerusalem

as a journey and nothing more; when he misrepresents the force of a

Latin word (p. 225); when he is blind to the true character of the

Roman name (the tria nomina); when he catches with such appreciation

and such ease the character of Paul's surroundings in Athens. His

hatred of the Jews and his obvious inability to feel the slightest

sympathy for their attitude towards Paul, are also Greek. On the other

hand, his touches of quiet humour are perhaps less characteristically

Greek; but he was not the old Greek of the classical period: he was the

Greek of his own age, when Greece had been for centuries a power in

Asia; when Macedonia had long been the leading Greek country; when

Stoicism and Epicureanism were the representative philosophies (XVII

18);and when the Greek language was the recognised speech of many

eastern Roman provinces, along with the Latin itself. To appreciate

Luke, we must study the modern Greek, as well as the Greek of the great

age of freedom.

I know that all such mundane characteristics are commonly considered to

be non-existent in "the early Christian"! But an "early Christian" did

not cease to be a man, and a citizen. Christianity has not taught men

to retire from society and from life; and least of all did Pauline

Christianity teach that lesson. It has impressed on men the duty of

living their life better, of striving to mould and to influence society

around them, and of doing their best in the position. in which they

were placed. When Luke became a Christian, he continued to be a Greek,

and perhaps became even more intensely a Greek, as his whole life

became more intense and more unselfish. It is a complete and ruinous

error for the historical student to suppose that Luke broke with all

his old thoughts, and habits, and feelings, and friends, when he was

converted. He lived in externals much as before; he observed the same

laws of politeness and good breeding in society (if he followed Paul's

instructions); his house, his surroundings, continued much the same; he

kept up the same family names; and, when he died, his grave, his

tombstone, and his epitaph, were in the ordinary style. It took

centuries for Christianity to disengage itself from its surroundings,

and to remake society and the rules of life. Yet one rarely finds among

modern historians of Christianity in the first two centuries of its

growth, any one who does not show a misconception on this point; and

the climax, perhaps, is reached in one of the arguments by which Dr.

Ficker attempts to disprove the Christian character of the epitaph of

the Phrygian second-century saint, Avircius Marcellus, on the ground

that a Christian epitaph would not be engraved on an attar. I presume

his point is that the altar-shaped form of tombstone was avoided by the

Christians of that time, because it was connected with the pagan

worship. But a Pauline Christian would hold that "a gravestone will not

commend us to God; neither, if we use it not, are we the worse, nor if

we use it, are we the better" (I Cor. VIII 8); and Avircius Marcellus

mentions Paul, and Paul alone among the Apostles, in his epitaph. In

fact, almost all the early Christian epitaphs at Eumeneia are engraved

on altars, because there that shape was fashionable; whereas at Apameia

they are rarely on altars, because there that shape was not in such

common use.

Our view that the author of Acts was a Macedonian does not agree with a

tradition (which was believed to occur in Eusebius, see p. 389) that

Luke was an Antiochian. The modern authorities who consider this

tradition to be rounded on a confusion between Lucas and Lucius, an

official of the Antiochian Church (XIII 1), seem to have strong

probability on their side. The form Lueas may very well be a vulgarism

for Lucius; but, except the name, these two persons have nothing in

common. The name Lucas is of most obscure origin: it may be a shortened

form of Lucius, or Lucilius, or Lucianus, or Lucanus, or of some Greek

compound name. The Latin names, Lucius, Lucilius, etc., were spelt in

earlier Greek Leukios, in later Greek Loukios; and the change may

roughly be dated about A.D. 50-75, though Leukios in some rare cases

occurs later, and possibly Loukios sometimes earlier. It is noteworthy

that Loukas has the later form.

The Bezan "we" in XI 28 will satisfy those who consider the Bezan Text

to be Lukan; but to us it appears to condemn the Bezan Text as of

non-Lukan origin. The warmth of feeling, which breathes through all

parts of Acts dealing with the strictly Greek world, is in striking

contrast with the cold and strictly historical tone of the few brief

references to Syrian Antioch. If the author of Acts was a native bred

up in Antioch, then we should have to infer that there lay behind him

an older author, whose work he adapted with little change. But our view

is that the Reviser had an Antiochian connection, and betrays it in

that insertion, which to him recorded a historical fact, but to us

seems legend in an early stage of growth.

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

[31] ten Phrugian kai Galatiken choran. The use of kai to connect two

epithets of the same person or place is regular in Greek (so Saulos ho

kai Paulos, Saul alias Paul); e.g., Strabo speaks of a mouth of the

Nile as to Kanobikon kai herakleotikon, the mouth which is called by

both names, Canopic and Heracleotic, where we should say, "the Canopic

or Heracleotic mouth". I need not dwell on such an elementary point.

Another point of Greek construction comes up in XVIII 23: when a list

is given in Greek, the items of which are designated by adjectives with

the same noun, the regular order is to use the noun with the first

alone. Strabo has numberless examples: 767, ton parakeimenon Arabion

ethnon Nabataion te kai Chaulotopaion kai Agraion; 751, ho Arkeuthes

potamos kai ho Orontes kai ho Labotas; 802, to Mendesion stoma kai to

Tanitikon (there are some interesting and delicate examples in Strabo,

on which we cannot here dwell, of the distinction between the double

epithet and the double item); Herodotus, II 17, to de Bolbitinon stoma

kai to Boukolikon and so Luke groups two Regiones as ten Galatiken

choran kai Phrugian, XVIII 23. The North-Galatian theorists insist that

Phrugian in XVI 6 must be a substantive; but they have not quoted any

case in which a noun with its adjective is coupled anarthrously by kai

to a preceding noun with the article. Dr. Chase quoted Luke III 1, tes

Itouraias kai Trachonitidos choras; but the case tells against him, for

Luke's intention to use Itouraias here as an adjective is proved by the

following reasons:-- (1) Eusebius and Jerome repeatedly interpret Luke

III 1 in that way (see Expositor, Jan. 1894, p. 52; April, p. 289). (2)

Itouraia is never used as a noun by the ancients, but is pointedly

avoided, even where he Itouraion was awkward: the reason was that

Itoupaia, as a noun, would indicate a political entity, whereas the

Itur�i were a wandering nomadic race, who had not a definite and

organised country. As my other reasons have been disputed, I do not

append them here; though I consider them unshaken. [Mr. Arnold's

attempt to find one instance of Itoupaia as a noun in Appian seems to

refute itself, Engl. Hist Rev., 1895, p. 553.]

[32] dielthon ten Ph. k. G. chopan koluthentes. Many are likely to rest

on the authority of the great MSS., and prefer this reading. It may be

understood, by an ellipse common in Greek, "they made a missionary

progress through the Phrygian land, viz., the Galatic part of it,

inasmuch as they were prevented from preaching in Asia, and could not,

therefore, do missionary work in the Asian part of it". But, if this

were the writing of Luke, I should prefer to hold that he meant

dielthon kai ekoluthesan, using a construction which he has in (1)

XXIII 35 ephe keleusas he said, "I will hear thee, when thy accusers

arrive," and ordered him to be imprisoned: (2) XXV 13 katentesan

aspasamenoi "they arrived at C�sareia and paid their respects to

Festus": (3) XVII 26 epoiesen ex henos, horisas "he made all nations of

one blood, and assigned to them limits and bounds" (here the unity of

all nations is the initial idea, and the fixing of limits and

distinctions is later). Blass, who thus explains XXIII 35, gives in his

preface, p. 20, many examples of the present infinitive used in the

same way (XVIII 23 exelthn dierchomenos he went forth and made a

progress through the Galatic Region, cp. VI 9 anestesan sunzetountes

they rose up and disputed with Stephen, VI 11 hupebalon andras legontas

they suborned men which said [also VI 13], VIII 10 proseichon legontes

they hearkened and said, V. 36 aneste legon he stood up and said, VIII

18, XlV 22, etc.); and he accepts and prints in his text the reading of

inferior authority in XXVIII 14 pareklethemen par autois, etimeinantes

we were cheered among them, and remained seven days. The usage is

common in Paul. The use of aorist or present participle corresponds to

the tense which would be used if the sentence were constructed in the

fuller fashion, ephe kai ekeleusen but exelthen kai diercheto (Blass

differs in regard to XXI 16, which he says = sunelthon kai egagon).

[33] Hobart, The Medical Language of St. Luke, a work which has to be

used with the caution that the author recognises as needful.

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

CHAPTER X.

THE CHURCHES OF MACEDONIA

1. PHILIPPI.

(XVI 13) ON THE SABBATH DAY WE WENT FORTH WITHOUT THE GATE BY THE RIVER

SIDE, WHERE THERE WAS WONT TO BE HELD A MEETING FOR PRAYER; AND WE SAT

DOWN, AND SPARE UNTO THE WOMEN THAT CAME TOGETHER. (14) AND A CERTAIN

WOMAN NAMED LYDIA, A SELLER OF PURPLE, OF THE CITY OF THYATIRA, A

GOD-FEARING proselyte WAS A HEARER; AND THE LORD OPENED HER HEART TO

GIVE HEED UNTO THE THINGS THAT WERE SPOKEN BY PAUL. (15) AND WHEN SHE

WAS BAPTISED AND HER HOUSEHOLD, SHE BESOUGHT US, SAYING, "IF YE HAVE

JUDGED ME TO BE. FAITHFUL TO THE LORD, COME INTO MY HOUSE AND ABIDE

THERE"; AND SHE CONSTRAINED US.

The omission of the article before the word "river" (potamon) is one of

the touches of familiarity which show the hand of one who knew Philippi

well. As we say "I'm going to town," the Greeks omitted the article

with familiar and frequently mentioned places or things. In this phrase

the commentators in general seem to understand that the Greek words

mean "along a river," which is the form of expression that a complete

stranger might use about a city and a river that he had only heard of.

The text of the next clause is uncertain; but we hold that the

Authorised Version is right, following the inferior MSS. [34] On the

first Sabbath they went along the river-bank to the regular place where

the Jews in Philippi, and those non-Jews who had been attracted to

Jewish customs, were wont to meet in prayer. There seems to have been

no proper synagogue, which shows that the Jewish community was very

small; and in the rest of the narrative no Jew is mentioned.

Lydia, the Thyatiran woman, settled at Philippi, is an interesting

person in many respects. Thyatira, like the Lydian land in general, was

famous for its dyeing; and its guild of dyers is known from the

inscriptions. Lydia sold the purple dyed garments from Thyatira in

Philippi; and she had, no doubt, a regular connection with a firm in

her native city, whose agent she was. In ancient time many kinds of

garments were woven in their perfect shape; and there was much less

cutting and sewing of cloth than at the present day. Lydia, of course,

sold also the less expensive kinds of garments; but she takes her

trade-name from the finest class of her wares, indicating that she was

a first-class dealer. She must have possessed a considerable amount of

capital to trade in such articles. As her husband is not mentioned, and

she was a householder, she was probably a widow; and she may be taken

as an ordinary example of the freedom with which women lived and worked

both in Asia Minor and in Macedonia.

Lydia had probably become addicted to Jewish religious practices in her

native city. There had been a Jewish colony planted in Thyatira, which

had exercised considerable influence on the city; and a hybrid sort of

worship had been developed, half Jewish, half pagan, which is called in

Revelation II 20, "the woman Jezebel". [35]

It is not to be inferred that Lydia and her household were baptised on

the first Sabbath. A certain interval must be admitted in v. 14, which

shows Luke's looseness about time. Lydia was present on the first

Sabbath, and became a regular hearer; and finally her entire household

came over with her.

2. THE VENTRILOQUIST.

(XVI 16) AND IT CAME TO PASS, AS WE WERE GOING TO THE PLACE OF PRAYER,

THAT A CERTAIN SLAVE-GIRL, POSSESSED OF A SPIRIT PYTHON, i.e., a

ventriloquist, MET US, WHICH BROUGHT HER MASTERS MUCH GAIN BY

SOOTHSAYING. (17) THE SAME, FOLLOWING AFTER PAUL AND US, KEPT CRYING

OUT SAYING, "THESE MEN ARE THE SLAVES OF THE GOD THE HIGHEST, WHICH

ANNOUNCE TO YOU THE WAY OF SAFETY ". (18) AND THIS SHE DID FOR MANY

DAYS. BUT PAUL, BEING SORE TROUBLED, TURNED AND SAID TO THE SPIRIT, "I

CHARGE THEE IN THE NAME OF JESUS THE ANOINTED TO GO OUT FROM HER"; AND

IT WENT OUT THAT VERY MOMENT.

The idea was universally entertained that ventriloquism was due to

superhuman influence, and implied the power of foretelling the future.

The girl herself believed this; and in her belief lay her power. Her

words need not be taken as a witness to Christianity. "God the Highest"

was a wide-spread pagan expression, and "salvation" was the object of

many vows and prayers to that and other gods. We need not ask too

curiously what was her motive in thus calling out at Paul's company. In

such a case there is no distinct motive; for it is a poor and false

view, and one that shows utter incapacity to gauge human nature, that

the girl was a mere impostor. That her mind became distorted and

diseased by her belief in her supernatural possession, is certain; but

it became thereby all the more acute in certain perceptions and

intuitions. With her sensitive nature, she became at once alive to the

moral influence, which the intense faith by which the strangers were

possessed gave them, and she must say what she felt without any

definite idea of result therefrom; for the immediate utterance of her

intuitions was the secret of her power. She saw in Paul what the

populace at Pisidian Antioch saw in Thekla, "a devotee, bound by some

unusual conditions, an inspired servant of the God,' who differed from

the usual type" of "God-driven" devotees.

When Paul turned on her, and ordered the spirit to come forth from her

in the name of his Master, the girl, who had been assiduously declaring

that Paul and his companions were God-possessed, and fully believed it,

was utterly disconcerted, and lost her faith in herself and with it her

power. When next she tried to speak as she had formerly done, she was

unable to do so; and in a few days it became apparent that she had lost

her power. Along with her power, her hold on the superstitions of the

populace disappeared; and people ceased to come to her to have their

fortunes read, to get help in finding things they had lost, and so on.

Thus the comfortable income that she had earned for her owners was

lost; and these, knowing who had done the mischief, sought revenge.

This was by no means a rare motive for the outbreak of persecution

against the Church in later time; and at this stage, when Christianity

was an unknown religion, it was only through its interference with the

profits of any individual or any class (p. 277) that it was likely to

arouse opposition among the pagans.

3. ACCUSATION AND CONDEMNATION IN PHILIPPI.

(XVI 19) BUT, WHEN HER MASTERS SAW THAT THEIR HOPE OF GAIN HAD

DEPARTED, THEY SEIZED PAUL AND SILAS [AND DRAGGED THEM INTO THE AGORA

BEFORE THE MAGISTRATES], (20) [AND BRINGING THEM TO THE PRESENCE OF THE

PR�TORS], THEY SAID, "THESE MEN DO EXCEEDINGLY DISTURB OUR CITY, JEWS

AS THEY ARE, (21) AND RECOMMEND CUSTOMS, WHICH IT IS ILLEGAL FOR US TO

RECEIVE OR TO OBSERVE, AS WE ARE ROMANS". (22) AND THE POPULACE ROSE IN

A BODY AGAINST THEM; AND THE PR�TORS, RENDING THEIR GARMENTS in horror,

BADE the lictors BEAT THEM, (23) AND WHEN THEY HAD LAID MANY STRIPES ON

THEM, THEY CAST THEM INTO PRISON, CHARGING THE JAILOR TO KEEP THEM

SAFELY: (24) AND HE HAVING RECEIVED SUCH A CHARGE, CAST THEM INTO THE

INNER PRISON, AND MADE THEIR FEET FAST IN THE STOCKS.

It is hardly possible that vv. 19, 20 have the final form that the

writer would have given them. The expression halts between the Greek

form and the Latin, between the ordinary Greek term for the supreme

board of magistrates in any city (archontes), and the popular Latin

designation (strategoi, pr�tores), as if the author had not quite made

up his mind which he should employ. Either of the clauses bracketed is

sufficient in itself; and it is hardly possible that a writer, whose

expression is so concise, should have intended to leave in his text two

clauses which say exactly the same thing.

The title Pr�tors was not technically accurate, but was frequently

employed as a courtesy title for the supreme magistrates of a Roman

colony; and, as usual, Luke moves on the plane of educated conversation

in such matters, and not on the plane of rigid technical accuracy. He

writes as the scene was enacted.

It is impossible and unnecessary to determine whether the slave-girl's

owners were actually Roman citizens. They speak here as representatives

of the general population. The actual coloni planted here by Augustus

when he rounded the colony, were probably far outnumbered by the Greek

population (incol�); and it is clear that in the colonies of the

Eastern provinces, any Italian coloni soon melted into the mass of the

population, and lost most of their distinctive character, and probably

forgot even their language. The exact legal relation of the native

Greek population to the Roman coloni is uncertain; but it is certain

that the former occupied some kind of intermediate position between

ordinary provincials and Romans or Latins (when the colony was a Latin

colony like Antioch). These colonies were one of the means whereby Rome

sought to introduce the Roman spirit and feeling into the provinces, to

romanise them; and the accusation lodged against Paul, with the whole

scene that followed, are a proof, in this vivid photographic picture,

that the population prided themselves on their Roman character and

actually called themselves Romans, as they called their magistrates

Pr�tors.

Paul on other occasions claimed his right of citizen ship; why not

here? It is evident that the Pr�tors made a great to-do over this case:

they regarded it as a case of treason, or, as it was termed in Greek,

"impiety" (asebeia), rent their clothes in loyal horror, with the

fussy, consequential airs that Horace satirises in the would-be Pr�tor

of a country town (Sat. I 5, 34): the fabric of the Empire was shaken

to its foundations by this disgraceful conduct of the accused persons;

but the Pr�tors of Philippi stood firm, and the populace rose as one

man, like true Romans, to defend their country against her insidious

enemies. In such a scene what chance was there that Paul's protest

should be listened to? Perhaps it was made and not listened to, since

the whole proceedings were so disorderly and irregular.

The first person ceases at this point; the author was not arrested, and

therefore could not speak in the first person of what happened in the

prison. He did not accompany Paul further; but remained at Philippi as

his headquarters, till Paul returned there, XX 6, when the first person

is resumed. It is only natural to understand that he was left in

Philippi, because of his obvious suitability for the work of

evangelising that city; and his success was so striking that his

"praise in the preaching of the good news was through all the

Churches," II Cor. VIII 18 (a passage which is understood by early

tradition as referring to Luke). At the same time it is clear that he

had not been a householder in Philippi previously, for he went with

Paul to enjoy Lydia's hospitality.

4. THE PRISON AND THE EARTHQUAKE.

(XVI 25) BUT ABOUT MIDNIGHT PAUL AND SILAS WERE PRAYING AND SINGING

HYMNS UNTO GOD, AND THE PRISONERS WERE LISTENING TO THEM; (26) AND

SUDDENLY THERE WAS A GREAT EARTHQUAKE, SO THAT THE FOUNDATIONS OF THE

PRISON-HOUSE WERE SHAKEN; AND IMMEDIATELY ALL THE DOORS WERE OPENED;

AND EVERY ONE'S FETTERS WERE SHAKEN OUT. (27) AND THE JAILOR, BEING

ROUSED FROM SLEEP, AND SEEING THE PRISON-DOORS OPEN, DREW HIS SWORD,

AND WAS ABOUT TO KILL HIMSELF, CONSIDERING THAT THE PRISONERS HAD

ESCAPED. (28) BUT PAUL CRIED OUT WITH A LOUD VOICE, "DO THYSELF NO

HARM, FOR WE ARE ALL HERE ". (29) AND CALLING FOR LIGHTS, HE RAN

HASTILY IN, AND TREMBLING FOR FEAR THREW HIMSELF BEFORE PAUL AND SILAS,

(30) AND BROUGHT THEM OUT [WHEN HE HAD MADE THE REST FAST], AND SAID,

"SIRS! WHAT MUST I DO TO BE SAVED?" (31) AND THEY SAID, "BELIEVE ON THE

LORD JESUS, AND THOU SHALT BE SAVED, THOU AND THY HOUSE". (32) AND THEY

SPAKE THE WORD OF THE LORD TO HIM, WITH ALL THAT WERE IN HIS HOUSE.

(33) AND HE TOOK THEM AT THAT HOUR OF THE NIGHT AND WASHED THEM OF

THEIR STRIPES; AND WAS BAPTISED, HE AND ALL HIS IMMEDIATELY. (34) AND

HE BROUGHT THEM UP INTO HIS HOUSE, AND SET MEAT BEFORE THEM, AND

REJOICED GREATLY, WITH ALL HIS HOUSE, HAVING CONCEIVED FAITH IN GOD.

There are several difficulties which occur to every one on first

reading this passage. (1) The opening of the doors and the undoing of

the bonds by the earthquake seem incredible to one who thinks of doors

like those in our prisons and of handcuffed prisoners. But any one that

has seen a Turkish prison will not wonder that the doors were thrown

open: each door was merely closed by a bar, and the earthquake, as it

passed along the ground, forced the door posts apart from each other,

so that the bar slipped from its hold, and the door swung open. The

prisoners were fastened to the wall or in wooden stocks, v. 24; and the

chains and stocks were detached from the wall, which was shaken so that

spaces gaped between the stones. In the great earthquakes of 1880 at

Smyrna, and 1881 at Scio, I had the opportunity of seeing and hearing

of the strangely capricious action of an earthquake, which behaves

sometimes like a playful, good-natured sprite, when it spares its full

terrors.

(2) Why did not the prisoners run away when their fetters were loosed?

The question is natural to those who are familiar with the northern

races, and their self-centred tenacity of purpose and presence of mind.

An earthquake strikes panic into the semi-oriental mob in the �gean

lands; and it seems to me quite natural that the prisoners made no dash

for safety when the opportunity was afforded them. Moreover, they were

still only partially free; and they had only a moment for action. The

jailor was also roused by the earthquake, and came to the outer door;

he was perhaps a soldier, or at least had something of Roman

discipline, giving him presence of mind; his call for lights brought

the body of diogmitai or other class of police who helped to guard the

prisoners; and the opportunity was lost.

(3) It was midnight, and the jailor had to call for lights: how could

Paul from the inner prison see that the jailor was going to kill

himself? We must understand that the inner prison was a small cell,

which had no window and no opening, except into the outer and larger

prison, and that the outer prison, also, had one larger door in the

opposite wall; then, if there were any faint starlight in the sky,

still more if the moon were up, a person in the outer doorway would be

distinguishable to one whose eyes were accustomed to the darkness, but

the jailor would see only black darkness in the prison.

The jailor was responsible with his life for the safety of his

prisoners; and, concluding from the sight of the open door that they

had managed to set themselves free, and open the door, and escape, he

preferred death by his own hand, to exposure, disgrace, and a

dishonourable death.

The Bezan Text preserves in v. 30 a little detail, which is so

suggestive of the orderly well-disciplined character of the jailor,

that we are prompted to accept it as genuine. The jailor first attended

to his proper work, and secured all his prisoners; and thereafter he

attended to Paul and Silas, and brought them forth. It seems highly

improbable that a Christian in later time would insert the gloss that

the jailor looked after his prisoners before he cared for his

salvation; it is more in the spirit of a later age to be offended with

the statement that the jailor did so, and to cut it out. In his

subsequent action to Paul and Silas, the jailor was not acting

illegally. He was responsible for producing his prisoners when called

for; but it was left to himself to keep them as he thought best.

5. RELEASE AND DEPARTURE FROM PHILIPPI.

(XVI 35) AND WHEN DAY WAS COME THE PR�TORS SENT THE LICTORS, WITH THE

MESSAGE to the jailor: "LET THOSE MEN GO". (36) AND THE JAILOR REPORTED

THE MESSAGE TO PAUL THAT "THE PR�TORS HAVE SENT orders THAT YOU BE SET

FREE. NOW, THEREFORE, GO FORTH AND TAKE YOUR WAY IN PEACE]" (37) BUT

PAUL SAID UNTO THEM: "THEY FLOGGED US IN PUBLIC without investigation,

ROMAN CITIZENS AS WE ARE, AND CAST US INTO PRISON; AND NOW DO THEY TURN

US OUT SECRETLY? NOT SO; BUT LET THEM COME IN PERSON AND BRING US OUT."

(38) AND THE LICTORS REPORTED TO THE PR�TORS THESE WORDS; AND THEY WERE

TERRIFIED ON HEARING THAT "THEY ARE ROMAN CITIZENS"; (39) AND THEY WENT

AND BESOUGHT THEM, AND BROUGHT THEM OUT, AND ASKED THEM TO GO AWAY FROM

THE CITY. (40) AND THEY WENT OUT FROM THE PRISON AND ENTERED INTO

LYDIA'S HOUSE; AND THEY SAW AND EXHORTED THE BRETHREN, AND WENT AWAY.

The sudden change of attitude on the part of the Pr�tors is remarkable.

One day they sent the prisoners for careful custody: the next morning

they send to release them. The Bezan Reviser felt the inconsequence,

and inserts an explanation: "And when day was come the Pr�tors

[assembled together in the agora, and remembering the earthquake that

had taken place, they were afraid, and] sent the lictors". But, though

this is modelled on Luke's language (cp. I 15, etc.), it is hardly in

his style of narrative. It is more characteristic of him to give no

explanation, but simply to tell the facts. Perhaps the earthquake had

roused their superstitious fears on account of the irregular and

arbitrary proceedings of yesterday. Perhaps they felt some misgivings

about their action. if we are right in thinking that Paul and Silas had

appealed vainly to their rights as Romans.

Whatever be the reason, there can be no mistake as to Luke's intention

to bring out the contrast (1) between the orders sent to the jailor in

the morning, and the charge given to him at night; (2) between the

humble apology of the Pr�tors in the morning, and their haughty action

on the previous day; (3) between the real fact, that the Pr�tors had

trampled on Roman order and right, and their fussy pretense of

vindicating the majesty of Rome. And so the same Pr�tors who had

ordered them to be beaten and imprisoned now begged them to go away

from the city. In the Bezan Text the request of the Pr�tors is put at

greater length, and with obvious truth: "the magistrates, being afraid

lest there should be another conspiracy against Paul, and distrusting

their own ability to keep order, said, Go forth from this city, lest

they, again make a riot and inveigh loudly against you to us' ". The

weakness of municipal government in the cities of the �gean lands was

always a danger to order; and the Bezan Text hits off admirably the

situation, and brings out with much skill the naive desire of the

magistrates to avoid an unpleasant ease by inducing the innocent and

weaker parties to submit to injustice and withdraw from the city. One

would gladly think this Lukan.

In v. 37 the rendering (A.V. and R.V.) "uncondemned" does not fairly

represent Paul's meaning, for it suggests that it would have been

allowable for the Pr�tors to condemn Paul after fair trial to be

flogged. But the Pr�tors could not in any circumstances order him to be

flogged; in fact, formal trial would only aggravate their crime, as

making it more deliberate. The crime might be palliated by pleading

that it was done in ignorance: and Paul would naturally cut away the

plea by saying that they had made no attempt to investigate the facts.

Yet the Greek is clear, and can only be translated "uncondemned". A

parallel case occurs XXII 25, where Paul asks the centurion: "is it

lawful for you to flog a man that is a Roman citizen, and him

uncondemned?" Here there is the same false implication that the act

would be aggravated by being done without the proper formal

condemnation.

Yet Paul, as a Roman citizen, must have known his rights; and it seems

clear that he could not have used the exact words which Luke reports.

Now, when we consider the facts, we see that it must be so. No civis

Romanus would claim his rights in Greek; the very idea is ludicrous.

Paul claimed them in the Roman tongue; and we may fairly understand

that the officials of a Roman colony were expected to understand Latin;

for the official language even of far less important colonies in Asia

Minor was Latin. The phrase which Paul used was most probably re

incognita, "without investigating our case". Luke, however, had the

true Greek inability to sympathise with the delicacies of Roman usage,

and. translates the Latin by a term, which would in some circumstances

be a fair representative, but not here, nor in XXII 25.

The whole residence of Paul at Philippi seems to have been short: it is

defined by Luke as being "for certain days," and apparently not much

seems to have been accomplished before the incident of the

ventriloquist and the resulting imprisonment. If the party was at Troas

in October A.D. 50, they probably left Philippi before the end of the

year. It seems probable from v. 40 that there were some other

Christians besides those in Lydia's house. It is, however, remarkable

that Luke makes no explicit reference to any other converts.

Doubtless, before Paul left, the question was discussed what should be

his next centre; and Thessalonica was suggested, probably on account of

its Jewish settlers, whose synagogue offered a good opening for work.

The directions which were given the travellers at starting were to make

their way along the Roman road through Amphipolis and Apollonia to

Thessalonica (XVII 1, where diodeusantes is the verb, hodos denoting

the Roman road).

6. THESSALONICA.

(XVII 1) AND THEY WENT ALONG THE Roman ROAD THROUGH AMPHIPOLIS AND

APOLLONIA, AND CAME TO THESSALONICA, WHERE WAS A SYNAGOGUE OF THE JEWS.

(2) AND, AS WAS CUSTOMARY WITH PAUL, HE WENT IN TO ADDRESS THEM, AND

FOR THREE SABBATHS HE REASONED WITH THEM FROM THE SCRIPTURES, (3)

OPENING THEIR MEANING, AND QUOTING TO PROVE THAT IT WAS PROPER THAT THE

ANOINTED ONE SHOULD SUFFER AND RISE AGAIN FROM THE DEAD, AND THAT "THE

ANOINTED ONE IS THIS man, THE very JESUS WHOM I AM PROCLAIMING TO YOU".

(4) AND SOME OF THEM WERE PERSUADED; AND THERE WERE IN ADDITION

GATHERED TO PAUL AND SILAS MANY OF THE GOD-FEARING proselytes, AND A

GREAT MULTITUDE OF THE GREEKS, AND OF THE LEADING WOMEN NOT A FEW. [36]

This passage is full of difficulty both in text and in interpretation.

Our text, agreeing with many MSS. and Versions, recognises three

classes of hearers besides the Jews; whereas the Approved Text, resting

on the great MSS., unites the "God-fearing" and "the Greeks" into the

single class "God-fearing Greeks". In this case many reasons combine to

show the error of the latter reading, and the falseness of the

principle that has led Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort, and others to

set almost boundless confidence in those MSS. [37]

In v. 4 Paul goes on to a wider sphere of influence than the circle of

the synagogue; and a lapse of time is implied in the extension of his

work over the general population of the city (called here by the

strictly correct term, Hellenes). Between the two opposite groups, the

Jews and the Hellenes, there is interposed the intermediate class of

God-fearing proselytes; and there is added as a climax a group of noble

ladies of the city. In Macedonia, as in Asia Minor, women occupied a

much freer and more influential position than in Athens; and it is in

conformity with the known facts that such prominence is assigned to

them in the three Macedonian cities.

In this journey a more pointed distinction than before between the

short period of synagogue work, and the longer period of general work,

may be noticed. The three Sabbaths of v. 2 must be taken as the entire

period of work within the circle of the synagogue; and the precise

statement of time may also be taken as an indication that the usual

quarrel with the Jews took place earlier at Thessalonica than in former

cases.

That a considerable time was spent in the wider work is proved both by

its success, and by the language of I Thess. I, II, which cannot

reasonably refer only to work in the synagogue or to a short missionary

work among the general population. Paul clearly refers to a long and

very successful work in Thessalonica. His eagerness to return, and his

chafing at the ingenious obstacle preventing him, are explained by his

success: he was always eager to take advantage of a good opening.

Further Paul mentions that the Philippians, IV 16, "sent once and again

unto my need in Thessalonica". It is reasonable to think that some

interval elapsed between the gifts (especially as Paul had to work to

maintain himself, I Thess. II 9). Dec. 50-May 51 seems a probable

estimate of the residence in Thessalonica.

7. THE RIOT AT THESSALONICA.

(XVII 5) AND THE JEWS BECAME JEALOUS; AND WITH SOME WORTHLESS

ASSOCIATES OF THE LOWER ORDERS THEY GATHERED A MOB AND MADE A RIOT;

AND, ASSAULTING THE HOUSE OF JASON, THEY SOUGHT TO BRING Paul and Silas

BEFORE A PUBLIC MEETING. (6) AND WHEN THEY FOUND THEM NOT, THEY BEGAN

TO DRAG JASON AND CERTAIN BRETHREN BEFORE THE POLITARCHS, SHOUTING,

"THESE THAT HAVE TURNED THE CIVILISED WORLD UPSIDE DOWN HAVE COME

HITHER ALSO, (7) AND JASON HATH RECEIVED THEM; AND THE WHOLE OF THEM

ARE VIOLATING THE IMPERIAL LAWS, ASSERTING THAT THERE IS ANOTHER

EMPEROR, JESUS". (8) AND THEY TROUBLED THE PEOPLE AND THE POLITARCHS,

WHO HEARD THIS. (9) AND THE POLITARCHS TOOK SECURITIES FOR GOOD

BEHAVIOUR FROM JASON AND THE OTHERS, AND LET THEM GO.

The curious and rare title "politarchs" was given to the supreme board

of magistrates at Thessalonica, as is proved by inscriptions.

The description of this riot is more detailed than any of the

preceding. The lower classes, the least educated, and the most enslaved

to paganism on its vulgarest and most superstitious side, were the most

fanatical opponents of the new teaching; while the politarchs were by

no means inclined to take active measures against it, and the better

educated people seem to have supplied most of the converts. Men of all

classes were impressed by the preaching of Paul, but only women of the

leading families; and the difference is obviously due to the fact that

the poorer women were most likely to be under the sway of superstition.

A similar distinction is mentioned at Berea (XVII 12), where not a few

of the high-born Greek ladies and of the male population in general

were attracted by the new teaching.

It would appear that this riot was more serious than the words of Luke

would at first sight suggest. The language of Paul in his first letter

to the Thessalonians, II 14-16, shows that a powerful, dangerous, and

lasting sentiment was roused among the classes which made the riot.

The charge brought against Paul was subtly conceived and most

dangerous. The very suggestion of treason against the Emperors often

proved fatal to the accused; and it compelled the politarchs to take

steps, for, if they failed to do so, they became exposed to a charge of

treason, as having taken too little care for the honour of the Emperor.

Many a man was ruined by such a charge under the earlier Emperors.

The step taken by the politarchs was the mildest that was prudent in

the circumstances: they bound the accused over in security that peace

should be kept. This was a penalty familiar in Roman law, from which it

must have been adopted in the ordinary practice of provincial towns

like Thessalonica.

Paul evidently felt very deeply his sudden and premature separation

from the Church of Thessalonica: it was at once so promising and so

inexperienced, that he was unusually eager to return to it; and as he

says, "we endeavoured the more exceedingly to see your face with great

desire; because we would fain have come to you, I Paul once and again;

and Satan hindered us". What is the meaning of the strange expression,

"Satan hindered us"? How did Paul, who was so eager to go back to

Thessalonica, find an insurmountable obstacle in his way? Was it mere

personal danger that prevented him, or was it some more subtle device

of Satanic craft that kept him out of Thessalonica?

It is not in keeping with Paul's language to interpret "Satan" in this

case as the mob, which had brought him into danger and was still

enraged against him. He alludes by a very different metaphor to the

opposition which he often. experienced from the vulgar, uneducated, and

grossly superstitious city populace. In I Cor. XV 32 he describes his

relations with the Ephesian mob as "fighting with beasts". This term is

an interesting mixture of Greek and Roman ideas, and corresponds well

to Paul's mixed education, as a Roman citizen in a Greek philosopher's

lecture-room. In the lecture room he became familiar with the Platonic

comparison of the mob to a dangerous beast; and amid the surroundings

of the Roman Empire he became familiar with the death-struggle of

criminals against the wild beasts of the circus. But a person who

designates the mob in this contemptuous way, uses the term "Satan" only

of some more subtle and dangerous enemy, far harder to overcome.

Now, security against any disturbance of the peace had been exacted

from Jason and his associates, the leading Christians of Thessalonica;

and clearly this implied that they were bound over to prevent the cause

of disturbance, Paul, from coming to Thessalonica. This ingenious

device put an impassable chasm between Paul and the Thessalonians

(enekopsen is the strong term used). So long as the magistrates

maintained this attitude, he could not return: he was helpless, and

Satan had power. His only hope lay in an alteration of the magistrates'

policy. They would not be long in power; and perhaps their successors

might act differently. But the politarchs doubtless thought that they

treated the case mildly and yet effectually; they got rid of the cause,

without inflicting any punishment on any person. This interpretation of

the term "Satan," as denoting action taken by the governing power

against the message from God, is in keeping with the figurative use of

the word throughout the New Testament.

8. BEROEA.

(XVII 10) AND THE BRETHREN IMMEDIATELY SENT AWAY PAUL AND SILAS BY

NIGHT UNTO BEREA; AND WHEN THEY WERE COME HITHER THEY WENT INTO THE

SYNAGOGUE OF THE JEWS. (11) NOW THESE WERE MORE NOBLE THAN THOSE IN

THESSALONICA, IN THAT THEY RECEIVED THE WORD WITH ALL READINESS OF

MIND, EXAMINING THE SCRIPTURES DAILY WHETHER THESE THINGS WERE SO. (12)

MANY OF THEM THEREFORE BELIEVED; AS DID ALSO NOT A FEW OF THE HIGH-BORN

GREEK LADIES AND OF THE MALE POPULATION. (13) BUT WHEN THE JEWS OF

THESSALONICA LEARNED THAT IN BEREA ALSO THE WORD OF GOD WAS PREACHED BY

PAUL, THEY CAME THERE ALSO EXCITING AND DISTURBING THE MULTITUDES. (14)

THEN FORTHWITH PAUL WAS SENT FORTH BY THE BRETHREN TO GO TOWARDS THE

SEA; BUT SILAS AND TIMOTHY REMAINED THERE. (15) AND THEY THAT CONDUCTED

PAUL BROUGHT HIM AS FAR AS ATHENS; AND RECEIVING DIRECTIONS FOR SILAS

AND TIMOTHY THAT THEY SHOULD COME TO HIM WITH ALL SPEED, THEY DEPARTED.

Here, just as at Thessalonica, a wider influence than the circle of the

synagogue is distinctly implied, so that we must understand that Paul

preached also to the Greek population. The nobler conduct of the Berean

Jews consisted in their freedom from that jealousy, which made the Jews

in Thessalonica and many other places enraged when the offer of

salvation was made as freely to others as to themselves.

The process that compelled Paul's departure from Berea was evidently

quite similar to that at Thessalonica; and probably that is the reason

why the riot and the accusation of treason against the Emperor are not

mentioned more particularly (p. 72). As usual, we notice how lightly

Luke passes over the difficulties and dangers which drove Paul from

place to place.

In v. 15 we must understand that Silas and Timothy obeyed the

directions, and came on to rejoin Paul. There is no point in mentioning

such an order, unless it were obeyed. It is in the style of Luke to

mention an intention and leave the reader to gather that it was carried

into effect (p. 181). Moreover, we learn from I Thess. III 1 that

Timothy was sent by Paul away from Athens to Thessalonica, which

implies that he rejoined him. It is undeniable that the statement in

XVIII 5, "when Silas and Timothy came down from Macedonia," seems at

first sight to imply that they arrived from Berea only after Paul had

left Athens, and followed him on to Corinth, and met him there for the

first time since his departure from Berea. But the calculation of time

shows that that could hardly be the case: it would not take nearly so

long to perform the journey, and we shall see that Silas and Timothy

rejoined Paul in Corinth after a mission from Athens to Thessalonica

and Philippi (p. 241). In that case the narrative is very awkward and

badly constructed; and we can hardly suppose that it has received the

final touches from the author's hand. It is not unnatural that the

Philippian author, writing about facts with which he and his nearest

audience were specially familiar, and making his narrative as brief as

possible, should have omitted to mention the mission from Athens to

Macedonia. But it is probable that, if he had lived to put the

finishing touch to his work, he would not have left this awkwardness.

Another possible indication of incompleteness is the emission of the

harbour of Berea, a unique omission in this history (p. 70).

The question naturally occurs, why did Paul go on from Berea alone,

leaving Silas and Timothy behind, and yet send orders immediately on

reaching Athens that they were to join him with all speed? There seems

at first sight some inconsistency here. But again comparison between

Acts and Thess. solves the difficulty. Paul was eager "once and again"

to return to Thessalonica; and was waiting for news that the impediment

placed in his way was removed. Silas and Timothy remained to receive

the news (perhaps about the attitude of new magistrates); and to bring

it on to Paul. But they could not bring it on to him until they

received his message from Athens; Paul left Berea with no fixed plan,

"sent forth by the brethren to go to the coast," and the further

journey to Athens was resolved on at the harbour.

We must allow several months for the residence at Berea, with the

preaching in the synagogue and the city, and the riot. Paul must have

reached Athens some time in August 51, as is shown by the dates of his

residence in Corinth (p. 264).

There is an interesting addition made to the Bezan Text of v. 15: "and

they which conducted Paul brought him as far as Athens; [and he

neglected Thessalia, for he was prevented from preaching the word unto

them]". Here we meet a difficult question in provincial bounds. Where

should Paul go from Beroea? The one thing clear to him was that he was

called to Macedonia. If Thessaly was part of that province, [38]

Larissa was the natural completion of his Macedonian work; and we could

readily believe that he thought of it and was prevented by a

revelation. But, in that case, why is "the revelation" left out? Such

an omission is unique in Acts. On the other hand, if Thessaly was part

of Achaia, Paul could not think at that time of beginning work in a new

province. In Athens he was merely waiting for the chance of returning

to Thessalonica (p. 240). But, in that case, we might understand, "he

was prevented (by the call restricting him to Macedonia)". Perhaps the

Reviser, having eliminated parelthen from XVI 8, thought that XVII 15

was a suitable place for the idea, which he wished to preserve.

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

[34] The Place of Prayer at Philippi. We take our stand upon the fact

that the Bezan Text, "where there seemed to be a prayer-place" (edokei

proseuche einai , appears to be an explanation of our text (eomizeto

proseuche einai): it is therefore clear that in the middle of the

second century our text was read, and was found difficult, and was

misunderstood to mean "there was thought to be a prayer-place ". This

misunderstanding led to other attempts at correction, one of which

appears in the great MSS. (enomizomen proseuche einai).

[35] See Sch�rer in Abhandlungen Weizs�cker gewidmet, p. 39.

[36] In v. 4 kai tines ex auton epeisthesan. kai proseklerothesan to

Paulo kai Sila polloi ton sebomenon. kai ellenon plethos polu. gunaikon

te ton proton ouk oligai, approximating to the Bezan Text, and to that

of the inferior MSS. followed in the Authorized Version.

[37] The true reading of XVII 4 results from a comparison of A with D.

The reading of the great MSS. is impossible for these reasons: (1) It

restricts Paul's converts to Jews. proselyte Greeks, and a few ladies,

taking no notice of any work outside the circle of the synagogue. I

Thess. gives the impression that converts direct from heathenism were

the mass of the Church. (2) It restricts Paul's work to three Sabbaths,

which is opposed to all rational probability, to Thess. and to Phil.;

whereas our text restricts the work within the circle of the synagogue

to three Sabbaths, but adds a second stage much more important, when a

great multitude of the general population of the city was affected. (3)

The contrast drawn between the Jews of Berea and of Thessalonica, v.

11, is very unfair to the latter, if, as the great MSS. put it, three

Sabbaths produced such vast effect within the circle of the synagogue.

(4) That reading speaks of "a great multitude of God-fearing Greeks,"

implying that the synagogue had exercised an astonishing influence on

the population. Lightfoot quotes the fact that Salonica is still mainly

a Jewish city, as a proof that Judaism gained and kept a strong hold on

the city throughout Christian history; but a visit to Salonica would

have saved him from this error. The Jews of Salonica speak Spanish as

their language, and are descended from Spanish Jews, expelled by

Ferdinand and Isabella, who found in Turkey a refuge denied or grudged

them in most European countries. There is no reason known to me for

thinking that Judaism was strong in the city under the Byzantine

Empire; and the strong antipathy of the Greeks to the Jews makes it

improbable. The Thessalonian Jews were protected by the Roman

government; but one may doubt if they maintained their ground under the

Christian Empire.

[38] Ptolemy gives Thessaly to Macedonia, Strabo to Achaia (for we

cannot accept Mommsen's interpretation of Strab. p. 276): at some

unknown time Thessaly was separated from Achaia (Brandis thinks by

Pius, Marquardt by Vespasian, but perhaps 44 may have been the time).

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

CHAPTER XI.

ATHENS AND CORINTH

1. ATHENS.

(XVII 16) NOW WHILE PAUL WAS WAITING FOR THEM IN ATHENS, HIS SOUL WAS

PROVOKED WITHIN HIM AS HE BEHELD THE CITY FULL OF IDOLS. (17) SO HE

REASONED IN THE SYNAGOGUE WITH THE JEWS AND THE PROSELYTES, AND IN THE

MARKETPLACE EVERY DAY WITH CHANCE COMERS. . . . (23) "AS I WENT THROUGH

THE CITY SURVEYING THE MONUMENTS OF YOUR RELIGION, I FOUND ALSO AN

ALTAR WITH THIS INSCRIPTION TO UNKNOWN GOD'."

The picture of Paul in Athens, which is given in the ensuing scene, is

very characteristic of Athenian life. Luke places before us the man who

became "all things to all men," and who therefore in Athens made

himself like an Athenian and adopted the regular Socratic style of

general free discussion in the agora; and he shows him to us in an

atmosphere and a light which are thoroughly Attic in their clearness,

delicacy, and charm.

It is evident from v. 23, and our conception of Paul's character forces

the same view on us, that he was not indifferent even to the "sights"

of the great university city of the world, which united in itself so

many memorials of history and of education. The feelings which would

rise in the mind of an American scholar from Harvard, seeing Oxford for

the first time, were not alien to Paul's spirit The mere Jew could

never have assumed the Attic tone as Paul did. He was in Athens the

student of a great university, visiting an older but yet a kindred

university, surveying it with appreciative admiration, and mixing in

its society as an equal conversing with men of like education.

This extraordinary versatility in Paul's character, the unequaled

freedom and ease with which he moved in every society, and addressed so

many races within the Roman world, were evidently appreciated by the

man who wrote this narrative, for the rest of Chapter XVII is as

different in tone from XIII as Athens is different from Phrygia. Only a

writer who was in perfect sympathy with his subject could adapt his

tone to it so perfectly as Luke does. In Ephesus Paul taught "in the

school of Tyrannus"; in the city of Socrates he discussed moral

questions in the market-place. How incongruous it would seem if the

methods were transposed! But the narrative never makes a false step

amid all the many details, as the scene changes from city to city; and

that is the conclusive proof that it is a picture of real life.

Athens in Paul's time was no longer the Athens of Socrates; but the

Socratic method had its roots in the soil of Attica and the nature of

the Athenian people. In Athens Socrates can never quite die, and his

spirit was in Paul's time still among the people, though the learned

lecturers of the university felt already the coming spirit of Herodes

Atticus more congenial to them. Among the people in the agora, then,

Paul reasoned in the Socratic fashion; but when the Professors came

upon the scene, they soon demanded of him a display in the style of the

rhetorician.

As Paul wandered through Athens, the interest in its monuments and its

university was soon overpowered by the indignation roused by the idols

with which it was crowded. In this centre of the world's education,

amid the lecture-rooms where philosophers had taught for centuries that

it was mere superstition to confuse the idol with the divine nature

which it represented, the idols were probably in greater numbers than

anywhere else in Paul's experience. Though he was only waiting for the

message to go back to Thessalonica, and resume the work in Macedonia to

which he had been called, yet indignation would not let him keep

silence during the short stay which he anticipated in Athens. He began

to discourse in the synagogue, and to hold Socratic dialogue in the

agora with any one whom he met.

Here we observe the same double mission as in Berea, Thessalonica, and

elsewhere; and, as in other cases, the Jewish mission is mentioned

first. There is one marked difference between this passage and the

corresponding descriptions at Berea and Thessalonica. In those cases

great results were attained; but in Athens no converts are mentioned at

this stage, either in the synagogue or in the agora. The lack of

results at this stage is, however, fully explained by the shortness of

the time. Paul's stay in Athens can hardly have been longer than six

weeks, and was probably less than four; and the process described in v.

17 was brought to a premature close by the great event of his visit,

which the historian describes very fully.

The time spent in Athens may be deduced approximately from the

following considerations. Probably less than a fortnight elapsed before

Silas and Timothy joined him there, according to his urgent directions.

They brought with them no favourable news: it was still impossible for

him to return to Thessalonica, and he "thought it good to be left in

Athens alone, and sent Timothy to comfort the Thessalonians concerning

their faith" (I Thess. III 1, 2).

Since Paul remained alone, Silas also must have been sent away from

Athens; and as, some two months later, Silas with Timothy rejoined Paul

from Macedonia, he was probably sent to Philippi, for frequent

communication was maintained at this time between Paul and his first

European Church (Phil. IV 15 f.).

Paul was still looking forward to a return to his proper work in

Macedonia; and it is clear that he intended to remain in Athens until

Silas and Timothy came back from their mission, which makes it probable

that their absence was not intended to be a long one. Doubtless they

travelled to Thessalonica together, and Timothy waited there while

Silas went to Philippi, discharged his mission, and returned; and then

they came to Athens together. They found Paul no longer there, for he

had in the meantime gone to Corinth. Circumstances that happened in

Athens had forced him to abandon the city and go to Corinth: "after

this he departed from Athens and came to Corinth" (XVIII 1). In this

sentence it might seem that the words "departed from Athens" are

wasted; and that it would have been sufficient to say after this he

came to Corinth"; but our principle is that every minute fact stated in

Acts has its own significance, and the departure from Athens

(choristheis ek ton Athenon is emphasised, because it was a violation

of the intended plan under the compulsion of events.

The same word is used in XVIII 1 to describe Paul's departure from

Athens, and in 2 to describe Aquila's enforced departure from Rome. On

our view (p. 252) the idea of sudden, premature departure is contained

in each. Further, it is clear that Paul had been in Corinth for some

time and attained a certain measure of success, before Silas and

Timothy arrived; and, if we allow seven weeks for their mission, which

seems ample, he must have spent altogether about three or four weeks in

Athens and five or six in Corinth.

2. IN THE UNIVERSITY AT ATHENS.

(XVII 18 AND CERTAIN ALSO OF THE STOIC AND EPICUREAN PHILOSOPHERS

ENGAGED IN DISCUSSIONS WITH HIM; AND SOME SAID, "WHAT WOULD THIS

SPERMOLOGOS [ignorant plagarist] SAY?" AND OTHERS, "HE IS APPARENTLY AN

EXPONENT OF FOREIGN DIVINITIES" [BECAUSE HE WAS GIVING THE GOOD NEWS OF

"JESUS" AND "RESURRECTION "]. (19) AND THEY TOOK HOLD OF HIM AND

BROUGHT HIM BEFORE THE Council of AREOPAGUS, SAYING, "MAY WE LEARN WHAT

IS THIS NEW TEACHING WHICH IS SPOKEN BY THEE? (20) FOR THOU BRINGEST

SOME THINGS OF FOREIGN FASHION TO OUR EARS; WE WISH THEREFORE TO LEARN

WHAT IS THEIR NATURE." (21) BUT THE WHOLE crowd of ATHENIANS AND

RESIDENT STRANGERS who formed the audience WERE INTERESTED ONLY IN

SAYING OR HEARING SOMETHING NEW and smart. (22) AND PAUL STOOD IN THE

MIDST OF THE Council of AREOPAGUS AND SAID . . . (33) THUS PAUL WENT

FORTH FROM THE MIDST OF THEM.

The explanatory clause in v. 18 is wanting in the Bezan Text and an old

Latin Version, and is foreign to Luke's fashion of leaving the reader

to form his own ideas with regard to the scene. It is apparently a

gloss, suggested by v. 32, which found its way into the text of almost

all MSS.

The different opinions of the philosophers in v. 18 are purposely

placed side by side with a touch of gentle sarcasm on their inability,

with all their acuteness, to agree in any opinion even about Paul's

meaning. The first opinion is the most interesting. It contains a word

of characteristically Athenian slang, Spermol�gos, and is clearly

caught from the very lips of the Athenians (as Dr. Blass happily puts

it). This term was used in two senses--(1) a small bird that picks up

seeds for its food, and (2) a worthless fellow of low class and vulgar

habits, with the insinuation that he lives at the expense of others,

like those disreputable persons who hang round the markets and the

quays in order to pick up anything that falls from the loads that are

carried about. Hence, as a term in social slang, it connotes absolute

vulgarity and inability to rise above the most contemptible standard of

life and conduct; it is often connected with slave life, for the

Spermol�gos was near the type of the slave and below the level of the

free man; and there clings to it the suggestion of picking up refuse

and scraps, and in literature of plagiarism without the capacity to use

correctly. In ancient literature plagiarism was not disapproved when it

was done with skill, and when the idea or words taken from another were

used with success: the literary offence lay in the ignorance and

incapacity displayed when stolen knowledge was improperly applied.

To appreciate fully a term of social slang requires the greatest effort

to sympathise with and recreate the actual life of the people who used

the term. Probably the nearest and most instructive parallel in modern

English life to Spermol�gos is "Bounder," allowing for the difference

between England and Athens. In both there lies the idea of one who is

"out of the swim," out of the inner circle, one who lacks that thorough

knowledge and practice in the rules of the game that mould the whole

character and make it one's nature to act in the proper way and play

the game fair. The English term might be applied to a candidate for a

professorship, whose life and circumstances had lain in a different

line and who wanted knowledge and familiarity with the subject; and

that is the way in which St. Paul is here called a Spermol�gos, as one

who aped the ways and words of philosophers. Dean Farrar's rendering,

"picker-up of learning's crumbs," is happy, but loses the touch of

slang.

The general tendency of recent opinion is that Paul was taken to the

Hill of Ares, in order to give an address in quiet surroundings to a

crowd of Athenians on the spot where the Council that derived its name

from the hill sat to hold solemn trials for murder; and the view taken

in the Authorised Version and the ancient authorities, such as

Chrysostom and Theophylact, that Paul was subjected to a trial before

the Council, is rejected on the ground that in the proceedings there is

nothing of a judicial type, no accuser, no accusation, and no defensive

character in Paul's speech, which is addressed not to a court but to a

general Athenian audience. These reasons quite disprove the view that

the scene described in vv. 19-34 was a trial. But the idea that the

assembly of Athenians went up to the hill-top as a suitable place for

listening to an address is even more unsatisfactory. The top of the

little hill is a most unsuitable place from its small size and its

exposed position; and it is quite out of keeping with the habits of the

people to go to such a place for such a purpose. Curtius has led the

way to a proper view of the whole incident, which lies wholly in the

agora.

Further, it is inconsistent with the patriotism and pride of the

Athenians that they should conduct a foreigner for whom they expressed

such contempt to the most impressive seat of Athenian religious and

national history, in order that he might there talk to them. The

Athenians were, in many respects, flippant; but their flippancy was

combined with an intense pride in the national dignity and the historic

glory of the city, which would have revolted at such an insult as that

this stranger should harangue them about his foreign deities on the

spot where the Athenian elders had judged the god Ares and the hero

Orestes, where the goddess Athena had presided in the highest court of

her chosen people, and where still judgment on the most grave cases of

homicide was solemnly pronounced.

Nor would it be a permissible interpretation that a small number of

philosophic inquirers retired to this quiet spot for unimpeded

discussion. The scene and the speech breathe the spirit of the agora,

and the open, free, crowded life of Athens, not the quiet atmosphere of

the philosophic study or class-room; while the tone of the opinions

expressed in v. 18 is not one of philosophic interest and careful

discussion, but of contempt, dislike, and jealousy. Moreover, it would

be an insult to address philosophic inquirers in the language of vv.

22-3. The philosophers did not dedicate altars to an Unknown God, but

regarded all such proceedings as the mere superstition of the vulgar.

Paul's speech is an exceedingly skillful one, if addressed to a popular

audience; but to philosophers it would be unskillful and unsuitable.

But the language shows clearly that Paul was brought before the Council

and not simply conducted to the Hill. He stood "in the midst of the

Areopagus," v. 22, and "he went forth from the midst of them": he that

went forth from the midst of them must have been standing in the midst

of them. In this scene, full of the Attic spirit and containing typical

words of Athenian slang like Spermol�gos, we require some distinctly

Greek sense for each detail; and "Paul stood in the middle of the Hill"

is in Greek an absurdity. He stood in the middle of the Council, a

great and noble, but not a friendly assembly, as in IV 7 Peter stood

"in the midst" of the Sanhedrim; and in Acts and the Gospels many

similar expressions occur. [39]

The philosophers took hold of Paul. When a man, especially an educated

man, goes so far as to lay his hands on another, it is obvious that his

feelings must be moved; and the word must have some marked sense in a

writer whose expression is so carefully studied as Luke's. It occurs as

a sign of friendly encouragement to a person in a solitary and

difficult position, IX 27, XXIII 19; but more frequently it denotes

hostile action, as XXI 30, XVIII 17, XVI 19. There must have been some

stronger feeling among the philosophers than mere contempt mingled with

some slight curiosity, before they actually placed their hands on Paul.

Now they certainly did not act as his friends and sponsors in taking

him before the Council, therefore we must understand that they took him

there from dislike and with malice.

What then was their object? Every attempt to explain the scene as a

trial has failed, and must fail (p. 243). Even the idea of a

preliminary inquiry is unsuitable; for, if it were so, none of the

marked features of the scene are preserved in the narrative, which

would be contrary to our experience in Luke's descriptions. In

estimating the situation, we must remember that in vv. 18, 19, Paul is

among the lecturers and professors of the university. Therein lies the

chief interest of the scene, which is unique in Acts. We have seen Paul

in various situations, and mixing in many phases of contemporary life.

Here alone he stands amid the surroundings of a great university,

disputing with its brilliant and learned teachers; and here, as in

every other situation, he adapts himself with his usual versatility to

the surroundings, and moves in them as to the manner born.

Two questions have to be answered in regard to the scene that follows:

why was Paul taken before the Council? and what were the intentions of

the philosophers in taking him there? It is clear that Paul appeared to

the philosophers as one of the many ambitious teachers who came to

Athens hoping to find fame and fortune at the great centre of

education. Now, certain powers were vested in the Council of Areopagus

to appoint or invite lecturers at Athens, and to exercise some general

control over the lecturers in the interests of public order and

morality. There is an almost complete lack of evidence what were the

advantages and the legal rights of a lecturer thus appointed, and to

what extent or in what way a strange teacher could find freedom to

lecture in Athens. There existed something in the way of privileges

vested in the recognised lecturers; for the fact that Cicero induced

the Areopagus to pass a decree inviting Cratippus, the Peripatetic

philosopher, to become a lecturer in Athens, implies that some

advantage was thereby lectured to him. There certainly also existed

much freedom for foreigners to become lecturers in Athens, for the

great majority of the Athenian professors and lecturers were foreign.

The scene described in vv. 18-34 seems to prove that the recognised

lecturers could take a strange lecturer before the Areopagus, and

require him to give an account of his teaching and pass a test as to

its character.

When they took him to the court to satisfy the supreme university

tribunal of his qualifications, they probably entertained some hope

that he would be overawed before that august body, or that his teaching

might not pass muster, as being of unsettling tendency (for no body is

so conservative as a University Court).

The government in Greek cities exercised a good deal of control over

the entire system of education, both for boys and for young men, who

were trained in graduated classes and passed on from one to another in

regular course. There is good reason for thinking that in Athens this

control was exercised by the Council of Areopagus, in the case both of

boys and of young men: it rises naturally out of their ancient charge

of the manners and morals of the citizens, of the public hygiene and

the state physicians, and of offences against religious ritual (though

serious charges of impiety and of introducing foreign religion were not

tried before the Areopagus but before the popular courts); and it is,

in ancient view, related to the control of peace and order which they

exercised in the Roman period. Moreover, Quintilian mentions that the

Areopagus punished a boy who used to pluck out the eyes of quails,

which implies their jurisdiction over the young.

In the rhetorical displays of that period, the general audience

(corona) was an important feature. The influence of the audience is

familiar to every reader of the literature of that time; and the

younger Pliny says that even the lawyers of his time spoke more to gain

the approval and applause of the audience than to influence the opinion

and judgment of the court. Owing to the difficulty in multiplying

copies of literary productions, public opinion could not be so well

appealed to or expressed in any other way; and the applause or

disapproval of the circle of hearers came to represent to a great

extent the public verdict on all intellectual achievements. Luke,

therefore, could not well omit the audience, even in this brief

account; and he touches it off in v. 21, where the force of the

imperfect tense is important: Luke is not describing the general

character of the Athenian people (which would require a present tense):

he places another element in the scene alongside of those already

described. While the philosophers insisted with some malevolent

intention on having a test applied, the general crowd of Athenians and

resident strangers were merely moved by curiosity.

The unmistakable tone of contempt in the description suits a Macedonian

describing an Athenian crowd (for the two peoples always disliked and

despised each other); and it is not undeserved. As Mr. Capes says in

his University Life in Ancient Athens: "the people commonly was nothing

loath to hear: they streamed as to a popular preacher in our own day,

or to an actor starring in provincial towns: the epicures accepted the

invitation to the feast of words, and hurried to the theatre to judge

as critics the choice of images, and refinement of the style, and all

the harmony of balanced periods ". As Luke says, they were as eager to

make smart criticisms as to listen.

3. THE SPEECH BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF AREOPAGUS.

(XVII 22) AND PAUL STOOD IN THE MIDST OF THE COUNCIL AND SAID, "YE MEN

OF ATHENS, IN ALL RESPECTS I OBSERVE THAT YOU ARE MORE than others

RESPECTFUL OF WHAT IS DIVINE. (23) FOR AS I WAS GOING THROUGH your city

AND SURVEYING THE MONUMENTS OF YOUR WORSHIP, I FOUND ALSO AN ALTAR WITH

THE INSCRIPTION TO UNKNOWN GOD. THAT divine nature, THEN, WHICH YOU

WORSHIP, NOT KNOWING what it is, I AM SETTING FORTH TO YOU. (24) THE

GOD THAT MADE THE WORLD AND ALL THINGS THEREIN, HE, LORD AS HE IS OF

HEAVEN AND EARTH, DWELLETH NOT IN SHRINES MADE WITH HANDS, (25) AND IS

NOT SERVED BY HUMAN HANDS AS THOUGH HE NEEDED ANYTHING, SINCE HE

HIMSELF GIVETH TO ALL LIFE AND BREATH AND ALL THINGS. (26) AND HE MADE

OF ONE nature EVERY RACE OF MEN TO DWELL ON ALL THE FACE OF THE EARTH;

AND FIXED DEFINED TIMES AND BOUNDS OF THEIR HABITATION, (27) THAT THEY

SHOULD SEEK THE GOD, IF HAPLY THEY MIGHT FEEL AFTER HIM AND FIND HIM,

BEING AS INDEED HE IS NOT FAR FROM EACH ONE OF US. (28) FOR IN HIM WE

LIVE AND MOVE AND ARE, AS CERTAIN ALSO OF YOUR POETS HAVE SAID, FOR WE

ARE ALSO HIS OFFSPRING. (29) BEING THEN THE OFFSPRING OF GOD, WE OUGHT

NOT TO THINK THAT THE DIVINE NATURE IS LIKE UNTO GOLD OR SILVER OR

STONE, GRAVEN BY ART AND DEVICE OF MAN. (30) NOW THE TIMES OF IGNORANCE

GOD OVERLOOKED, BUT AT PRESENT HE CHARGETH ALL MEN EVERYWHERE TO

REPENT, (31) INASMUCH AS HE HATH SET A DAY ON WHICH, IN the person of

THE MAN WHOM HE HATH ORDAINED, HE WILL JUDGE THE WORLD IN

RIGHTEOUSNESS; AND HE HATH GIVEN ALL A GUARANTEE BY RAISING HIM FROM

THE DEATH." (32) AND WHEN THEY HEARD OF "RAISING FROM THE DEAD," SOME

MOCKED, AND OTHERS SAID, "WE WILL HEAR THEE CONCERNING THIS YET AGAIN".

(33) THUS PAUL WENT OUT FROM THE MIDST OF THEM. (34) BUT CERTAIN MEN

CLAVE UNTO HIM AND BELIEVED; AMONG WHOM ALSO WAS DIONYSIUS, A MEMBER OF

THE COUNCIL, AND A WOMAN NAMED DAMARIS, AND OTHERS WITH THEM. (XVIII 1)

AND THEREAFTER HE LEFT ATHENS, AND WENT TO CORINTH.

The influence of Paul's Athenian surroundings may be traced in the

"philosophy of history" which he sketches briefly in his address. In

the Socratic position the virtue of" knowing" was too exclusively dwelt

on, and in some of the earlier Platonic dialogues the view is

maintained that virtue is knowledge and vice ignorance; and Greek

philosophy was never clear about the relation of will and permanent

character to "knowing". The Greek philosophers could hardly admit, and

could never properly understand, that a man may know without carrying

his knowledge into action, that he may refuse to know when knowledge is

within his grasp, and that the refusal exercises a permanent

deteriorating influence on his character. Now Paul, in his estimate of

the relation of the pre-Christian world to God, adopts a different

position in the Athenian speech from that on which he afterwards took

his stand in his letter to the Romans, I 19-32. In the latter place he

recognises (to quote Lightfoot's brief analysis) that the pagan world

"might have seen God through His works. They refused to see Him. They

disputed, and they blinded their hearts. Therefore they were delivered

over to impurity. They not only did those things; but they took delight

in those who did them." Here we have a full recognition of that

fundamental fact in human nature and life, which �schylus expressed in

his greatest drama [40] a conception of his own differing from the

common Greek view:" the impious act breeds more, like to its own kind:

it is the nature of crime to beget new crime, and along with it the

depraved audacious will that settles, like an irresistible spirit of

ill, on the house". But to the Athenians Paul says, "the times of

ignorance, therefore, God overlooked"; and those times are alluded to

as a period, when men were doing their best to find and to worship "God

Unknown". We must not, of course, demand that the entire theology of

Paul should be compressed into this single address; but yet there is a

notable omission of an element that was unfamiliar and probably

repugnant to his audience, and an equally notable insistence on an

element that was familiar to them. The Stoic ring in 23 f. is marked

(pp. 147, 150).

One woman was converted at Athens; and it is not said that she was of

good birth, as Was stated at Berea and Thessalonica and Pisidian

Antioch. The difference is true to life. It was impossible in Athenian

society for a woman of respectable position and family to have any

opportunity of hearing Paul; and the name Damaris (probably a vulgarism

for damalis, heifer) suggests a foreign woman, perhaps one of the class

of educated Hetairai, who might very well be in his audience.

It would appear that Paul was disappointed and perhaps disillusioned by

his experience in Athens. He felt that he had gone at least as far as

was right in the way of presenting his doctrine in a form suited to the

current philosophy; and the result had been little more than naught.

When he went on from Athens to Corinth, he no longer spoke in the

philosophic style. In replying afterwards to the unfavourable

comparison between his preaching and the more philosophical style of

Apollos, he told the Corinthians that, when he came among them, he

"determined not to know anything save Jesus Christ, and Him crucified"

(I Cor. I 12); and nowhere throughout his writings is he so hard on the

wise, the philosophers, and the dialecticians, as when he defends the

way in which he had presented Christianity at Corinth. Apparently the

greater concentration of purpose and simplicity of method in his

preaching at Corinth is referred to by Luke, when he says, XVIII 5,

that when Silas and Timothy rejoined him there, they found him wholly

possessed by and engrossed in the word. This strong expression, so

unlike anything else in Acts, must, on our hypothesis, be taken to

indicate some specially marked character in the Corinthian preaching.

4. CORINTH.

(XVIII 1) AFTER THESE EVENTS HE LEFT ATHENS AND WENT TO CORINTH. (2)

AND, FINDING A CERTAIN JEW NAMED AQUILA, A MAN OF PONTUS BY BIRTH, WHO

HAD LATELY COME FROM ITALY, AND PRISCILLA HIS WIFE, BECAUSE CLAUDIUS

HAD COMMANDED ALL THE JEWS TO LEAVE ROME, HE ACCOSTED THEM. (3) AND

BECAUSE HE WAS OF THE SAME CRAFT, HE ABODE WITH THEM, AND WROUGHT AT

HIS TRADE [FOR THEY WERE TENTMAKERS BY THEIR CRAFT]. (4) AND HE USED TO

DISCOURSE IN THE SYNAGOGUE EVERY SABBATH, AND TRIED TO PERSUADE JEWS

AND GREEKS. (5) AND WHEN SILAS AND TIMOTHY ARRIVED FROM MACEDONIA, HE

WAS WHOLLY ABSORBED IN PREACHING, ATTESTING TO THE JEWS THAT THE

ANOINTED ONE IS JESUS.

Almost all MSS. add to v. 3 the explanation which we have given in

parentheses; but it comes in very awkwardly, for Luke, who said at the

beginning of the verse, "because he was of the same craft," did not

intend to say at the end, "for they were tentmakers by craft". The

Bezan Text and an old Latin Version (Gig.) omit this detail; and they

must here represent the original state of the text. In order to make

the explanation a little less awkward, the two great MSS. read, "he

abode with them and they wrought". The explanation is a gloss, which

crept from the margin into the text. It is doubtless very early, and

perfectly trustworthy: its vitality lies in its truth, for that was not

the kind of detail that was invented in the growth of the Pauline

legend.

Aquila, a man of Pontus, settled in Rome bears a Latin name; and must

therefore have belonged to the province and not to non-Roman Pontus.

This is a good example of Luke's principle to use the Roman provincial

divisions for purposes of classification (pp. 91, 196).

There is here a reference to Imperial history. Aquila and Priscilla had

come recently from Rome, on account of an edict of Claudius expelling

the Jews from Rome. Suetonius says that the expulsion was caused by a

series of disturbances "due to the action of Chrestus"; and in all

probability this Chrestus must be interpreted as "the leader of the

Chrestians" (p. 47 f.), taken by a popular error as actually living. In

the earliest stages of Christian history in Rome, such a mistake was

quite natural; and Suetonius reproduces the words which he found in a

document of the period. As Dion Cassius mentions, it was found so

difficult to keep the Jews out of Rome on account of their numbers,

that the Emperor did not actually expel them, but made stricter

regulations about their conduct. It would therefore appear that the

edict was found unworkable in practice; but Suetonius is a perfect

authority that it was tried, and it is quite probable that some Jews

obeyed it, and among them Aquila. Neither Suetonius nor Dion gives any

clue to the date; but Orosius says that it occurred in Claudius's ninth

year, 49. I believe that this date is a year wrong, like that of the

famine (p. 68), and for the same reason: the edict must be placed in

the end of 50, and thus Aquila arrived in Corinth six or seven months

before Paul came in Sept. 51.

The careful record of Aquila's antecedents must, on our hypothesis, be

taken as not a mere picturesque detail; Luke mentioned his Roman

residence, because it had some bearing on his subject. After some time

(during most of which Paul had been in Aquila's company at Corinth and

at Ephesus), a journey to Rome is announced as Paul's next intention,

XIX 21. Aquila was able to tell him of the events that had occurred in

Rome "at the action of Chrestus"; and his experience showed him how

important it was to go direct to the great centres of Roman life. The

connection of Luke with the Macedonian journey (p. 203) is an

interesting parallel.

Paul mentions in writing to the Romans, XV 24, that he intended to go

on from Rome to Spain. Such an intention implies in the plainest way an

idea already existent in Paul's mind of Christianity as the religion of

the Roman Empire. Spain was by far the most thoroughly romanised

district of the Empire, as was marked soon after by the act of

Vespasian in 75, when he made the Latin status universal in Spain. From

the centre of the Roman world Paul would go on to the chief seat of

Roman civilisation in the West, and would thus complete a first survey,

the intervals of which should be filled up by assistants, such as

Timothy, Titus, etc.

5. THE SYNAGOGUE AND THE GENTILES IN CORINTH.

(XVIII 6) AND WHEN THEY BEGAN TO FORM A FACTION AGAINST HIM AND

BLASPHEME, HE SHOOK OUT HIS GARMENTS AND SAID UNTO THEM, "YOUR BLOOD ON

YOUR OWN HEAD! I ON MY SIDE AM CLEAN! FROM HENCEFORTH I WILL GO UNTO

THE GENTILES," i.e., in this city. (7) AND HE CHANGED HIS PLACE from

the synagogue, AND WENT INTO THE HOUSE OF A CERTAIN MAN NAMED TITIUS

JUSTUS, A GOD-FEARING proselyte, WHOSE HOUSE JOINED HARD TO THE

SYNAGOGUE. (8) BUT CRISPUS, THE ARCHISYNAGOGOS, BELIEVED IN THE LORD

WITH ALL HIS HOUSE; AND MANY OF THE PEOPLE OF CORINTH USED TO HEAR AND

BELIEVE AND RECEIVE BAPTISM. (9) AND THE LORD SAID IN THE NIGHT BY A

VISION UNTO PAUL, "BE NOT AFRAID, BUT SPEAK ON, AND HOLD NOT THY PEACE;

(10) BECAUSE I AM WITH THEE, AND NO MAN SHALL SET ON THEE TO HARM THEE;

BECAUSE I HAVE MUCH PEOPLE IN THIS CITY". (11) AND HE SETTLED A YEAR

AND SIX MONTHS, TEACHING AMONG THEM THE WORD OF GOD.

The distinction between the period of work in the synagogue, and that

of direct preaching to the populace, is expressed with marked emphasis

at Corinth. Corinth stood on the highroad between Rome and the East;

and was therefore one of the greatest centres of influence in the Roman

world. Macedonia was in this respect quite secondary, though one of the

routes to the East passed across it; and hence Paul was ordered to sit

down for a prolonged stay when he reached Corinth. It is characteristic

of Luke to define the entire stay before relating some incidents that

occurred in it (pp. 153, 289).

It must be acknowledged that Paul had not a very conciliatory way with

the Jews when he became angry. The shaking out of his garments was

undoubtedly a very exasperating gesture; and the occupying of a

meetinghouse next door to the synagogue, with the former archisynagogos

as a prominent officer, was more than human nature could stand.

Probably he found unusual opposition here, pp. 143, 287; but it is not

strange that the next stage of proceedings was in a law-court.

Titius Justus was evidently a Roman or a Latin, one of the coloni of

the colony Corinth. Like the centurion Cornelius, he had been attracted

to the synagogue. His citizenship would afford Paul an opening to the

more educated class of the Corinthian population.

It seems to be implied by vv. 8, 17, that there was only one

archisynagogos in the Corinthian synagogue; and, when Crispus became a

Christian, a successor was appointed. At Pisidian Antioch there were

several archisynagogoi. M.S. Reinach has shown from a Smyrn� an

inscription that the title in Asia Minor did not indicate an office,

but was a mere expression of dignity, "a leading person in the

synagogue"; and the Bezan Text of XIV 2 distinguishes clearly between

the archons of the synagogue (officials, probably two in number), and

the archisynagogoi.

6. THE IMPERIAL POLICY IN ITS RELATION TO PAUL AND TO CHRISTIAN

PREACHING.

(XVIII 12) BUT WHILE GALLIO WAS PROCONSUL OF ACHAIA, THE JEWS WITH ONE

ACCORD ROSE UP AGAINST PAUL, AND BROUGHT HIM BEFORE THE TRIBUNAL,

SAYING, (13) "THIS MAN PERSUADETH PEOPLE TO WORSHIP GOD CONTRARY TO THE

LAW" (14) BUT WHEN PAUL WAS ABOUT. TO OPEN HIS MOUTH, GALLIO SAID UNTO

THE JEWS, "IF A MISDEMEANOUR OR A CRIME WERE IN QUESTION, YE JEWS,

REASON WOULD THAT I SHOULD BEAR WITH YOU; (15) BUT IF THEY ARE

QUESTIONS OF WORD, not deed, AND OF NAMES, not things, AND OF YOUR LAW,

not Roman law, YE YOURSELVES WILL LOOK TO IT: TO BE A JUDGE OF THESE

MATTERS for my part HAVE NO MIND". (16) AND HE DROVE THEM FROM THE

TRIBUNAL. (17) AND ALL THE GREEKS SEIZED SOSTHENES, THE ARCHISYNAGOGOS,

AND PROCEEDED TO BEAT HIM BEFORE THE TRIBUNAL; AND GALLIO TOOK NO

NOTICE OF THIS CONDUCT.

Achaia was governed by a proconsul from B.C. 27 to A.D. 15, and from

A.D. 44 onwards. It was a province of the second rank, and was

administered by Roman officials, after holding the pr�torship, and

generally before the consulship. Corinth had now become the chief city

of Achaia, and the residence of its governors (as Marquardt infers from

this passage).

Here we have another point of contact with Roman history. Gallio was a

brother of the famous Seneca, and shared his fortunes. [41] Seneca was

in disgrace from 41 to 49; but in 49 he was recalled from banishment

and appointed pr�tor for A.D. 50. Pliny mentions that Gallio attained

the consulship, which was probably after his proconsulship in Achaia.

In his career of office Gallio must have been pr�tor not less than five

years before he went to Achaia; but no evidence survives to show in

what year he held the pr�torship (except that it cannot have been

between 41 and 49):as the elder brother, he probably held it before

Seneca. There is no other evidence that Gallio governed Achaia; but the

statement of Luke is corroborated by the fact, which Seneca mentions,

that Gallio caught fever in Achaia, and took a voyage for change of

air.

Either the Jews at Corinth did not manage their accusation so well as

those of Thessalonica, or Gallio elicited the true character of their

complaints against Paul as being really matters of mere Jewish concern.

It is clear that Gallio's short speech represents the conclusion of a

series of inquiries, for the accusation, as it is quoted, does not

refer to words or names, but only to the Law. But it is reasonable to

suppose that the Jews put their accusation at first in a serious light,

with a view to some serious penalty being inflicted; and Gallio, on

probing their allegations, reduced the matter to its true dimensions as

a question that concerned only the self-administering community of "the

Nation of the Jews in Corinth". It would have been interesting to know

more about this case, for it seems to show that Gallio shared the broad

and generous views of his brother about the policy of Rome in regard to

the various religions of the provinces. The Greeks, who always hated

the Jews, took advantage of the marked snub which the governor had

inflicted on them, to seize and beat Sosthenes, who had been appointed

to replace Crispus as Archisynagogos, and who doubtless was taking a

prominent part in the proceedings. Gallio took no notice of this piece

of "Lynch law," which probably seemed to him to be a rough sort of

justice.

The fact that Sosthenes (whether the same or another) joined with Paul

in writing to the Corinthians, I 1, caused an early misapprehension of

the scene. It was understood that Gallio, after deciding against the

Jews, allowed them to console themselves by beating a Christian; and

the word "Greeks" is omitted in the great MSS. under the influence of

this mistake. But such action is inconceivable in the Roman governor;

and the text of the inferior MSS. which substitutes a lifelike and

characteristic scene for one that is utterly foolish, must undoubtedly

be preferred. Probably two persons at Corinth named Sosthenes were

brought into relations with Paul, one a Jew, the other a prominent

Christian; or perhaps the Jew was converted at a later date.

This action of the Imperial government in protecting him from the Jews,

and (if we are right) declaring freedom in religious matters, seems to

have been the crowning fact in determining Paul's line of conduct.

According to our view, the residence at Corinth was an epoch in Paul's

life. As regards his doctrine he became more clearly conscious of its

character, as well as more precise and definite in his presentation of

it; and as regards practical work he became more clear as to his aim

and the means of attaining the aim, namely, that Christianity should be

spread through the civilised, i.e., the Roman, world (not as excluding,

but as preparatory to, the entire world, Col. III 11), using the

freedom of speech which the Imperial policy as declared by Gallio

seemed inclined to permit. The action of Gallio, as we understand it,

seems to pave the way for Paul's appeal a few years later from the

petty outlying court of the procurator of Judea, who was always much

under the influence of the ruling party in Jerusalem, to the supreme

tribunal of the Empire (p. 306 f.).

The letters to the Thessalonians belong to the earlier part of his stay

in Corinth, before he had definitely reached the new stage of thought

and aim. To the new stage, when he had attained full consciousness and

full dominion over his own plans, belong the four great letters, Gal. I

and II Cor., Rom.

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

[39] ho Areios Pagos was often used, in a conversational way, in place

of the cumbrous technical form, he ex Areiou Pagou boule. The decisive

passages are pointed out to me by two friends and old pupils, Mr. A.

Souter and Rev. A.F. Findlay. Cicero says to Atticus, I 14, 5, Senatus

[Areios Pagos. "our Senate is a veritable Areopagus". Cicero picked up

the conversational usage during his six months residence in Athens; and

hence he uses Areopagus to denote the Court, Nat. D. II 29, 74, Rep. I

27, 43. Again in an inscription of A.D. 50-100 (Cavvadias, Fouilles

d'Epidaure I p. 68, No. 206) we find Areios Pagos en Eleusini logous

epoiesato. (Pape quotes other cases, which are not so clear, and are

denied by some authorities.) Here, as everywhere, we find Luke using

the language of educated conversation.

[40] Agamemnon 730 f., a passage where the text is very uncertain and

is terribly maltreated by many editors. Paley turns it into an

elaborate genealogical tree, while Wecklein conjectures away the

depravation of the will, which is the key to the philosophic position

of �schylus.

[41] Gallio. One of the many difficulties in which Dr. Clemen's theory

involves him is that he has to deny the identity of Luke's Gallio with

Seneca's brother. Gallio's voyage from Achaia, undertaken on account of

a local fever (Seneca, Ep. Mor. 104, 1), was not the same as his voyage

from Rome to Egypt after his consulship on account of phthisis (Pliny,

XXXI 33), though probably the first also was to Egypt.

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

CHAPTER XII.

THE CHURCH IN ASIA

1. THE SYRIAN VOYAGE AND THE RETURN TO EPHESUS.

(XVIII 18) AND PAUL TOOK HIS LEAVE OF THE BRETHREN, AND SAILED [42]

THENCE FOR SYRIA, AND WITH HIM PRISCILLA AND AQUILA; AND HE SHORE HIS

HEAD IN CENCHRE�, FOR HE HAD A VOW. (19) AND THEY REACHED EPHESUS, AND

HE LEFT THE OTHERS THERE. AND FOR HIMSELF, HE WENT INTO THE SYNAGOGUE,

AND DELIVERED A DISCOURSE UNTO THE JEWS. (20) AND WHEN THEY ASKED HIM

TO ABIDE A LONGER TIME, HE CONSENTED NOT; (21) BUT HE TOOK HIS LEAVE OF

THEM, AND SAID, ["I MUST BY ALL MEANS PASS THE COMING FEAST IN

JERUSALEM]; IF GOD PLEASE, I WILL RETURN UNTO YOU;" AND HE SET SAIL

FROM EPHESUS. (22) AND, REACHING C�SAREIA, HE WENT UP to Jerusalem,

SALUTED THE CHURCH, AND then WENT DOWN TO ANTIOCH. (23) AND, HAVING

SPENT SOME TIME there, HE WENT FORTH, AND MADE A PROGRESS IN ORDER from

first to last THROUGH THE GALATIC REGION AND THE PHRYGIAN Region,

CONFIRMING ALL THE DISCIPLES. . . . (IX 1) AND IT CAME TO PASS THAT

PAUL, MAKING A MISSIONARY PROGRESS THROUGH THE HIGHER-LYING QUARTERS of

Asia, CAME TO the capital of the province EPHESUS (Expositor, July,

1895, p. 39).

Just as in XX 6 the company sailed away from Philippi (Neapolis, where

they really embarked, being omitted, p. 70), so here Paul sailed from

Corinth, the harbour being left out of sight. Then the harbour is

brought in as an afterthought: before actually embarking at Cenchre�,

the eastern port of Corinth, Paul cut his hair, marking the fulfilment

of a vow which apparently was connected with safe embarkation from

Corinth. Though the grammatical construction of v. 18 would suggest

that Aquila made the vow, and one old Latin Version makes this sense

explicit, yet the natural emphasis marks Paul as the subject here.

Aquila and Priscilla remained in Ephesus until the end of 55 (I Cor.

XVI 19); but in 56 they returned to Rome, where they were in the early

part of A.D. 57 (Rom. XVI 3). We may fairly suppose that Timothy came

with Paul to Ephesus, and went up on a mission from thence to his

native city and the other Churches of Galatia.

This is an important passage for dating the journey. If we accept the

longer reading of v. 21 (which appears in the Bezan Text, and

elsewhere), it is certain that Paul was hurrying to Jerusalem for the

coming feast, which may be confidently understood as the Passover. But

even with the shorter reading of the great MSS., it would be highly

probable that the reason why he postponed accepting the invitation to

work in Ephesus and hurried on to C�sareia, could lie only in his

desire to be present at Jerusalem on some great occasion; and the

Passover is the feast which would attract him. Paul seems to have made

a practice of beginning his journeys in the spring.

According to our view the whole journey took place thus. Paul was

always eager to. profit by any "open door," and an invitation from his

own people to preach to them in Ephesus must have been specially

tempting to him. Nothing but some pressing duty, which seemed to him to

imperatively require his presence in Jerusalem at the feast, was likely

to hurry him away from them. Further, the feast must have been close at

hand, otherwise he could have waited some weeks before going on. Now,

in A.D. 53, Passover fell on March 22; and navigation began as a rule

only on March 5. But Paul took an early ship for C�sareia, probably a

pilgrim ship, carrying from Corinth and Ephesus many Jews for the

coming Passover, and directing its course accordingly. In these

circumstances he could not lose a day on the road, and could merely

promise to return, "if God will ".

On reaching C�sareia, he went up and saluted the Church. Dr. Blass

considers that he went up from the harbour to the city of C�sareia and

saluted the Church there, and then "went down" to Antioch. That

interpretation is impossible for several reasons. (1) It is impossible

to use the term "went down" of a journey from the coast-town C�sareia

to the inland city Antioch. On the contrary, one regularly "goes down"

to a coast-town (III 4, XIV 25, XVI 8, etc.). (2) The terms "going up"

and "going down" are used so frequently of the journey to and from

Jerusalem as to establish this usage. Usually the phrase is given in

full, "they went up to Jerusalem"; but Dr. Blass accepts as Lukan a

reading in XV 6, in which "to go up to the Elders" is used in the sense

of "to go up to Jerusalem to the Elders". If he admits that sense in XV

6, why not also in XVIII 22? Conversely, the phrase "to go down" is

used XXIV 22, where the reader has to understand "from Jerusalem to

C�sareia". Now, the aim of Paul's journey to Jerusalem, having been put

in the reader's mind by the words of v. 21, is readily and naturally

supplied in v. 22.

The shipload of pilgrims to Jerusalem, with Paul among them, landed at

C�sareia, and went up to Jerusalem to the Passover in regular course.

Paul exchanged greetings with the Church (this phrase implies that he

made only a brief stay), and went down to Antioch. There he received

serious news about the Galatian Churches (p. 190); and with all

convenient speed he went by the land route through Cilicia, to Derbe,

Lystra, Iconium, and Pisidian Antioch. With the shortest stay that can

be supposed, when he was seeing old and loved friends after years of

absence, Paul can hardly have reached Derbe before July 53. We cannot

allow less than two months for confirming the wavering Churches of

Galatia, especially as on this visit (I Cor. XVI 1) he probably planned

the collection for the poor in Jerusalem, which was made universal

throughout his new Churches during the following three years. Thus he

would have completed his work in Galatia by the beginning of September.

Then he went on to Ephesus, taking the higher-lying and more direct

route, not the regular trade route on the lower level down the Lycus

and M�ander valleys. As he made a missionary progress through the upper

lands, he can hardly have reached Ephesus before the end of September,

A.D. 53, and October is a more probable time. Such a journey must have

occupied much time, even if we cut it down to the shortest possible

limits. The distances are very great, and progression was very slow;

and even on a rapid journey many interruptions must be allowed for (as

any one who travels in these countries knows only too well).

In interpreting v. 22, we had to understand that the thought of

Jerusalem as Paul's aim had been suggested to the reader's mind by v.

21. That is the case when the longer form of v. 21 is accepted; but

with the shorter text it becomes too harsh and difficult to supply the

unexpressed thought in v. 22. We conclude that the longer form is the

original text, and the shorter form is a corruption. But how did the

corruption originate? A curious error appears in Asterius (c. 400,

A.D.), and in Euthalius (probably c. 468), and therefore was probably

part of the early tradition, according to which Pisidian Antioch, not

Syrian Antioch, was alluded to in v. 22. By that misconception the

whole journey is obscured, and especially a visit to Jerusalem in v. 22

becomes impossible. Two ways of curing the difficulty were tried. The

Bezan Text retained the allusion to Jerusalem and the feast in v. 22,

and explained the supposed failure to pay the visit by interpolating in

XIX 1 the statement, "now when Paul wished according to his own plan to

go to Jerusalem, the Spirit bade him turn away into Asia". On the other

hand, in the text of the great MSS., the reference to the intended

visit to Jerusalem is cut out of v. 21. Each of these seems a

deliberate and conscious effort made by some editor to eliminate a

difficulty from the passage as it stood originally

2. APOLLOS, PRISCILLA AND AQUILA.

During the time that Paul was absent from Ephesus, there came thither

an Alexandrian Jew named Apollos, a good speaker, and well read in the

Scriptures. He had learned in Alexandria the doctrine of John the

Baptist and his prophecy of the immediate coming of Christ; and this he

preached in Ephesus with great fervour and detailed proof from

Scripture. Priscilla and Aquila, having heard his preaching, instructed

him with regard to the fulfilment of John's prophecy. Afterwards he

conceived the intention of crossing over to Achaia; and the Brethren

gave him letters of recommendation to the disciples in Corinth. When he

settled there he became an effective preacher, and a powerful opponent

of the Jews, showing how in Jesus the prophecies with regard to the

Anointed One were fulfilled.

This episode is obviously introduced, not so much for its own intrinsic

importance, as for the sake of rendering the opening of Paul's first

letter to the Corinthians clear and intelligible. A contrast is drawn

there between the more elaborate and eloquent style of Apollos and the

simple Gospel of Paul; and it is implied that some of the Corinthian

Brethren preferred the style and Gospel of Apollos. The particulars

stated here about Apollos have clearly been selected to throw light on

the circumstances alluded to, but not explained in the letter.

In the Bezan Text the account of Apollos appears in a different form,

which has all the marks of truth, and yet is clearly not original, but

a text remodelled according to a good tradition. The name is given in

the fuller form Apollonius; but Paul uses the diminutive Apollos; and

Luke, to make his explanation clearer would naturally use the same

form. Moreover, Luke regularly uses the language of conversation, in

which the diminutive forms were usual; and so he speaks of Priscilla,

Sopatros and Silas always, though Paul speaks of Prisca, Sosipatros and

Silvanus. On that principle we must prefer the form Apollos.

Again, the text of almost all MSS. mentions Priscilla first; but the

Bezan Text alters the order, putting Aquila first. Elsewhere also the

Bezan Reviser shows his dislike to the prominence assigned to women in

Acts. In XVII 12 he changes "not a few of the honourable Greek women

and of men" into "of the Greeks and the honourable many men and women".

In XVII 34 he cuts out Damaris altogether. In XVII 4 he changes the

"leading women" into "wives of the leading men" These changes show a

definite and uniform purpose, and therefore spring from a deliberate

Revision of the original Received Text.

The unusual order, the wife before the husband (so XVIII 18), must be

accepted as original; for there is always a tendency among scribes to

change the unusual into the usual. Paul twice (II Tim. IV 19, Rom. XVI

3) mentions Prisca before Aquila; that order was, therefore, a

conversational custom, familiar in the company among whom they moved;

though it must have seemed odd to strangers in later generations.

Probably Prisca was of higher rank than her husband, for her name is

that of a good old Roman family. Now, in XVIII 2 the very harsh and

strange arrangement of the sentence must strike every reader. But

clearly the intention is to force on the reader's mind the fact that

Aquila was a Jew, while Priscilla was not; and it is characteristic of

Luke to suggest by subtle arrangement of words a distinction which

would need space to explain formally (pp. 85, 204). Aquila was probably

a freedman. The name does indeed occur as cognomen in some Roman

families; but it was also a slave name, for a freedman of M�cenas was

called (C. Cilnius) Aquila. There is probably much to discover with

regard to this interesting pair, but in this place we cannot dwell on

the subject.

The order in which the different threads of the narrative here succeed

one another exactly recalls the method of XI 27-XII 25. There vv. 27-30

narrate the events in Antioch, and bring Barnabas and Saul to the gates

of Jerusalem; next, the events in Jerusalem are brought up to date; and

then the action of the envoys in Jerusalem is described. So here Paul's

journey is narrated, and he is brought to the frontier of Asia; next,

the events in Ephesus are brought up to date; and then Paul's entrance

into Asia and his action at Ephesus are described.

3. EPHESUS.

(XIX 1) AND IT CAME TO PASS, THAT, WHILE APOLLOS WAS AT CORINTH, PAUL,

HAVING PASSED THROUGH THE UPPER DISTRICTS, CAME TO EPHESUS. (8) AND HE

ENTERED INTO THE SYNAGOGUE, AND SPAKE BOLDLY FOR THE SPACE OF THREE

MONTHS, REASONING AND PERSUADING AS TO WHAT CONCERNS THE KINGDOM OF

GOD. (9) BUT WHEN SOME WERE HARDENED AND DISOBEDIENT, SPEAKING EVIL OF

THE WAY BEFORE THE MULTITUDE, HE DEPARTED FROM THEM AND SEPARATED THE

DISCIPLES, REASONING DAILY IN THE SCHOOL OF TYRANNUS [FROM THE FIFTH TO

THE TENTH HOUR]. (10) AND THIS CONTINUED FOR THE SPACE OF TWO YEARS.

The distinction between the period of preaching in the synagogue and

the direct address to the Ephesian population is very clearly marked,

and the times given in each case. In vv. 2-7 a strange episode is

related before Paul entered the synagogue. He found twelve men who had

been baptised by the baptism of John, and induced them to accept

rebaptism. This episode I must confess not to understand. It interrupts

the regular method of Luke's narrative; for in all similar cases, Paul

goes to the synagogue, and his regular efforts for his own people are

related before any exceptional cases are recorded. The circumstances,

too, are difficult. How had these twelve escaped the notice of Aquila,

Priscilla, and Apollos, and yet attracted Paul's attention before he

went to the synagogue? Perhaps the intention is to represent Paul as

completing and perfecting the work begun by Apollos; rebaptism was,

apparently, not thought necessary for Apollos, and now Paul lays down

the principle that it is required in all such cases. But that seems

distinctly below the level on which Luke's conception of Paul is

pitched. If there were any authority in MS. or ancient Versions to omit

the episode, one would be inclined to take that course. As there is

none, I must acknowledge that I cannot reconcile it with the conception

of Luke's method, founded. on other parts of the narrative, which is

maintained in this book. Possibly better knowledge about the early

history of the Ephesian Church might give this episode more

significance and importance in the development history than it seems to

possess.

We should be glad to know more about the lecture room of Tyrannus. It

played the same part in Ephesus that the house of Titius Justus

adjoining the synagogue did in Corinth. Here Paul regularly taught

every day; and the analogy which we have noticed in other cases (pp.

75, 243) between his position, as it would appear to the general

population, and that of the rhetors and philosophers of the time, is

very marked. There is one difference, according to the Bezan Text of v.

9: Paul taught after the usual work of the lecture-room was concluded,

i.e., "after business hours ". Doubtless he himself began to work (XX

34, I Cor. IV 12) before sunrise and continued at his trade till

closing time, an hour before noon. His hours of work are defined by

himself, I Thess. II 9, "ye remember our labour and toil, working day

and night "; there, as often in ancient literature, the hours before

daybreak are called "night," and his rule at Thessalonica may be

extended to Ephesus. Public life in the Ionian cities ended regularly

at the fifth hour; and we may add to the facts elsewhere stated a

regulation at Attaleia in Lydia that public distribution of oil should

be "from the first to the fifth hour" [43] . Thus Paul himself would be

free, and the lecture-room would be disengaged, after the fifth hour;

and the time, which was devoted generally to home-life and rest, was

applied by him to mission-work.

In the following narrative the powers of Paul are brought into

competition with those of Jewish exorcists and pagan dabblers in the

black art, and his superiority to them demonstrated. Ephesus was a

centre of all such magical arts and practices, and it was therefore

inevitable that the new teaching should be brought in contact with them

and triumph over them. There can be no doubt that, in the conception of

Luke, the measure of success lay in the extent to which Divine power

and inspiration was communicated to a new Church; and perhaps the whole

description may be defended as the extremist example of that view. But

it seems undeniable that, when we contrast this passage with the great

scene at Paphos, or the beautiful though less powerful scene with the

ventriloquist at Philippi, there is in the Ephesian description

something like vulgarity of tone, together with a certain vagueness and

want of individuality, very different from those other scenes. Such

details, too, as are given, are not always consistent and satisfactory.

The seven sons in v. 14 change in an unintelligible way to two in v. 16

(except in the Bezan Text); and the statement that the seven were sons

of a chief priest, looks more like a popular tale than a trustworthy

historical statement. There is no warrant in the text for the view

sometimes advocated, that Sceva was merely an impostor who pretended to

be a chief priest. The money value of the books that were destroyed is

another touch that is thoroughly characteristic of the oriental popular

tale. The inability of the vulgar oriental mind to conceive any other

aim, object, or standard in the world except money, and its utter

slavery to gold, are familiar to every one who has seen the life of the

people, or studied the Arabian Nights: in the West one sees nothing

like the simple, childish frankness with which the ordinary oriental

measures all things by gold, and can conceive of no other conscious aim

except gold. So far as the oriental peasant is natural and unconscious,

he is interesting and delightful, and his complete difference of nature

at once attracts and holds at a distance the man of Western thoughts;

but so far as he consciously attempts to conceive motives and form

plans, gold is his sole standard of value.

In this Ephesian description one feels the character, not of weighed

and reasoned history, but of popular fancy; and I cannot explain it on

the level of most of the narrative The writer is here rather a

picker-up of current gossip, like Herodotus, than a real historian. The

puzzle becomes still more difficult when we go on to v. 23, and find

ourselves again on the same level as the finest parts of Acts. If there

were many such contrasts in the book as between vv. 11-20 and 23-41, I

should be a believer in the composite character of Acts. As it is, I

confess the difficulty in this part; but the existence of some unsolved

difficulties is not a bar to the view maintained in the present

treatise (p. 16).

4. THE CHURCH IN THE PROVINCE OF ASIA.

(XIX 10) THIS CONTINUED FOR THE SPACE OF TWO YEARS, SO THAT ALL THEY

THAT DWELT IN ASIA HEARD THE WORD. . . . (21) NOW AFTER THESE THINGS

WERE ENDED, PAUL PURPOSED IN THE SPIRIT, WHEN HE HAD MADE A PROGRESS

THROUGH MACEDONIA AND ACHAIA, TO GO TO JERUSALEM, SAYING, "AFTER I HAVE

BEEN THERE, I MUST ALSO SEE ROME". (22) AND, HAVING SENT INTO MACEDONIA

TWO OF THEM THAT ASSISTED HIM, TIMOTHY AND ERASTUS, HE HIMSELF STAYED

IN ASIA FOR A WHILE.

The work in Asia, which had been Paul's aim in A.D. (p. 198), was now

carried out. The long residence suits the greatness of the work, for

Asia was the richest. one of the largest, and in many ways the leading

province of the East.

Ephesus, as the seat of government, was the centre from which the whole

province of Asia could best be affected (p. 104); and the effect of

Paul's long work there extended far over that vast province, but

chiefly, of course, along the great lines of communication. For

example, Churches arose in three cities of the Lycos Valley, Laodiceia,

Colossai, and Hierapolis, though Paul himself did not go there. All the

seven Churches mentioned in the Revelation were probably rounded during

this period, for all were within easy reach of Ephesus, and all were

great centres of trade. It is probable that they, being the first

foundations in the province, retained a sort of representative

character; and thus they were addressed in the Revelation (perhaps as

heads over districts), when there were certainly other Churches in the

province.

In the ordinary communication between the capital and the other cities

of the province, the influence from Ephesus would be carried to these

cities; but that was not the only way in which these other Churches

grew. Paul had with him a number of subordinate helpers, such as

Timothy, Erastus, Titus, etc. The analogy of many other cases in the

early history of the Church would leave no room to doubt that helpers

were often employed in missions to the new Churches; and, as Timothy

joined with Paul in the letter to the Colossians, it may be inferred

that he had been working in that city. The clear conception of a

far-reaching plan revealed in v. 21 is confirmed by Rom. XV 24 (see p.

255).

It has been argued by some (and notably by Lightfoot) that Paul made a

short visit to Corinth, during his Ephesian mission. But this

conjectural visit (II Cor. XII 14, XIII 1) is more likely to have been

made from Philippi, (p. 283), for clearly (Acts XIX 9, 10) Paul resided

in Ephesus throughout the period Oct. 53 to Jan. 56. In the latter part

of autumn 55 he sent to Corinth the First Epistle; and at that time his

intention was to remain in Ephesus till Pentecost 56 (XVI 8), and then

to go through Macedonia to Corinth. But this was an alteration of a

previous plan to sail direct from Ephesus to Corinth, thence going to

Macedonia, and returning to Corinth, from whence he should sail for

Jerusalem (II Cor. I 16). That intention was abandoned, and a letter, I

Cor., was sent instead: the full knowledge of the state of things in

Corinth, which is revealed in that letter, was gained by the report of

some envoys (XVI 17, compare p. 284). The abandonment of the plan was

doubtless due to the conviction that the success of the work in Asia

demanded a longer residence. He, therefore, cut out of his programme

the first of these two proposed visits to Corinth, and restricted

himself to one, which he should pay after a progress through Macedonia

(I Cor. XVI 5). He sent Timothy and Erastus to Macedonia, instructing

the former to go on to Corinth, and he told the Corinthians, IV 17,

that Timothy was coming, "who shall put you in remembrance of my ways

which be in Christ". Finally, when his Asian work was cut short, he

went from Philippi to Corinth, April 56 (see Preface).

The analogy of this case strengthens our interpretation of the Galatian

letter (p. 190). In each case Paul had to encounter a serious and

dangerous situation in a distant Church. In the case of Corinth, he

could not go, but sent a substitute and a letter explaining that the

substitute was on the way, and the bearer would give the reason why

Paul could not go then; but he adds in the letter a promise to go

later, though "some of them fancied that he was not coming". In the

case of Galatia he was able to go immediately, and sent off a hasty

letter in front, the bearer of which would announce that he was

following. But on the usual theory, Paul, in that serious emergency In

Galatia, neither thought of going there, nor of explaining that he

could not go.

No allusion to Timothy occurs between XVIII 5 (where he rejoined Paul

at Corinth) and XIX 22. According to the analogy of Luke's method (p.

46 f.), this shows that he was understood by the author to have been

attached to Paul's service during the intervening period, ready for any

mission, such as that to Galatia, or this to Macedonia. According to I

Cor. IV 17, Timothy was to go on to Corinth: Luke speaks only of

Macedonia. Both are correct; it becomes clear from II Cor. that Timothy

did not go on to Corinth, and that Paul found him in Macedonia:

probably he met Titus on his way back to report to Paul the result of

the first letter, and waited instructions before going on. See p. 285.

The plan of staying in Ephesus till Pentecost was interrupted by a

popular riot. Already in the autumn of 55 Paul spoke of the

difficulties in Ephesus caused by the opposition of the vulgar populace

(p. 230, I Cor. XV 32); and the character of the city shows how

inevitable that was. The superstition of all Asia was concentrated in

Ephesus. Throughout the early centuries the city mob, superstitious,

uneducated, frivolous, swayed by the most commonplace motives, was

everywhere the most dangerous and unfailing enemy of Christianity, and

often carried the imperial officials further than they wished in the

way of persecution. Moreover, round the great Ephesian temple, to which

worshippers came from far, many tradesmen got their living from the

pilgrims, supplying them with victims and dedicatory offerings of

various kinds, as well as food and shelter. During the year 55, the

tension in Ephesus grew more severe: the one hand, the teaching spread

so fast that Paul was tempted to remain longer than he had intended (p.

275): on the other hand, his success only enraged and alarmed the

opposing forces. "A great door and effectual is opened unto me, and

there are many adversaries" (I Cor. XVI 9): "after the manner of men I

fought with beasts in Ephesus" (ib. XV 32, p. 230).

The most sensitive part of "civilised" man is his pocket; and it was

there that opposition to Christian changes, or "reforms," began. Those

"reforms" threatened to extinguish some ancient and respectable trades,

and promised no compensation; and thus all the large class that lived

off the pilgrims and the temple service was marshalled against the new

party, which threatened the livelihood of all.

5. DEMETRIUS THE SILVERSMITH.

The scene which follows is the most instructive picture of society in

an Asian city at this period that has come down to us. It is impossible

here to treat it so fully as it deserves; and we can only enumerate the

more striking points, and refer to previous discussions. A certain

Demetrius was a leading man in the associated trades, which made in

various materials, terra-cotta, marble and silver, small shrines (naoi)

for votaries to dedicate in the temple, representing the Goddess

Artemis sitting in a niche or naiskos, with her lions beside her. Vast

numbers of these shrines were offered to the goddess by her innumerable

votaries. The rich bought and offered them in more expensive materials

and more artistic form, the poor in simple rude terra-cotta. The temple

and the sacred precinct were crowded with dedications; and the priests

often cleared away the old and especially the worthless offerings to

make room for new gifts. The richer tradesmen made shrines in the more

expensive material, and silver was evidently a favourite material among

the wealthy. Demetrius, then, must have had a good deal of capital sunk

in his business. He called a meeting of the trades, doubtless in a

guild house where they regularly met, and pointed out that Paul, by

teaching the worthlessness of images, was seriously affecting public

opinion and practice over almost the whole province Asia, [44] and

endangering their business as well as the worship of the goddess. The

tradesmen were roused; they rushed forth into the street; [45] a

general scene of confusion arose, and a common impulse carried the

excited crowd into the great theatre. The majority of the crowd were

ignorant what was the matter; they only knew from the shouts of the

first rioters that the worship of Artemis was concerned; and for about

two hours the vast assembly, like a crowd of devotees or howling

dervishes, shouted their invocation of "Great Artemis". In this scene

we cannot mistake the tone of sarcasm and contempt, as Luke tells of

this howling mob; they themselves thought they were performing their

devotions, as they repeated the sacred name; but to Luke they were

merely howling, not praying.

A certain Alexander was put forward by the Jews to address the mob; but

this merely increased the clamour and confusion. There was no clear

idea among the rioters what they wanted: an anti-Jewish and an

anti-Christian demonstration were mixed up, and probably Alexander's

intention was to turn the general feeling away from the Jews. It is

possible that he was the worker in bronze, who afterwards did Paul much

harm (II Tim. IV 14).

Our conception of the scene assumes that the Bezan reading in 28, 34

(megale Artemis) is original. The accepted text, "Great is Artemis,"

gives a different tone to the scene: that is the quiet expression in

which a worshipper recognises and accepts a sign of the goddess's

power, drawing an inference and expressing his respect and gratitude.

"Great Artemis" was a common formula of devotion and prayer, as is

attested by several inscriptions; and it gives a more natural and a far

more effective tone to the scene.

Two of Paul's companions in travel, Gaius and Aristarchus, had been

carried into the theatre with the crowd; and he himself was on the

point of going there, but the disciples would not allow him, and his

friends among the Asiarchs sent urging him not to risk himself among

the mob. It is noteworthy that Luke, as usual, adds no comments or

reflections of his own as to the danger in which Paul was placed. But

the slightest consideration suffices to show that he must have been at

this period in the most imminent danger, with the mob of a great Ionian

coast-city raging against him. In the speech of Demetrius are

concentrated most of the feelings and motives that, from the beginning

to the end, made the mob so hostile to the Christians in the great

oriental cities. Paul himself says, "concerning our affliction which

befell in Asia, that we were weighed down exceedingly, beyond our

power, insomuch that we despaired even of life" (II Cor. I 8). His

immediate withdrawal from Ephesus, in the midst of his promising work,

was forced on him.

It is a question whether the reading of some few MSS., "Gaius and

Aristarchus a Macedonian," should not be followed. Gaius, in that case,

would be the native of Derbe mentioned in XX 4. Luke, himself a

Macedonian, does not omit the little touch of national pride in

Aristarchus; but he was not so interested in the nationality of Gaius.

The peculiar phraseology, with the ethnic in singular (Makedona)

following two names, and preceding sunekdemous, led naturally to the

change (Makedonas), which appears in most MSS. The epithet, "travelling

companions," seems to point forward to XX 4, as we have no reason to

think that either Gaius or Aristarchus had hitherto been companions of

Paul on a journey. Prof. Blass, recognising the probability that Gaius

is the travelling companion of XX 4, accepts Valckenaer's alteration of

the text in that place, making Gaius a Thessalonian, and Timothy a man

of Derbe; and that alteration would be very tempting, were it not for

the insurmountable statement, XVI 1, that Timothy was a Lystran.

The reference to the Asiarchs is very important, both in respect of the

nature of that office (on which it throws great light, though that

opens up a wide and disputed field), and as a fact of Pauline history.

The Asiarchs, or High Priests of Asia, were the heads of the imperial,

political-religious organisation of the province in the worship of

"Rome and the Emperors" (p. 134); and their friendly attitude is a

proof both that the spirit of the imperial policy was not as yet

hostile to the new teaching, and that the educated classes did not

share the hostility of the superstitious vulgar to Paul. Doubtless,

some of the Asiarchs had, in the ordinary course of dignity, previously

held priesthoods of Artemis or other city deities; and it is quite

probable that up to the present time even the Ephesian priests were not

at all hostile to Paul. The eclectic religion, which was fashionable at

the time, regarded new forms of cult with equanimity, almost with

friendliness; and the growth of each new superstition only added to the

influence of Artemis and her priests. My friend, Mr. J. N. Farquhar,

Principal of the L.M.S. College, Calcutta, writes that he is struck

with similar facts in the situation of mission work in India, and its

relation to the priests and people.

Luke, having stated the accusation against Paul, does not fail to show

up its utter groundlessness in the eyes of responsible officials. The

speech of the Town-clerk, which is given at length, is a very skillful

and important document, in its bearing on the whole situation, and on

Luke's plan (p. 304 f.). The Clerk was probably the most important

official in Ephesus, and therefore in close contact with the court of

the proconsul, who generally resided in that city; and his speech is a

direct negation of the charges commonly brought against Christianity,

as flagrantly disrespectful in action and in language to the

established institutions of the State. He points out that the only

permissible method of procedure for those who have complaints against a

Christian is action before the courts of the province, or the assembly

of the municipality; and he warns the rioters that they are bringing

themselves into danger by their disorderly action.

This address is so entirely an apologia of the Christians that we might

almost take it as an example of the Thucydidean type of speech, put

into the mouth of one of the actors, not as being precisely his words,

but as embodying a statesmanlike conception of the real situation. At

any rate, it is included by Luke in his work, not for its mere Ephesian

connection, but as bearing on the universal question of the relations

in which the Church stood to the Empire (p. 306). The well-known

rescripts of Hadrian to Fundanus, and of Antoninus Pius to the Greek

cities, take their stand on the same permanent and obvious ground,

which at all times formed the one statesmanlike principle of action,

and the basis for the Church's claim to freedom and toleration.

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

[42] exelei, lit. "he set about the voyage"; contrast XX 6,

exepleusamen aorist.

[43] In an inscription, Bulletin de Corresp. Hellen., 1887, p. 400.

[44] In an inscription, Bulletin de Corresp. Hellen., 1887, p. 400.

[45] I formerly erred as to the sense of Asia in XIX 26, 27, Church in

R. E., p. 166.

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

CHAPTER XIII.

THE VOYAGE TO JERUSALEM

1. THE SECOND EUROPEAN JOURNEY.

(XX 1) AND AFTER THE RIOT CEASED, PAUL, HAVING SENT FOR THE DISCIPLES

AND EXHORTED THEM, BADE THEM FAREWELL, AND DEPARTED TO MAKE HIS WAY

INTO MACEDONIA. (2) AND HAVING MADE A PROGRESS THROUGH THOSE QUARTERS,

AND EXHORTED THEM WITH MUCH PREACHING, HE WENT INTO GREECE. (3) AND HE

SPENT THREE MONTHS there.

Paul took a coasting vessel from Ephesus, we may be sure; and, as was

often the case, he had to transship in Troas. Here "a door was opened

to him" (II Cor. II 12). Doubtless he had to wait some time for a

passage to Macedonia; for, though in January a passage could be easily

obtained along the safe Asian coast, it was more difficult to find

opportunity for the longer voyage over the open sea to Macedonia;

perhaps none was found till general navigation began, March 5. It is

probable that already in the voyages between Ephesus and Macedonia, the

new teaching had effected a lodging in Troas (XIX 10);and in the delay

there, Paul had a good opening. In Troas Paul had expected to meet

Titus; and was much disappointed that he was not there. At the same

time he was greatly dispirited by the strong opposition which had

driven him prematurely from Ephesus (II Cor. I 8 f.); and was in a

depressed frame of mind owing to ill-health (ib. IV 7 f.).

Titus is the most enigmatic figure in early Christian history. His

omission from Acts has been alluded to (P. 59). He enters on the stage

of history for a short time in A.D. 45-6, and then we hear nothing of

him, until we learn that Paul expected to find him in Troas in January

or February 56. He was now on his way from Corinth to Macedonia; and he

joined Paul after he had arrived at Philippi in February or March,

bringing a detailed report of the state of the Corinthian Church. Now

in II Cor. Titus is prominent to a degree unique in Paul's letters; he

is named nine times, and always with marked affection and distinction.

Why, then, is he never mentioned in I Cor.?. There is one satisfactory

reason, and only one, so far as I can judge: he was the bearer of the

first letter. [46] His special interest in Corinth is mentioned, VII

15, VIII 16. He was eager to return on a second mission to Corinth,

VIII 17, and along with him Paul sent the Brother whose praise in the

delivery of the good tidings was spread over all the Churches (Luke,

according to an early tradition), and another, who was selected on

account of the confidence that he felt in the Corinthians. It may be

safely assumed that the Titus of II Cor. is the same Titus that is

mentioned in Gal II 1.

Titus, then, had been sent on his first mission to Corinth in autumn

55, probably by direct ship. He could not come back across the open sea

during the winter (Nov. 10 to March 5), and must take a coasting voyage

by Macedonia. Paul expected to find him in Troas; but he was detained

too long, and met Paul in Philippi in February or early March 56; and

he returned thence on a second mission to Corinth.

As Titus was at hand in Ephesus about October 55, it is hardly open to

doubt that he had been in Paul's company on the whole of the third

journey. It is equally clear that he had not been with Paul on the

first or the second journey, for he is mentioned in Gal. II 1 as a

stranger to the Galatians, whose Greek birth had to be explained to

them. Probably it was his Greek origin that had prevented Paul from

taking him as a companion on earlier journeys.

We have seen how careful Paul was to conciliate the Jews on his second

journey; and we may fairly consider that the grumbling of the Jews in

Jerusalem in 46 (even when Titus was bringing food to them) had warned

Paul that it was not expedient to have Titus with him when he entered

the synagogues of strange cities. For his companions on the second

journey he selected Silas, a Jewish Roman, and Timothy, half-Greek,

half-Jew. Finally, on his third journey, when he was putting down the

Judaising tendency in Galatia, he took Titus with him by a carefully

planned stroke of policy: one of the arguments by which the Judaisers

proved that Judaic Christianity was the higher stage was that Paul had

circumcised Timothy before promoting him to an office of trust. He

replied by taking Titus with him to Galatia; and from II Cor. we gather

that Titus proved one of the most congenial and useful of his

assistants. The space which he fills in II Cor. [47] is a unique fact

in Paul's letters; and in the loving and tender sympathy of Paul's

language about him we may read a wish to compensate for the neglect

that had during many years sacrificed him to the thankless policy of

conciliating the Jews.

The importance of Titus in subsequent years confirms the impression

derived from II Cor. He seems to have remained in Europe when Paul went

to Jerusalem in March 57. At a later time he was sent to Dalmatia, II

Tim. IV 10; and near the end of Paul's career he was entrusted with the

general oversight of the Churches in Crete, Tit. I 5.

Paul spent the summer and autumn of 56 in Macedonia. He found Timothy

waiting him either in Thessalonica or in Bercea; and they joined in

addressing the second letter to the Corinthians, enforcing in a more

personal way the instructions already sent through the three envoys who

had come from Philippi. The common view (which is as old as the

subscription added in some MSS. to the letter), that the envoys carried

with them II Cor., seems improbable. In winter Paul went on to Hellas

(the Greek term for the country forming the main part of the Roman

province), and spent December, January. and February in Corinth.

2. THE CONTRIBUTION OF THE FOUR PROVINCES.

(3) AND WHEN HE HAD SPENT THREE MONTHS, AND A PLOT WAS LAID AGAINST HIM

BY THE JEWS WHILE HE WAS ON THE POINT OF SETTING SAIL FOR SYRIA, HE

ADOPTED THE PLAN OF MAKING HIS RETURN JOURNEY to Jerusalem THROUGH

MACEDONIA. (4) AND THERE ACCOMPANIED HIM on the journey to Jerusalem

SOPATER, SON OF PYRRHUS OF BEREA, AND on the part OF THE THESSALONIANS

ARISTARCHUS AND SECUNDUS, AND GAIUS OF DERBE AND TIMOTHY, AND THE

ASIANS TYCHICUS AND TROPHIMUS (NOW THESE Asian delegates, COMING TO

MEET US, AWAITED US IN TROAS). (5) AND WE SAILED AWAY FROM PHILIPPI

AFTER THE DAYS OF UNLEAVENED BREAD, AND CAME UNTO THEM TO TROAS.

At the opening of navigation, Paul had arranged to sail from Corinth to

Jerusalem, obviously with the intention of celebrating the Passover

there; but the discovery of a Jewish plot to kill him altered his

plans. The style of this plot can be easily imagined. Paul's intention

must have been to take a pilgrim ship carrying Achaian and Asian Jews

to the Passover (p. 264). With a shipload of hostile Jews, it would be

easy to find opportunity to murder Paul. He therefore abandoned the

proposed voyage and sailed for Macedonia, where he easily arrived in

time to celebrate the Passover in Philippi.

It is clear that the plot was discovered at the last moment, when

delegates from the Churches had already assembled. The European

delegates were to sail from Corinth, the Asian from Ephesus, where

doubtless the pilgrim ship would call (as in 53, P. 264). When the plan

was changed, word was sent to the Asian delegates; and they went as far

as Troas to meet the others, for in ancient voyages it could be

calculated with certainty that Paul's company would put in at that

harbour.

The purpose of this numerous company is not stated in this part of the

text; but in XXIV 17, Paul says: "I came to bring alms to my nation,

and offerings," and the reason is often alluded to in the Epistles to

Corinth and Rome. In Rom. XV 25, written from Corinth about Jan. 57,

Paul says: "Now I go unto Jerusalem, acting as an administrator of

relief to the saints". The scheme of a general contribution collected

week by week for a long time in all the Pauline Churches of Galatia,

Asia, Macedonia, and Achaia, has been well described by Mr. Rendall

(Expositor, Nov. 1893, p. 321). The great importance which Paul

attached to this contribution, and to the personal distribution of the

fund (daikonia), is attested, not merely by the long and careful

planning of the scheme, and by the numerous body of delegates who

carried it to Jerusalem, but also by his determination to conduct the

delegates personally, in spite of all the dangers which, as he knew,

awaited him there: "I go constrained by the Spirit unto Jerusalem, not

knowing what shall befall me there, save that the Holy Spirit

testifieth unto me in every city, saying that bonds and afflictions

await me". It is evident that he thought this scheme the crowning act

of his work in these four provinces; and as soon as it was over, his

purpose was to go to Rome and the West (p. 255), and cease for the time

his work in the Eastern provinces (XX 25).

The scheme is not alluded to in the letter to the Galatian Churches:

but it seems to have been inaugurated there by oral instructions during

the third visit (I Cor. XVI 1). The mission of Timothy and of Titus in

56 doubtless helped to carry it out in Europe. Luke evidently took it

up with special zeal, and he was from an early date selected as one of

the administrators who were to carry it to Jerusalem (II Cor. VIII 19).

In the list, v. 4, Luke omits his own name, but suggests his presence

by his familiar device. No representative from Achaia is on the list;

but perhaps we may understand that the Corinthians had asked Paul

himself to bear their contribution, the amount of which he praises (II

Cor. IX 2).

In v. 4 we have probably a case like XVI 19 f., in which the authority

hesitated between two constructions, and left an unfinished sentence

containing elements of two forms. The facts were probably as stated in

our rendering; and it would lead too far to discuss the sentence, which

perhaps never received the author's final revision.

3. THE VOYAGE TO TROAS.

(XX 6) WE SAILED AWAY FROM PHILIPPI AFTER THE DAYS OF UNLEAVENED BREAD,

AND CAME UNTO THEM TO TROAS IN FIVE DAYS; AND THERE WE TARRIED SEVEN

DAYS. (7) AND ON THE FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK WHEN WE WERE GATHERED

TOGETHER TO BREAK BREAD, PAUL DISCOURSED WITH THEM, BEING ABOUT TO

DEPART ON THE MORROW; AND HE PROLONGED HIS SPEECH UNTIL MIDNIGHT . . .

(13) AND WE, GOING BEFORE TO THE SHIP, SET SAIL FOR ASSOS.

In A.D. 57 Passover fell on Thursday, April 7. The company left

Philippi on the morning of Friday, April 15, and the journey to Troas

lasted till the fifth day, Tuesday, April 19. In Troas they stayed

seven days, the first of which was April 19, and the last, Monday,

April 25. Luke's rule is to state first the whole period of residence,

and then some details of the residence (see pp. 153, 256, and XIX 10).

On the Sunday evening just before the start, the whole congregation

4. EUTYCHUS.

(XX 7) AND UPON THE FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK, WHEN WE WERE GATHERED

TOGETHER TO BREAK BREAD, PAUL DISCOURSED TO THEM, INTENDING TO GO AWAY

ON THE MORROW; AND HE PROLONGED HIS SPEECH UNTIL MIDNIGHT. (8) AND

THERE WERE MANY LIGHTS IN THE UPPER CHAMBER, WHERE WE WERE GATHERED

TOGETHER. (9) AND THERE SAT IN THE WINDOW A CERTAIN YOUNG MAN NAMED

EUTYCHUS, WHO WAS GRADUALLY OPPRESSED BY SLEEP AS PAUL EXTENDED HIS

DISCOURSE FURTHER, AND BEING BORNE DOWN BY HIS SLEEP HE FELL FROM THE

THIRD STORY TO THE GROUND, AND WAS LIFTED UP DEAD. (10) AND PAUL WENT

DOWN AND FELL ON HIM, AND EMBRACING HIM SAID, "MAKE YE NO ADO; FOR HIS

LIFE IS IN HIM". (11) AND HE WENT UP, AND BROKE BREAD AND ATE, AND

TALKED WITH THEM A LONG WHILE, EVEN TILL BREAK OF DAY; AND THUS HE

DEPARTED. (12) AND THEY BROUGHT THE LAD ALIVE, AND WERE NOT A LITTLE

COMFORTED. (13) BUT WE, GOING BEFORE TO THE SHIP, SET SAIL FOR ASSOS,

INTENDING TO TAKE PAUL ON BOARD FROM THENCE; FOR SO HE HAD ARRANGED,

INTENDING HIMSELF TO GO BY LAND.

In this case the author vouches that Eutychus was dead, implying

apparently that, as a physician, he had satisfied himself on the point

In XIV 19 he had no authority for asserting that Paul was dead, but

only that his enemies considered him dead.

The sequence of the narrative is remarkable: the young man fell: Paul

declared he was not dead: Paul went upstairs again, partook of the

common meal (conceived here as a sacrament), and conversed till break

of day: they brought the young man living. But the interruption of the

story of Eutychus's fate is intentional. The narrator was present in

the upper chamber, and saw Eutychus fall, and heard Paul declare that

he was not dead; but he does not claim to have been a witness of the

man's recovery, and he marks the difference by a break in the

narrative. The ship, having to round the projecting cape Lectum, would

take longer time to reach Assos than the land journey required; and

Paul stayed on to the last moment, perhaps to be assured of Eutychus's

recovery, while the other delegates went on ahead in the ship. Thus the

fact that Eutychus recovered is in a sense the final incident of the

stay at Troas. The Bezan reading makes the sequence clearer: "and while

they were bidding farewell, they brought the young man living, and they

were comforted".

There is a very harsh change of subject in v. 12; the persons who

brought the youth are not those who were comforted (as Dr. Blass points

out). A similar change of subject, but not quite so harsh, occurs in

XIII 2-3. The word "brought," not "carried," implies that Eutychus was

able to come with some help.

5. THE VOYAGE TO C�SAREIA.

(14) AND WHEN HE MET US AT ASSOS, WE TOOK HIM BOARD, AND CAME TO

MITYLENE; (15) AND SAILING FROM THENCE ON THE FOLLOWING DAY, WE REACHED

a point on the mainland OPPOSITE CHIOS; AND ON THE MORROW WE STRUCK

ACROSS TO SAMOS, AND [AFTER MAKING A STAY AT TROGYLLIA] ON THE NEXT DAY

WE CAME TO MILETUS. (16) FOR PAUL HAD DECIDED TO SAIL PAST EPHESUS, TO

AVOID SPENDING TIME IN ASIA; [48] FOR HE WAS HASTENING, IF IT WERE

PENTECOST. (17) AND FROM MILETUS HE SENT TO EPHESUS, AND SUMMONED THE

ELDERS OF THE CHURCH. (18) AND WHEN THEY WERE COME TO HIM, HE SAID UNTO

THEM . . . (36) AND WHEN HE HAD THUS SPOKEN, HE KNEELED DOWN WITH THEM

ALL, AND PRAYED. (37) AND THEY ALL WEPT SORE, AND FELL ON PAUL'S NECK,

AND KISSED HIM, SORROWING MOST OF ALL FOR THE WORD WHICH HE HAD SPOKEN,

THAT THEY WILL BEHOLD HIS FACE NO MORE. (38) AND THEY BROUGHT HIM ON

HIS WAY UNTO THE SHIP. (XXI 1) AND WHEN IT CAME TO PASS THAT WE,

TEARING OURSELVES FROM THEM, SET SAIL, WE MADE A STRAIGHT RUN TO COS,

AND THE NEXT DAY TO RHODES, AND FROM THENCE TO PATARA [and Myra]. (2)

AND, FINDING A SHIP GOING OVER SEA TO PHOENICE, WE WENT ON BOARD AND

SET SAIL. (3) AND, HAVING SIGHTED CYPRUS, LEAVING IT ON OUR LEFT, WE

SAILED UNTO SYRIA, AND LANDED AT TYRE; FOR THERE THE SHIP WAS TO

UNLADE. (4) AND HAVING FOUND THE DISCIPLES, WE TARRIED THERE SEVEN

DAYS; AND THESE SAID THROUGH THE SPIRIT TO PAUL NOT TO SET FOOT IN

JERUSALEM. (5) AND WHEN IT CAME TO PASS THAT WE HAD FINISHED OUR TIME,

WE DEPARTED AND WENT ON OUR JOURNEY; AND THEY ALL, WITH WIVES AND

CHILDREN, BROUGHT US ON OUR WAY TILL WE WERE OUT OF THE CITY. AND

KNEELING DOWN ON THE BEACH, WE PRAYED, (6) AND BADE EACH OTHER

FAREWELL; AND WE WENT ON BOARD SHIP, BUT THEY RETURNED HOME AGAIN. (7)

AND FINISHING THE short RUN FROM TYRE, WE REACHED PTOLEMAIS; AND WE

SALUTED THE BRETHREN AND ABODE WITH THEM ONE DAY.

The ship evidently stopped every evening. The reason lies in the wind,

which in the �gean during the summer generally blows from the north,

beginning at a very early hour in the morning; in the late afternoon it

dies away; at sunset there is a dead calm, and thereafter a gentle

south wind arises and blows during the night. The start would be made

before sunrise; and it would be necessary for all passengers to go on

board soon after midnight in order to be ready to sail with the first

breath from the north.

In v. 14 our translation (agreeing with Blass) assumes that the reading

sunebalen is correct; but the great MSS. read suneballen, and perhaps

the imperfect may be used, implying that Paul did not actually enter

Assos, but was descried and taken in by boat as he was nearing the

city. On Monday, April 25, they reached Mitylene before the wind fell;

and on Tuesday afternoon they stopped at a point opposite Chios

(probably near Cape Argennum). Hence on Wednesday morning they ran

straight across to the west point of Samos, and thence kept in towards

Miletus; but when the wind fell, they had not got beyond the promontory

Trogyllia at the entrance to the gulf, and there, as the Bezan Text

mentions, they spent the evening. Early on Thursday, April 28, they

stood across the gulf (which is now in great part filled up by the silt

of the river M�ander) to Miletus. Here they found that they could

reckon on a stay of some days, and Paul sent a messenger to Ephesus.

The messenger could not reach Ephesus that day, for the land road round

the gulf made a vast circuit, and the wind would prevent him from

sailing across to Priene in the forenoon. Moreover, it would take some

time to land, and to engage a messenger. In the early afternoon there

would arise a sea-breeze blowing up the gulf (called in modern times

Imbat, embates), which would permit the messenger to sail to the north

side of the gulf. He would probably land at Priene, cross the hills,

and thereafter take the coast road to Ephesus, which he might reach

during the night. Some time would be required to summon the presbyters;

and they could not travel so fast as a single chosen messenger. They

would show good speed if they reached Priene in the evening and were

ready to sail to Miletus with the morning wind. The third day of Paul's

stay at Miletus, then, was devoted to the presbyters; and we cannot

suppose that the ship left Miletus before Sunday morning, May 1, while

it is possible that the start took place a day later.

On that day they reached Cos, on May 2 Rhodes, May 3 Patara, May 4

Myra, and, probably, May 7 Tyre. In Tyre they stayed seven days, and

sailed on May 13 for Ptolemais, where they spent the day, and on May 14

they reached C�sareia. As Pentecost was on May 28, they had still a

considerable time before them. If Paul remained several days in

C�sareia, then, the reason must be that there was still plenty of time

to do so without endangering his purpose.

We reach the same conclusion from observing the author's concise style.

After stating the object of the journey in v. 16, he leaves the reader

to gather from his silence that the object was attained. The fact was

clear in his own mind, and he was content with one single incidental

allusion to it, not for its own sake (he as a Greek felt little

interest in Jewish festivals), but to explain a point in which he was

interested, viz., the sailing past Ephesus without touching there.

The statement in v. 16 has led to a common misconception that Paul was

sailing in a vessel chartered by himself, whose stoppages he could

control as he pleased. But if Paul had been able to fix where the

vessel should stop, it was obviously a serious waste of time to go to

Miletus and summon the Ephesian elders thither; the shorter way would

have been to stop at Ephesus and there make his farewell address.

Clearly the delay of three days at Miletus was forced on him by the

ship's course, and the facts of the journey were these. From Neapolis

they sailed in a ship bound for Troas. Here they had to transship; and

some delay was experienced in finding a suitable passage. Paul would

not voluntarily, have spent seven days at Troas: the length of a

coasting voyage was too uncertain for him to waste so many days at the

beginning, when he was hastening to Jerusalem. After a week, two

chances presented themselves: one ship intended to make no break on its

voyage, except at Miletus, the other to stop at Ephesus. The latter

ship was, for some reason, the slower; either it was not to sail

further south than Ephesus (in which case time might be lost there in

finding a passage); or it was a slow ship, that intended to stop in

several other harbours. The shortness of the time determined Paul to

choose the ship that went straight to Miletus, and "to sail past

Ephesus"; and the pointed statement proves that the question had been

discussed, and doubtless the Ephesian delegates begged a visit to their

city.

To Luke the interest of Pentecost lay not in itself, but in its

furnishing the reason why Paul did not go to Ephesus. There, as in so

many other touches, we see the Greek, to whom the Jews were little more

than "Barbaroi".

We notice that Paul, having been disappointed in his first intention of

spending Passover at Jerusalem, was eager at any rate to celebrate

Pentecost there. For the purpose which he had at heart, the formation

of a perfect unity between the Jewish and the non-Jewish sections of

the Church, it was important to be in Jerusalem to show his respect for

one of the great feasts.

Modern discussion of the voyage to C�sareia illustrates the unnecessary

obscurity in which a remarkably accurate narrative has been involved by

over-subtlety, want of experience of rough-and-ready travel, and

inattention to the peculiar method of Luke as a narrator. As we have

seen, only two numbers are at all doubtful: the length of the stay at

Miletus, and the duration of the over-sea voyage to Tyre; but in each

case a day more or less is the utmost permissible variation. We find

that Paul had fully thirteen days to spare when he reached C�sareia.

Yet many excellent scholars have got so far astray in this simple

reckoning of days as to maintain that Paul was too late. Even Weiss, in

his edition (in many respects excellent), so lately as 1893, concludes

that already in Tyre Paul found that it was impossible to reach

Jerusalem in time. Yet, at a pinch, the journey from Tyre to Jerusalem

could have been performed in four days.

The farewell speech to the Ephesians, simple, pathetic, and

characteristic of Paul as it. is, contains little that concerns our

special purpose. Paul intimates clearly that this is his farewell

before entering on his enterprise in the West: "Ye all shall no longer

see my face". With a characteristic gesture he shows his hands: "these

hands ministered unto my necessities".

Incidentally we notice the ancient custom of reckoning time: the

residence in Asia, which can hardly have been more than two years six

months at the most, is estimated loosely as "three years". The clinging

affection which is expressed in the farewell scene, and in the "tearing

ourselves away" of XXI 1, makes a very pathetic picture.

Myra is mentioned on this voyage in the Bezan Text, and there can be no

doubt that the ship on which the company was embarked either entered

the harbour of Myra, or, at least, went close to it before striking

across the open sea west of Cyprus to the Syrian coast. The voyage may

be taken as typical of the course which hundreds of ships took every

year, along a route familiar from time immemorial. It had been a

specially frequented route since the age of the earlier Seleucid and

Ptolemaic kings, when, as Canon Hicks remarks, "there must have been

daily communication between Cos and Alexandria ". [49]

The harbour of Myra seems to have been the great port for the direct

cross-sea traffic to the coasts of Syria and Egypt. It was the seat of

the sailors god, to whom they offered their prayers before starting on

the direct long course, and paid their vows on their safe arrival; this

god survived in the Christianised form, St. Nicholas of Myra, the

patron-saint of sailors, who held the same position in the maritime

world of the Levant as St. Phokas of Sinope did in that of the Black

Sea (where he was the Christianised form of Achilles Pontarches, the

Ruler of the Pontos).

Myra is termed by the pilgrim Sawulf (as I learn from Dr. Tomaschek)

"the harbour of the Adriatic Sea, as Constantinople is of the �gean

Sea"; and this importance is hardly intelligible till we recognise its

relation to the Syrian and Egyptian traffic. The prevailing winds in

the Levant throughout the season are westerly; and these westerly

breezes blow almost with the steadiness of trade-winds. Hence the

ancient ships, even though they rarely made what sailors call "a long

leg" across the sea, were in the habit of running direct from Myra to

the Syrian, or to the Egyptian coast. On the return voyage an

Alexandrian ship could run north to Myra, if the wind was nearly due

west; but, if it shifted towards north-west (from which quarter the

Etesian winds blew steadily for forty days from July 20), the ships of

Alexandria ran for the Syrian coast. The same steady winds, which

favoured the run from Myra to Tyre, made the return voyage direct from

Tyre to Myra an impossibility. Hence the regular course for ships from

Syria was to keep northwards past the east end of Cyprus till they

reached the coast of Asia Minor; and then, by using the land winds

which blow off the coast for some part of almost every day, and aided

also to some extent by the current which sets steadily westward along

the Karamanian coast (as it is now called), these traders from Syria

worked their way along past Myra to Cnidos at the extreme south-western

corner of Asia Minor.

It may, then, be safely assumed that Myra was visited by Paul's ship,

as the Bezan Text asserts. But the addition of "and Myra" is a mere

gloss (though recording a true fact), for it implies that the

transshipment took place at Myra. We need not hesitate to accept the

authority of the great MSS. that Paul and his company found at Patara a

ship about to start on the direct Syrian course, and went on board of

it (probably because their ship did not intend to make the direct

voyage, or was a slower vessel). Luke then hurries over the direct

voyage, mentioning only the fact which specially interested him, that

they sighted the western point of Cyprus. He did not mention Myra; he

was giving only a brief summary of the voyage, and for some reason the

visit to Myra did not interest him.

Many circumstances might occur to deprive the visit of interest and to

make Luke omit it (as he omits many other sights) from his brief

summary of the voyage. Formerly I illustrated this by my own

experience. I was in the port of Myra in the course of a voyage; yet I

never saw either the town or the harbour, and would probably omit Myra,

if I were giving a summary description of my experiences on that

voyage.

At Tyre the vessel stayed seven days unloading; it must therefore have

been one of the larger class of merchant vessels; and probably only

that class ventured to make the direct sea voyage from Lycia by the

west side of Cyprus. Small vessels clung to the coast. As the same ship

[50] was going on as far as Ptolemais, and as there was still abundant

time for the rest of the journey, Paul remained until the allotted time

of its stay was over, v. 5. None of the party seems to have known Tyre,

for they had to seek out the Brethren there. The hearty welcome which

they received from strangers, whose sole bond of union lay in their

common religion, makes Luke dwell on this scene as showing the

solidarity of feeling in the Church. There took place a kindly farewell

on the shore at Tyre, as at Miletus; but the longing and sorrow of long

personal friendship and love could not here be present to the same

extent as there. The scenes are similar, and yet how different! Such

touches of diversity amid resemblance could be given only by the

eye-witness.

The ship completed the short voyage to Ptolemais early; and the party

spent the day with the Brethren; and went on to C�sareia next day.

Probably they went in the same ship. The emphasis laid on "finishing

the voyage" from Tyre to Ptolemais is due to the fact that it was

probably over about 10 A.M.

6. C�SAREIA AND JERUSALEM.

(XXI 8) ON THE MORROW WE DEPARTED, AND CAME INTO C�SAREIA. AND,

ENTERING INTO THE HOUSE OF PHILIP THE EVANGELIST, WHO WAS ONE OF THE

SEVEN, WE ABODE WITH HIM. (9) NOW THIS MAN HAD FOUR DAUGHTERS, VIRGINS,

WHICH DID PROPHESY. (10) AND, AS WE TARRIED THERE SOME [51] DAYS, THERE

CAME DOWN FROM JUDEA A CERTAIN PROPHET NAMED AGABUS. (11) AND COMING TO

US AND TAKING PAUL'S GIRDLE, HE BOUND HIS OWN FEET AND HANDS AND SAID:

"THUS SAITH THE HOLY SPIRIT, SO SHALL THE JEWS BIND AT JERUSALEM THE

MAN THAT OWNETH THIS GIRDLE, AND DELIVER HIM INTO THE HANDS OF THE.

GENTILES'". . . . (15) AND AFTER THESE DAYS, WE, HAVING EQUIPPED

horses, PROCEEDED ON OUR WAY TO JERUSALEM. (16) AND THERE WENT WITH US

ALSO some OF THE DISCIPLES FROM C�SAREIA,

CONDUCTING US TO the house OF ONE MNASON, AN EARLY DISCIPLE, WHERE WE

SHOULD FIND ENTERTAINMENT. (17) AND WHEN WE ARRIVED AT JERUSALEM, THE

BRETHREN RECEIVED US GLADLY. and these conducted us where we should

find entertainment; and reaching a certain village, we were in the

house of Mnason, an early disciple; and going out thence we came to

Jerusalem, and the Brethren received us gladly.

The length of the stay at C�sareia is concealed, with Luke's usual

defective sense of time, by the vague phrase, v. 10, hemeras pleious.

The sense of this expression varies greatly according to the situation

(cp. XXIV 17, with XIII 31, XXVII 20); but here it is not likely to be

less than nine or ten.

The party was therefore cutting down the time for the journey to the

utmost. Evidently they desired to remain as long as possible with the

Brethren; and the plan for the journey was arranged for them, so that

with C�sareian guidance and help it could be done with comfort and

certainty when time necessitated departure. Now, it is an elementary

principle of prudent living in Southern countries that one should avoid

those great exertions and strains which in Northern countries we often

take as an amusement. The customs of the modern peoples (whom we on

superficial knowledge are apt to think lazy, but who are not so) show

that this principle guides their whole life; and it may be taken as

certain that in ancient time the same principle was followed. Moreover,

Paul was accompanied by his physician, who fully understood the

importance of this rule, and knew that Paul, subject as he was to

attacks of illness, and constantly exposed to great mental and

emotional strains, must not begin his work in Jerusalem by a hurried

walk of sixty-four miles from C�sareia, more especially as it is clear

from a comparison of the Bezan with the Accepted Text that the journey

was performed in two days. We conclude, then, that the journey was not

performed on foot; and when we look at the words with this thought in

our minds we find there the verb which means in classical Greek, "to

equip or saddle a horse" Chrysostom took the word in that sense; [52]

but the modern commentators have scorned or misunderstood him.

Some of the Brethren from C�sareia accompanied them as far as a village

on the road, where they stayed for a night with Mnason of Cyprus, one

of the earliest Christian converts. The next day the Brethren returned

with the conveyances to C�sareia, while Paul and his company performed

the rest of the journey (which was probably not far) on foot. Time had

passed rapidly, when a convert of A.D. 30 or 31 was "ancient" in 57;

but the immense changes that had occurred made the Church of 30 seem

divided by a great gulf from these Macedonian and Asian delegates as

they approached Jerusalem.

7. THE CRISIS IN THE FATE OF PAUL AND OF THE CHURCH.

From the moment when Paul was arrested onwards, the narrative becomes

much fuller than before. It still continues true to the old method of

concentrating the reader's attention on certain selected scenes, which

are described in considerable detail, while the intervening periods are

dismissed very briefly. Thus XXI 17-XXIV 23 describes the events of

twelve days, XXIV 24-27 of two years, XXV 1-XXVIII 7 of about five

months, XXVIII 8-11 of three months. But the scenes selected for

special treatment lie closer together than formerly; and it is beyond

doubt that, on our hypothesis, the amount of space assigned to Paul's

imprisonment and successive examinations marks this as the most

important part of the book in the author's estimation. If that is not

the case--if the large space devoted to this period is not deliberately

intended by the author as proportionate to its importance--then the

work lacks one of the prime qualities of a great history. It is

essential to our purpose to establish that we are now approaching the

real climax, and that what has hitherto been narrated leads up to the

great event of the whole work. If we fail in that, we fail in the main

object for which we are contending; and we should have to allow that

Acts is a collection of episodic jottings, and not a real history in

the true sense of the word.

It must strike every careful reader that Luke devotes special attention

throughout his work to the occasions on which Paul was brought in

contact with Roman officials. Generally on these occasions, the

relations between the parties end in a friendly way: the scene with the

proconsul of Cyprus is the most marked case: but Gallio, too, dismissed

the case against him, and the formal decision of a proconsul had such

weight as a precedent that the trial practically resulted in a

declaration of religious liberty for the province.

To come to subordinate Roman officials, the "Pr�tors" of the colony

Philippi, though treating him severely at first, ended by formally

apologising and acknowledging his rights, and only begged of him as a

favour to move on--a request which he instantly granted. In the

colonies Antioch and Lystra he was treated severely, but the blame is

laid entirely on the Jews, and the magistrates are not directly

mentioned; while in both cases it is brought out in the narrative that

condemnation was not pronounced on fair charges duly proved. But though

the reader's attention is not drawn to the magistrates, there can be no

doubt that, at least in Antioch, the magistrates took action against

Paul; and there is some probability that in each place he was scourged

by lictors (p. 107), though these and many other sufferings are passed

over. In the first stages of his work in Asia Minor. he was in

collision with Roman colonial officials; but these events are treated

lightly, explained as due to error and extraneous influence, and the

Roman character of the cities is not brought out. While the picture is

not discoloured, yet the selection of details is distinctly guided by a

plan.

The clerk (Grammateus) of the city of Ephesus was not a Roman official,

but, as the most important officer of the capital of the province, he

was in closer relations with the Roman policy than ordinary city

magistrates: and he pointedly acquitted Paul of any treasonable design

against the State or against the established order of the city, and

challenged the rioters to bring any charge against Paul before the

Roman Courts. The Asiarchs, who were officials of the province, and

therefore part of the Roman political system, were his friends, and

showed special care to secure his safety at that time. Even the jailor

at Philippi was an officer of Rome, though a very humble one; and he

found Paul a friend in need, and became a friend in turn.

The magistrates of ordinary Greek cities were not so favourable to Paul

as the Roman officials are represented. At Iconium they took active

part against him; and the silence about the magistrates of the colonies

Antioch and Lystra is made more marked by the mention of those of

Iconium. At Thessalonica the magistrates excluded him from the city as

a cause of disorder. At Athens the Areopagus was contemptuous and

undecided. The favourable disposition of Roman officials towards Paul

is made more prominent by the different disposition of the ordinary

municipal authorities.

These facts acquire more meaning and more definite relation to the

historian's purpose when we come to the last scenes of the book. We

cannot but recognise how pointedly the Imperial officials are

represented as Paul's only safeguard from the Jews, and how their

friendly disposition to him is emphasised. Even Felix, one of the worst

of Roman officials, is affected by Paul's teaching, and on the whole

protects Paul, though his sordid motives are not concealed, and he

finally left Paul bound, as "desiring to gain favour with the Jews,"

XXIV 27; but at least there was no official action on the part of Felix

against him. Festus, his successor, is described as just and fair

towards Paul; he found in him "nothing worthy of death," and had

difficulty in discovering any definite charge against him that he could

report when sending him for trial before the supreme court of the

Empire. The inferior officials, from the tribune Claudius Lysias, to

the centurion Julius, are represented as very friendly. This is all the

more marked, because nothing is said at any stage of the proceedings of

kindness shown to Paul by any others; yet no one can doubt that the

household of Philip and the general body of Christians in C�sareia

tried to do everything possible for him. We see then that the

historian, out of much that might be recorded, selects for emphasis the

friendliness of the Roman officials: in the climax of his subject he

concentrates the reader's attention on the conduct of Romans to Paul,

[53] and on their repeated statements that Paul was innocent in the

eyes of Roman Imperial law and policy.

Throughout the whole book, from the time when the centurion Cornelius

is introduced, great art is shown in bringing out without any formal

statement the friendly relations between the Romans and the new

teaching, even before Paul became the leading spirit in its

development. To a certain extent, of course, that lies in the subject

matter, and the historian simply relates the facts as they occurred,

without colouring them for his purpose; but he is responsible for the

selection of details, and while he has omitted an enormous mass of

details (some of which we can gather from other informants), he has

included so many bearing on this point, as to show beyond all question

his keen interest in it.

Further, when we compare Luke with other authorities in their treatment

of the same subject, we see how much more careful he is than they in

bringing out the relations in which Christianity stood to the Imperial

government. In the Third Gospel, Luke alone among the four historians

records formally the attempt made by the Jews to implicate Jesus in

criminal practices against the Roman Empire, [54] and the emphatic,

thrice [55] repeated statement of Pilate acquitting Him of all fault

(XXIII 2, 4, 14, 22) before the law.

We must conclude, then, that the large space devoted to the trial of

Paul in its various stages before the Roman Imperial tribunals is

connected with a strongly marked interest and a clear purpose running

through the two books of this history; and it follows that Luke

conceived the trial to be a critical and supremely important stage in

the development of the Church.

The next question that faces us is whether Luke is justified as a

historian in attaching such importance to this stage in the development

of Christianity. Perhaps the question may be best answered by quoting

some words used in a different connection and for a different purpose.

"It is both justifiable and necessary to lay great stress on the trial

of Paul. With the legal constructiveness and obedience to precedent

that characterised the Romans, this case tried before the supreme court

must have been regarded as a test case and a binding precedent, until

some act of the supreme Imperial authority occurred to override it. If

such a case came for trial before the highest tribunal in Rome, there

must have been given an authoritative and, for the time, final judgment

on the issues involved."

But, further, it is obvious that the importance of the trial for Luke

is intelligible only if Paul was acquitted. That he was acquitted

follows from the Pastoral Epistles with certainty for all who admit

their genuineness; while even they who deny their Pauline origin must

allow that they imply an early belief in historical details which are

not consistent with Paul's journeys before his trial, and must either

be pure inventions or events that occurred on later journeys. I have

elsewhere argued that the subsequent policy of Nero towards the Church

is far more readily intelligible if Paul was acquitted. But, if he was

acquitted, the issue of the trial was a formal decision by the supreme

court of the Empire that it was permissible to preach Christianity: the

trial, therefore, was really a charter of religious liberty, and

therein lies its immense importance. It was, indeed, overturned by

later decisions of the supreme court; but its existence was a highly

important fact for the Christians.

The importance of the preliminary stages of the trial lies in its

issue; and it is obviously absurd to relate these at great length, and

wholly omit the final result which gives them intelligibility and

purpose. It therefore follows that a sequel was contemplated by the

author, in which should be related the final stages of the trial, the

acquittal of Paul, the active use which he made of his permission to

preach, the organisation of the Church in new provinces, and the second

trial occurring at the worst and most detested period of Nero's rule.

That sequel demands a book to itself; and we have seen that the natural

implication of Luke's expression in Acts I 1, if he wrote as correct

Greek as Paul wrote, is that his work was planned to contain, a least,

three books.

This view of Luke's historical plan suits well the period at which he

wrote. It is argued in Ch. XVII 2 that he was engaged in composing this

book under Domitian, a period of persecution, when Christians had come

to be treated as outlaws or brigands, and the mere confession of the

name was recognised as a capital offence. The book was not an apology

for Christianity: it was an appeal to the truth of history against the

immoral and ruinous policy of the reigning Emperor, a temperate and

solemn record, by one who had played a great part in them, of the real

facts regarding the formation of the Church, its steady and unswerving

loyalty in the past, its firm resolve to accept the facts of Imperial

government, its friendly reception by many Romans, and its triumphant

vindication in the first great trial at Rome. It was the work of one

who had been trained by Paul to look forward to Christianity becoming

the religion of the Empire and of the world who regarded Christianity

as destined not to destroy but to save the Empire.

8. FINANCES OF THE TRIAL.

It has been asked where Paul got the money which he required to pay the

expenses of four poor men (XXI 23), purifying themselves in the temple;

and the suggestion has been made that the elders who advised him to

undertake this expense, followed up their advice by giving him back

some of the money which the delegates from the four provinces had just

paid over to them. Without laying any stress on the silence of Luke as

to any such action, we cannot believe that Paul would accept that money

for his own needs, or that James would offer it. They were trustees of

contributions destined for a special purpose; and to turn it to any

other purpose would have been fraudulent. It is incredible that Paul,

after laying such stress on the purpose of that contribution, and

planning it for years (p. 288), should divert part of it to his own use

the day after he reached Jerusalem.

But several other facts show clearly that, during the following four

years, Paul had considerable command of money. Imprisonment and a long

lawsuit are expensive. Now, it is clear that Paul during the following

four years did not appear before the world as a penniless wanderer,

living by the work of his hands. A person in that position will not

either at the present day or in the first century be treated with such

marked respect as was certainly paid to Paul, at C�sareia, on the

voyage, and in Rome. The governor Felix and his wife, the Princess

Drusilla, accorded him an interview and private conversation. King

Agrippa and his Queen Berenice also desired to see him. A poor man

never receives such attentions, or rouses such interest. Moreover,

Felix hoped for a bribe from him; and a rich Roman official did not

look for a small gift. Paul, therefore, wore the outward appearance of

a man of means, like one in a position to bribe a Roman procurator. The

minimum in the way of personal attendants that was allowable for a man

of respectable position was two slaves; and, as we shall see, Paul was

believed to be attended by two slaves to serve him. At C�sareia he was

confined in the palace of Herod; but he had to live, to maintain two

attendants, and to keep up a respectable appearance. Many comforts,

which are almost necessities, would be given by the guards, so long as

they were kept in good humour, and it is expensive to keep guards in

good humour. In Rome he was able to hire a lodging for himself and to

live there, maintaining, of course, the soldier who guarded him.

An appeal to the supreme court could not be made by everybody that

chose. Such an appeal had to be permitted and sent forward by the

provincial governor; and only a serious case would be entertained. But

the case of a very poor man is never esteemed as serious; and there is

little doubt that the citizen's right of appeal to the Emperor was

hedged in by fees and pledges. There is always one law for the rich man

and another for the poor: at least, to this extent, that many claims

can be successfully pushed by a rich man in which a poor man would have

no chance of success. In appealing to the Emperor, Paul was choosing

undoubtedly an expensive line of trial. All this had certainly been

estimated before the decisive step was taken. Paul had weighed the

cost; he had reckoned the gain which would accrue to the Church if the

supreme court pronounced in his favour; and his past experience gave

him every reason to hope for a favourable issue before a purely Roman

tribunal, where Jewish influence would have little or no power. The

importance of the case, as described in the preceding section, makes

the appeal more intelligible.

Where, then, was the money procured? Was it from new contributions

collected in the Churches? That seems most improbable, both from their

general poverty, from Paul's personal character, and from the silence

of Luke on the point. Luke himself was probably a man dependent on his

profession for his livelihood. His name is not that of a man of high

position. There seems no alternative except that Paul's hereditary

property was used in those four years. As to the exact facts, we must

remain in ignorance. If Paul hitherto voluntarily abstained from using

his fortune, he now found himself justified by the importance of the

case in acting differently. If, on the other hand, he had for the time

been disowned by his family, then either a reconciliation had been

brought about during his danger (perhaps originating in the bold

kindness of his young nephew), or through death property had come to

him as legal heir (whose right could not be interfered with by any

will). But, whatever be the precise facts, we must regard Paul as a man

of some wealth during these years.

He appeared to Felix [56] and to Festus, then, as a Roman of Jewish

origin of high rank and great learning, engaged in a rather foolish

controversy against the whole united power of his nation (winch showed

his high standing, as well as his want of good judgment). That is the

spirit of Festus's words, "Paul! Paul! you are a great philosopher, but

you have no common sense".

On the details given of the incidents in Jerusalem and C�sareia, I

shall not enter. I am not at home on the soil of Palestine; and it

seems better not to mix up second-hand studies with a discussion of

incidents where I stand on familiar ground.

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

[46] Suggested as possible by Dr. Plumptre in Intro. to II Cor. p. 359.

[47] II 13, VII 6 f., 13 f., VIII 6 f., 16-24, XII 18.

[48] Literally, "that it might not come to pass that he spent time in

Asia."

[49] Paton and Hick's Inscriptions of Cos, p. xxxiii. I should hardly

venture to speak so strongly; but Mr. Hicks is an excellent authority

on that period.

[50] in v. 2 "a ship," in v. 6 "the ship".

[51] Literally, "more days," a considerable number of days.

[52] He says labontes ta pros ten hodoiporian (i.e. hupozugia).

[53] Luke says nothing about kindness shown to Paul by James and others

in Jerusalem; but we do not (like Dean Farrar) gather that they were

unfriendly.

[54] Less formally, John XVIII 30.

[55] John XVIII 38; Matthew XXVII 24.

[56] Procuratorship of Felix. The remarkable contradiction between

Josephus (who makes Cumanus governor of Palestine 48-52, Felix being

his successor in 52), and Tacitus (who makes Felix governor of Samaria

[and probably of Judea], contemporary with Cumanus as governor of

Galilee, the latter being disgraced in 52, and the former acquitted and

honoured at the same trial), is resolved by Mommsen in favour of

Tacitus as the better authority on such a point; and most students of

Roman history will agree with him.

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

CHAPTER XIV.

THE VOYAGE TO ROME

In describing the voyage from C�sareia to Malta, we are guided by the

excellent work of James Smith, Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul (third

edition, 1866); but as there are some points of interest which he has

not explained satisfactorily, we shall briefly describe the voyage, and

treat more elaborately such points as need to be added to Smith's

results.

1. C�SAREIA TO MYRA.

A convoy of prisoners was starting for Rome under charge of a centurion

of the Augustan cohort, and a detachment of soldiers; and Paul was sent

along with it. He, of course, occupied a very different position from

the other prisoners. He was a man of distinction, a Roman citizen who

had appealed for trial to the supreme court in Rome. The others had

been in all probability already condemned to death, and were going to

supply the perpetual demand which Rome made on the provinces for human

victims to amuse the populace by their death in the arena.

The cohorts of the Roman legions never bore surnames, and it would

therefore seem that this "Augustan cohort" was one of the auxiliary

cohorts, which had regularly one or more surnames. But the duty which

is here performed by the centurion was never performed by an auxiliary

officer, but only by an officer of a legion. It would therefore appear

that an auxiliary officer is here represented in a position which he

could not hold.

But, when we recollect (1) that Luke regularly uses the terms of

educated conversation, not the strict technical names, and (2) that he

was a Greek who was careless of Roman forms or names, we shall not seek

in this case to treat the Greek term (speira Sebaste) as a translation

of a correct Roman name; but we shall look for a body in the Roman

service which was likely to be called "the troop of the Emperor" by the

persons in whose society Luke moved at the time. We give the answer to

which Mommsen seems to incline Berlin Akad. Sitzungsber, 1895, p. 501,

adding the evidence of Luke's style, but otherwise quoting Mommsen.

First we ask what officer would be likely to perform the duty here

assigned to Julius. It would naturally be a legionary centurion on

detached service for communication between the Emperor and his armies

in the provinces (as described on p. 348). That the centurion whom Luke

alludes to was one of this body is confirmed by the fact that, when he

reached Rome, he handed Paul over to his chief. We conclude, then, that

the "troop of the Emperor" was a popular colloquial way of describing

the corps of officer-couriers; and we thus gather from Acts an

interesting fact, elsewhere unattested but in perfect conformity with

the known facts.

Luke uses the first person throughout the following narrative; and he

was therefore in Paul's company. But how was this permitted? It is

hardly possible to suppose that the prisoner's friends were allowed to

accompany him. Pliny mentions a case in point (Epist. III 16). Paetus

was brought a prisoner from Illyricum to Rome, and his wife Arria

vainly begged leave to accompany him; several slaves were permitted to

go with him as waiters, valets, etc., and Arria offered herself alone

to perform all their duties; but her prayer was refused. The analogy

shows how Luke and Aristarchus accompanied Paul: they must have gone as

his slaves, not merely performing the duties of slaves (as Arria

offered to do), but actually passing as slaves. In this way not merely

had Paul faithful friends always beside him; his importance in the eyes

of the centurion was much enhanced, and that was of great importance.

The narrative clearly implies that Paul enjoyed much respect during

this voyage, such as a penniless traveller without a servant to attend

on him would never receive either in the first century or the

nineteenth.

In the harbour of C�sareia there was no convenient ship about to sail

for Rome; and the convoy was put on board of an Adramyttian ship which

was going to make a voyage along the coast towns of the province Asia.

Communication direct with Rome might be found in some of the great

Asian harbours, or, failing any suitable ship in the late season, the

prisoners might be taken (like Ignatius half a century later) by Troas

and Philippi and the land road to Dyrrachium, and thence to Brundisium

and Rome.

The direct run from Lycia to the Syrian coast was often made, but it is

hardly possible that a direct run from Syria back to Myra was ever

attempted by ancient ships. They never ventured on such a run except

when a steady wind was blowing which could be trusted to last. But

westerly breezes blow with great steadiness through the summer months

in the Levant; and it is certain that ancient ships westward bound

sailed east of Cyprus, as the Adramyttian ship now did. Luke explains

why they sailed on this side of Cyprus; and he must, therefore, have

expected to take the other side. Now, a sailor or a person accustomed

to these seas would not have thought of making any explanation, for the

course of the ship was the normal one. But Luke had come to Sidon from

Myra by the west side of Cyprus, and he, therefore, was impressed. with

the difference, and (contrary to his. usual custom) he gives a formal

explanation; and his explanation stamps him as a stranger to these

seas.

The ship worked slowly along the Cilician and Pamphylian coast, as the

sailors availed themselves of temporary local land breezes and of the

steady westward current that runs along the coast. The description

given in the Periodoi of Barnabas of a voyage from Seleuceia in Syria

to Cyprus in the face of a prevailing steady westerly wind, the work of

a person familiar with the circumstances, illustrates perfectly the

voyage on this occasion. The Adramyttian ship crept on from point to

point up the coast, taking advantage of every opportunity to make a few

miles, and lying at anchor in the shelter of the winding coast, when

the westerly wind made progress impossible.

Smith in his masterly work collects several other examples of the same

course which was adopted by the Adramyttian ship. Modern sailing ships,

even with their superior rig, have several times been forced by the

steady westerly wind towards the north, keeping east of Cyprus, and

using the breezes which blow at intervals from the Caramanian coast.

In this description there is an addition made in the Later Syriac

version and some other authorities, which Westcott and Hort put in the

margin as one "which appears to have a reasonable probability of being

the true reading". The ship, in this addition, is said to have spent

fifteen days in beating along the Cyprio-Pamphylian coast. This

addition obviously suits the situation, and may be unhesitatingly

accepted as true, whether as written by Luke or as a well-informed

gloss. Most probably it is Lukan, for Luke gives rough statements of

the time throughout this voyage; and an exact estimate at this point is

quite in his style. It perhaps dropped out of most MSS., as wanting

interest for later generations. If we may judge from the Periodoi

Barnab�, the coasting voyage was accomplished comparatively rapidly as

far as Myra (see also p. 320).

In the harbour of Myra, the centurion found an Alexandrian ship on a

voyage towards Italy. He embarked his convoy on board of this ship. It

is characteristic of the style of Luke that he does not mention the

class of ship or the reason of its voyage from Alexandria to Italy; but

simply tells facts as they occur. Now, Egypt was one of the granaries

of Rome; and the corn trade between Egypt and Rome was of the first

importance and of great magnitude. There is, therefore, a reasonable

probability that this ship was carrying corn to Rome; and this

inference is confirmed by Luke himself, who mentions in v. 38 that the

cargo was grain.

A ship-captain familiar with the Levant informed me that he had known

ships going west from Egypt keep well to the north, in order to avail

themselves of the shelter of the Cretan coast. No ancient ship would

have ventured to keep so much out to sea as to run intentionally from

Egypt to Crete direct, and moreover the winds would rarely have

permitted it; but it is probable that this Alexandrian ship had sailed

direct to Myra across the Levant. The steady westerly Breezes which

prevented ships from making the direct run from Sidon, were favourable

for the direct run from Alexandria. Probably this course was a

customary one during a certain season of the year from Alexandria to

Italy. Any one who has the slightest knowledge of "the way of a ship in

the sea," will recognise that, with a steady wind near west, this was

the ideally best course; while if the breeze shifted a little towards

the north, it would be forced into a Syrian port; and, as we know from

other sources, that was often the case.

As we saw (p. 298), Myra was one of the great harbours of the Egyptian

service. It is, therefore, unnecessary and incorrect to say, as is

often done, that the Alexandrian ship had been blown out of its course.

The ship was on its regular and ordinary course, and had quite probably

been making a specially good run, for in the autumn there was always

risk of the wind shifting round towards the north, and with the wind

N.W. the Alexandrian ships could only fetch the Syrian coast.

A voyage which Lucian, in his dialogue The Ship, describes as made by a

large Egyptian corn-ship, may be accepted as a fair description of what

might occur in the first or second century; and it illustrates well the

course of both the Alexandrian and the Adramyttian ship. Lucian's Ship

attempted to run direct from Alexandria to Myra. It was off the west

point of Cyprus (Cape Akamas) on the seventh day of its voyage, but was

thence blown to Sidon by a west wind so strong that the ship had to run

before it. On the tenth day from Sidon it was caught in a storm at the

Chelidonian islands and nearly wrecked; ten days from Sidon to the

islands would correspond to fully thirteen from C�sareia to Myra.

Thereafter its course was very slow; it failed to keep the proper

course to the south of Crete; and at last it reached Pir�us on the

seventieth day from Alexandria.

2. FROM MYRA TO FAIR HAVENS.

(XXVII 7) AND WHEN WE HAD SAILED SLOWLY MANY DAYS, AND WERE COME WITH

DIFFICULTY OFF CNIDOS, AS THE WIND DID NOT PERMIT our straight course

ONWARDS, WE SAILED UNDER THE LEE OF CRETE, OFF Cape SALMONE; (8) AND

COASTING ALONG IT WITH DIFFICULTY, WE CAME UNTO A CERTAIN PLACE CALLED

FAIR HAVENS, NIGH TO WHICH WAS A CITY LASEA.

From Myra the course of both the Adramyttian and the Alexandrian ship

would coincide as far as Cnidos. But they found great difficulty in

making the course, which implies that strong westerly winds blew most

of the time. After a very slow voyage they came opposite Cnidos; but

they were not able to run across to Cythera (a course that was

sometimes attempted, if we can accept Lucian's dialogue The Ship, as

rounded on possible facts) on account of strong northerly winds blowing

steadily in the �gean, and threatening to force any ship on the north

coast of Crete, which was dangerous from its paucity of harbours

Accordingly, the choice was open either to put in to Cnidos, and wait a

fair wind, or to run for the east and south coast of Crete. The latter

alternative was preferred in the advanced season; and they rounded the

eastern promontory, Salmone (protected by it from a north-westerly

wind), and began anew to work slowly to the west under the shelter of

the land. They kept their course along the shore with difficulty until

they reached a place named Fair Havens, near the city Lasea, which, as

Smith has shown conclusively, is the small bay, two leagues east of

Cape Matala, still bearing the same name (in the modern Greek dialect

Limeonas Kalous); and there they lay for a considerable time. It is not

stated in the narrative why they stayed so long at this point, but the

reason is clear to a sailor or a yachtsman: as Smith points out, Fair

Havens is the nearest shelter on the east of Cape Matala, whilst west

of that cape the coast trends away to the north, and no longer affords

any protection from the north or north-west winds, and therefore they

could go no farther so long as the wind was in that quarter.

The voyage to Cnidos had been slow and hard, and the course along Crete

was made with difficulty. At the best that part of the voyage must

always have been troublesome, and as the difficulty was unusually great

in this case, we cannot allow less time between Myra and Fair Havens

than from September 1 to 25. The arrival at Fair Havens is fixed by the

narrative; and thus we get the approximate date, August 17, for the

beginning of the voyage from C�sareia.

3. THE COUNCIL.

(XXVII 9) AND WHEN A LONG TIME ELAPSED, AND SAILING WAS NOW DANGEROUS

(AS THE FAST ALSO WAS ALREADY OVER), PAUL OFFERED HIS ADVICE (10) IN

THESE WORDS: "SIRS, I PERCEIVE THAT THE VOYAGE IS LIKELY TO BE

ACCOMPANIED WITH HARDSHIP AND MUCH LOSS, NOT MERELY TO SHIP AND CARGO,

BUT ALSO TO OUR LIVES". (11) BUT THE CENTURION WAS INFLUENCED MORE BY

THE SAILING-MASTER AND THE CAPTAIN THAN BY WHAT PAUL SAID. (12) AND, AS

THE HAVEN WAS BADLY SITUATED FOR WINTERING IN, THE MAJORITY of the

council APPROVED THE PLAN TO GET UNDER WEIGH FROM THENCE, AND ENDEAVOUR

TO MAKE PHOENIX AS A STATION TO WINTER IN--A HARBOUR THAT FACES

SOUTH-WEST AND NORTH-WEST.

The great Fast fell in 59 on Oct. 5, and, as Paul and Aristarchus

observed the Fast, Luke uses it as an indication of date. The dangerous

season for navigation lasted from Sept. 14 to Nov. 11, when all

navigation on the open sea was discontinued. The ship reached Fair

Havens in the latter part of September, and was detained there by a

continuance of unfavourable winds until after Oct. 5. We might be

disposed to infer that the Feast of Tabernacles, Oct. 10, fell after

they left Fair Havens, otherwise Luke would have mentioned it rather

than the Fast, as making the danger more apparent. The picturesque

ceremonies of the Tabernacles would have remained in Luke's mind; but

at sea they were not possible; and the Fast was therefore the fact that

impressed him, as it was observed by Paul and Aristarchus.

In these circumstances a meeting was held to consider the situation, at

which Paul was present, as a person of rank whose convenience was to

some extent consulted, whose experience as a traveller was known to be

great. It is characteristic of Luke's style not to mention formally

that a council was held. He goes straight to what was the important

point in his estimation, viz., Paul's advice; then he explains why

Paul's advice was not taken; and in the explanation it comes out in

what circumstances the advice was given. The whole scene forms, in

point of narrative method, an exact parallel to the interview at Paphos

(p. 75). We notice also that Luke as a mere servant could not have been

present at the council, and depended on Paul's report; and his account

follows the order in which Paul would describe the proceedings. We can

imagine that Paul on coming forth, did not formally relate to his two

friends that the council met, that the chairman laid the business

before it, and so on, but burst forth with his apprehension that "they

had made a mistake in not taking the prudent course".

At the council it is implied that the centurion was president, while

the captain and sailing-master were merely advisers. To our modern

ideas the captain is supreme on the deck of his ship; and, even if he

held a meeting to decide on such a point as the best harbour to lay up

in, or consulted the wishes of a distinguished officer in the military

service, yet the ultimate decision would lie with himself. Here the

ultimate decision lies with the centurion, and he takes the advice of

the captain. The centurion, therefore, is represented as the commanding

officer, which implies that the ship was a Government ship, and the

centurion ranked as the highest officer on board. That, doubtless, is

true to the facts of the Roman service. The provisioning of the vast

city of Rome, situated in a country where farming had ceased to pay

owing to the ruinous foreign competition in grain, was the most serious

and pressing department of the Imperial administration. Whatever else

the Emperor might neglect, this he could not neglect and live. In the

urban populace he was holding a wild beast by the ear; and, if he did

not feed it, the beast would tear him to pieces. With ancient means of

transport, the task was a hundred times harder than it would be now;

and the service of ships on which Rome was entirely dependent was not

left to private enterprise, but was a State department. It is,

therefore, an error of the Authorised and Revised Versions to speak of

the owner (naukleros) of this Alexandrian ship: [57] the ship belonged

to the Alexandrian fleet in the Imperial service. The captains of the

fleet [58] made dedications on account of safe passage at Ostia, and

Seneca sat in his house at Puteoli and watched the advance ships sail

in announcing the approach of the Alexandrian fleet (Ep. Mor. 77).

Passengers were landed at Puteoli; but cargo was carried on to Ostia.

As a general rule the ships sailed in fleets; but, of course,

incidental reasons often kept one ship apart (as we see in XXVIII 11,

and in the opening of Lucian's dialogue The Ship).

Now, there was not in Rome that strict separation between the naval and

the military services which now exists. There was only one service; the

same person was at one moment admiral of a fleet, at another general of

a land army and an officer might pass from one branch to the other. The

land-service, however, ranked higher, and a legionary centurion was

certainly of superior rank to the captain of a vessel of the

Alexandrian fleet. In this case, then, the centurion sat as president

of the council. Naturally, he would not interfere in navigation, for

his life might pay the forfeit of any error, but the selection of a

port for wintering in was more in his line. Now, it was the regular

practice for all Roman officials, who often had to take responsibility

in cases in which they were not competent alone to estimate all the

facts, to summon a council (consilium) of experienced and competent

advisers before coming to a decision. Such was the nature of the

meeting here described.

The centurion, very properly, was guided in this matter, against the

advice of Paul, by the opinion of his professional advisers, who were

anxious to get on as far as possible before navigation ceased on

November 11, and it was resolved to take any fair opportunity of

reaching the harbour of Phoenix, which was not only further on, but

also better protected.

In the council-scene, then, when we put events in their sequence in

time, and add those facts of the situation which Luke assumes as

familiar to his readers, we have a vivid and striking incident,

agreeing with the general type of Roman procedure, and yet giving us

information about life on board a Government transport such as we could

not find in any other part of ancient literature.

There has been a good deal of discussion as to the description of the

harbour Phoenix, the modern Lutro, "the only secure harbour in all

winds on the south coast of Crete ". This, however, faces the east, not

the west. Smith tries to interpret the Greek words in that sense; but

it must be observed that Luke never saw the harbour, and merely speaks

on Paul's report of the professional opinion. It is possible that the

sailors described the entrance as one in which inward-bound ships

looked towards N.W. and S.W., and that in transmission from mouth to

mouth, the wrong impression was given that the harbour looked N.W. and

S.W.

4. THE STORM.

(XXVII 13) AND WHEN A MODERATE SOUTHERLY BREEZE AROSE, SUPPOSING THAT

THEY HAD GOT THEIR OPPORTUNITY, [59] THEY WEIGHED ANCHOR AND SAILED

ALONG THE CRETAN COAST CLOSE IN. (14) BUT AFTER NO LONG TIME THERE

STRUCK DOWN FROM THE ISLAND A TYPHONIC WIND, WHICH GOES BY THE NAME

EURAQUILO. (15) AND WHEN THE SHIP WAS CAUGHT BY IT, AND COULD NOT FACE

THE WIND, WE GAVE WAY AND LET THE SHIP DRIVE. (16) AND, WHEN WE RAN

UNDER THE LEE OF A SMALL ISLAND, CAUDA BY NAME, WE WERE ABLE WITH

DIFFICULTY TO HAUL IN THE BOAT. (17) AND HAVING UNDERGIRDING IT; AND

BEING IN TERROR LEST THEY BE CAST ON "THE GREAT QUICKSANDS," THEY

REDUCED SAIL, AND LET THE SHIP DRIFT IN THAT POSITION (viz., laid-to

under storm-sails).

One morning, after the council, their chance came with a moderate south

wind, which favoured their westerly voyage. At this point the writer

says that they went close inshore; and this emphatic statement, after

they had been on a coasting voyage for weeks, must in a careful writer

have some special force. Cape Matala projected well out to the south

about six miles west of Fair Havens, and it needed all their sailing

power to clear it on a straight course. From Luke's emphasis we gather

that it was for some time doubtful whether they could weather the

point; and in the bright late autumn morning we can imagine every one

gathered on the deck, watching the wind, the coast and the cape ahead.

If the wind went round a point towards the west, they would fail; and

the anxious hour has left its record in the single word of v. 13

(asson), while the inability of some scribes or editors to imagine the

scene has left its record in the alteration (thasson).

After passing Cape Matala, they had before them a fair course with a

favouring breeze across the broad opening of the Gulf of Messara. But

before they had got halfway across the open bay, [60] there came a

sudden change, such as is characteristic of that sea, where "southerly

winds almost invariably shift to a violent northerly wind". There

struck down from the Cretan mountains, which towered above them to the

height of over 7000 feet, a sudden eddying squall from about east-

north-east. Every one who has any experience of sailing on lakes or

bays overhung by mountains will appreciate the epithet "typhonic,"

which Luke uses. As a ship-captain recently said to me in relating an

anecdote of his own experience in the Cretan waters, "the wind comes

down from those mountains fit to blow the ship out of the water".

An ancient ship with one huge sail was exposed to extreme danger from

such a blast; the straining of the great sail on the single mast was

more than the hull could bear; and the ship was exposed to a risk which

modern vessels do not fear, foundering in the open sea. It appears that

they were not able to slacken sail quickly; and, had the ship been kept

up towards the wind, the strain would have shaken her to pieces. Even

when they let the ship go, the leverage on her hull must have been

tremendous, and would in a short time have sent her to the bottom.

Paul, who had once already narrowly escaped from such a wreck, drifting

on a spar or swimming for a night and a day (II Cor. XI 25), justified

in his advice at Fair Havens not to run the risk of coasting further in

the dangerous season on a coast where such sudden squalls are a common

feature. In this case the ship was saved by getting into calmer water

under the shelter of an island, Cauda (now Gozzo), about twenty-three

miles to leeward.

At this point Smith notices the precision of Luke's terminology. In v.

4 they sailed under the lee of Cyprus, keeping northwards with a

westerly wind on the beam (hupepleusamen); here they ran before a wind

under the lee of Cauda (hupodramontes).

The sailors knew that their only hope was in the smoother water behind

Cauda, and kept her up accordingly with her head to the wind, so that

she would make no headway, but merely drifted with her right side

towards the wind ("on the starboard tack").

Here three distinct operations were performed; and it is noteworthy

that Luke mentions first among them, not the one which was the most

important or necessary, but the one in which he himself took part,

viz., hauling in the boat. In the light breeze it had been left to tow

behind, and the squall had come down too suddenly to haul it in. While

the other operations required skill, any one could haul on a rope, and

Luke was pressed into the service. The boat was waterlogged by this

time; and the historian notes feelingly what hard work it was to get it

in, v. 16.

While this was going on, ropes were got out, and the ship undergirded

to strengthen her against the storm and the straining of her timbers.

The scholars who discuss nautical subjects seem all agreed that

undergirders were put longitudinally round the ship (i.e., horizontal

girders passed round stem and stern). If any of them will show how it

was possible to perform this operation during a storm, I shall be ready

to accept their opinion; but meantime (without entering on the question

what "undergirders," hupozomata, were in Athenian triremes) I must with

Smith believe that cables were passed underneath round the ship

transversely to hold the timbers together. This is a possible operation

in the circumstances, and a useful one.

Luke mentions last what a sailor would mention first, the most delicate

and indispensable operation, viz., leaving up just enough of sail to

keep the ship's head to the wind, and bringing down everything else

that could be got down. It is not certain that he fully understood this

operation, but perhaps the Greek (chalasantes to skeuos) might be taken

as a technical term denoting the entire series of operations,

slackening sail, but leaving some spread for a special purpose.

This operation was intended to guard against the danger of being driven

on the great quicksands of the African coast, the Syrtes. These were

still far distant; but the sailors knew that at this late season the

wind might last many days. The wind was blowing straight on the sands;

and it was absolutely necessary, not merely to delay the ship's motion

towards them, but to turn it in a different direction. In the Gulf of

Messara, the wind had been an eddying blast under the mountains; but

further out it was a steady, strong east-north-easterly gale.

Dragging stones or weights at the end of ropes from the stern, which is

the meaning elicited by some German commentators and writers on

nautical matters, might be useful in other circumstances; but how that

meaning can be got from the Greek words (chalasantes to skeuos), I

confess that I cannot see. Moreover, as we have said, what the sailors

wished was not merely to delay their course towards the Syrtes, but to

turn their course in another direction.

Accordingly, the ship drifted, with her head to the north, steadied by

a low sail, making lee-way proportionate to the power of the wind and

waves on her broadside. As Smith shows in detail, the resultant rate of

motion would vary, according to the size of the ship and the force of

the wind, between � and 2 miles per hour; and the probable mean rate in

this case would be about 1� miles per hour; while the direction would

approximate to 8� north of west. The ship would continue to drift in

the same way as long as the wind blew the same, and the timbers and

sails held; and at the calculated rates, if it was under Cauda towards

evening, it would on the fourteenth night be near Malta.

5. DRIFTING.

(XXVII 18) AND, AS WE LABOURED EXCEEDINGLY WITH THE STORM, THE NEXT DAY

THEY BEGAN TO THROW THE FREIGHT OVERBOARD, (19) AND ON THE THIRD DAY WE

CAST OUT, WITH OUR OWN HANDS ACTUALLY, THE SHIP'S FURNITURE. (20) AND

AS NEITHER SUN NOR STARS WERE VISIBLE FOR MANY DAYS, AND A SEVERE STORM

WAS PRESSING HARD ON US, ALL HOPE THAT WE SHOULD BE SAVED WAS GRADUALLY

TAKEN AWAY. (21) AND WHEN THERE HAD BEEN LONG ABSTINENCE FROM FOOD,

THEN PAUL STOOD FORTH IN MIDST OF THEM, AND SAID: "THE RIGHT COURSE,

GENTLEMEN, WAS TO HEARKEN TO ME, AND NOT TO SET (22) AND MY ADVICE TO

YOU IN THE PRESENT IS TO TAKE HEART; FOR LOSS OF LIFE THERE SHALL BE

NONE AMONG YOU, BUT OF THE SHIP. (23) FOR THERE STOOD BY ME THIS NIGHT

AN ANGEL OF THE GOD WHOSE I AM, WHOM ALSO I SERVE, (24) SAYING: FEAR

NOT, PAUL; THOU MUST STAND BEFORE C�SAR; AND, LO! THERE HAVE BEEN

GRANTED THEE BY GOD ALL THEY THAT SAIL WITH THEE'. (25) WHEREFORE TAKE

HEART, GENTLEMEN; FOR I BELIEVE GOD, THAT IT SHALL BE SO AS IT HATH

BEEN SPOKEN UNTO ME. (26) HOWBEIT WE MUST BE CAST ON SOME ISLAND."

In their situation the great danger was of foundering through leakage

caused by the constant straining due to the sail and the force of the

waves on the broadside, which ancient vessels were not strong enough to

stand. To lessen the danger, the sailors began to tighten the ship, by

throwing away the cargo. On the day after, the whole company, Luke

among them, sacrificed the ship's equipment. v. 19 is a climax; "with

our own hands we threw away all the ship's fittings and equipment," the

extreme act of sacrifice. The first person, used in the Authorised

Version, occurs only in some less authoritative MSS., but greatly

increases the effect. The sailors threw overboard part of the cargo;

and the passengers and supernumeraries, in eager anxiety to do

something, threw overboard whatever movables they found, which was of

little or no practical use, but they were eager to do something. This

makes a striking picture of growing panic; but the third person, which

appears in the great MSS., is ineffective, and makes no climax.

One of the miserable accompaniments of a storm at sea is the difficulty

of obtaining food; and, if that is so in a modern vessel, it must have

been much worse in an ancient merchant ship, inconveniently crowded

with sailors and passengers. Moreover, the sacrifice of the ship's

furniture must have greatly increased the difficulty of preparing food.

Worse than all, the leakage was steadily growing from the straining of

the mast, and yet they dared not cut the mast away, as it alone helped

them to work off the dreaded African sands. Day after day the crew sat

doing nothing, eating nothing, waiting till the ship should sink. In

such a situation the experience of many cases shows that some

individual, often one not hitherto prominent, and not rarely a woman,

comes forward to cheer the company to the hope of escape and the

courage of work; and many a desperate situation has been overcome by

the energy thus imparted. In this case Paul stood forth in the midst of

the helpless, panic-struck crowd. When caution was suitable (v. 10), he

had been the prudent, cautious adviser, warning the council of

prospective danger. But now, amidst panic and despair, he appears cool,

confident, assured of safety; and he speaks in the only tone that could

cheer such an audience as his, the tone of an inspired messenger. In a

vision he has learned that all are to escape; and he adds that an

island is to be the means of safety.

6. LAND.

(XXVII 27) BUT WHEN THE FOURTEENTH NIGHT WAS COME, AS WE WERE DRIVEN TO

AND FRO IN THE ADRIA, TOWARDS MIDNIGHT THE SAILORS SURMISED THAT SOME

LAND WAS NEARING THEM; (28) AND THEY SOUNDED, AND FOUND TWENTY FATHOMS;

AND AFTER A LITTLE SPACE THEY SOUNDED AGAIN, AND FOUND FIFTEEN FATHOMS.

(29) AND FEARING LEST HAPLY WE SHOULD BE CAST ON ROCKY GROUND THEY LET

GO FOUR ANCHORS FROM THE STERN, AND PRAYED THAT DAY COME ON. (30) AND

AS THE SAILORS WERE SEEKING TO MAKE THEIR ESCAPE FROM THE SHIP, AND HAD

LOWERED THE BOAT INTO THE SEA, UNDER PRETENCE OF LAYING OUT ANCHORS

FROM THE BOW, (31) PAUL SAID TO THE CENTURION AND THE SOLDIERS, "UNLESS

THESE ABIDE IN THE SHIP, YOU CANNOT BE SAVED". (32) THEN THE SOLDIERS

CUT AWAY THE ROPES OF THE BOAT AND LET HER FALL AWAY. (33) AND WHILE

THE DAY WAS COMING ON, PAUL BESOUGHT THEM ALL TO TAKE SOME FOOD,

SAYING: "THIS DAY IS THE FOURTEENTH DAY THAT YOU WATCH AND CONTINUE

FASTING, AND HAVE TAKEN NOTHING. (34) WHEREFORE, I BESEECH YOU TO TAKE

SOME FOOD, FOR THIS IS FOR YOUR SAFETY; FOR THERE SHALL NOT A HAIR

PERISH FROM THE HEAD OF ANY OF YOU." (35) AND WHEN HE HAD SAID THIS HE

TOOK BREAD AND GAVE THANKS TO GOD IN THE PRESENCE OF ALL; AND HE BRAKE

IT, AND BEGAN TO EAT. (36) THEN WERE THEY ALL OF GOOD CHEER, AND

THEMSELVES ALSO TOOK SOME FOOD. (37) AND WE WERE IN ALL ON THE SHIP 276

SOULS. (38) AND WHEN THEY HAD EATEN ENOUGH, THEY PROCEEDED TO LIGHTEN

THE SHIP, THROWING OUT THE WHEAT INTO THE SEA.

Luke seems to have had the landsman's idea that they drifted to and fro

in the Mediterranean. A sailor would have known that they drifted in a

uniform direction; but it seems hardly possible to accept Smith's idea

that the Greek word (diapheromenon) can denote a straight drifting

course.

The name Adria has caused some difficulty. It was originally narrower

in application; but in the usage of sailors it grew wider as time

passed, and Luke uses the term that he heard on shipboard, where the

sailors called the sea that lay between Malta, Italy, Greece, and Crete

"the Adria". As usual, Luke's terminology is that of life and

conversation, not of literature. Strabo the geographer, who wrote about

A.D. 19, says that the Ionian sea on the west of Greece was "a part of

what is now called Adria," implying that contemporary popular usage was

wider than ancient usage. In later usage the name was still more widely

applied: in the fifth century "the Adria" extended to the coast of

Cyrene; and medi�val sailors distinguished the Adriatic, as the whole

Eastern half of the Mediterranean, from the �gean sea (see p. 298).

On the fourteenth midnight, the practised senses of the sailors

detected that land was nearing: probably, as Smith suggests, they heard

the breakers, and, as an interesting confirmation of his suggestion,

one old Latin version reads "that land was resounding". [61] was now

necessary to choose where they should beach the vessel; for the sound

of the breakers warned them that the coast was dangerous. In the dark

no choice was possible; and they therefore were forced to anchor. With

a strong wind blowing it was doubtful whether the cables and anchors

would hold; therefore, to give themselves every chance, they let go

four anchors. Smith quotes from the sailing directions that in St.

Paul's Bay (the traditional scene of the wreck), "while the cables hold

there is no danger, as the anchors will never start". He also points

out that a ship drifting from Cauda could not get into the bay without

passing near the low rocky point of Koura, which bounds it on the east.

The breakers here warned the sailors; and the charts show that after

passing the point the ship would pass over 20 fathoms and then over 15

fathoms depth on her course, W. by N.

Anchoring by the stern was unusual; but in their situation it had great

advantages. Had they anchored by the bow, the ship would have swung

round from the wind; and, when afterwards they wished to run her

ashore, it would have been far harder to manage her when lying with her

prow pointing to the wind and away from the shore. But, as they were,

they had merely to cut the cables, unlash the rudders, and put up a

little foresail (v. 40); and they had the ship at once under command to

beach her at any spot they might select.

As the ship was now lying at anchor near some land, the sailors were

about to save themselves by the boat and abandon the ship to its fate

without enough skilled hands to work it; but Paul, vigilant ever,

detected their design, and prevented it. Then, in order that the

company might have strength for the hard work that awaited them at

daybreak, he encouraged them once more with the assurance of safety,

urged them to eat with a view thereto, and himself set the example.

There is perhaps an intention in v. 35 to represent Paul as acting like

Jesus at the last Passover; and the resemblance is more pointed if the

words added in one MS. and some versions are original, "giving also to

us". But it would be necessary to understand "us" to mean only Luke and

Aristarchus (as Dr. Blass agrees); and this is harsh after the word has

been so often used in a much wider sense. It is characteristic of

Christianity in all periods to seek after resemblances between the

Founder and any great hero of the faith at some crisis of history; and

this addition seems a later touch to bring out the resemblance.

7. PAUL'S ACTION ON THE SHIP.

The account of the voyage as a whole is commonly accepted by critics as

the most trustworthy part of Acts and as "one of the most instructive

documents for the knowledge of ancient seamanship," (Holtzmann on XXVII

4, p. 421). But in it many critics detect the style of the later hand,

the supposed second-century writer that made the work out of good and

early documents, and addressed his compilation to Theophilus. Many hold

that this writer inserted vv. 21-26, and some assign to him also vv.

33-35, because the character there attributed to Paul is quite

different from his character in the genuine old document, especially

vv. 10 and 31; in the original parts Paul is represented as a simple

passenger, cautious to a degree, suffering from hunger, apprehensive of

the future, keenly alive to prospective danger, and anxious to provide

against it: on the other hand, in vv. 21-26 he knows that their safety

is assured; he speaks as the prophet, not the anxious passenger; he

occupies a position apart from, and on a higher plane than human.

This is a fair hypothesis, and deserves fair and dispassionate

consideration; no one whose mind is not already definitely made up on

all questions can pass it by; and only those who feel that they

understand the entire narrative in every turn and phrase and allusion

would willingly pass it by, for every real student knows how frequently

his knowledge is increased by changing his point of view.

We may at once grant that the narrative would go on without any obvious

awkwardness if 21-26 were omitted, which is of course true of many a

paragraph describing some special incident in a historical work.

But it is half-hearted and useless to cut out 21-26 as an interpolation

without cutting out 33-38; there, too, Paul is represented as the

prophet and the consoler on a higher plane, though he is also the mere

passenger suffering from hunger, and alive to the fact that the safety

of all depends on their taking food and being fit for active exertion

in the morning. Some critics go so far as to cut out vv. 33-35. But it

is not possible to cut these out alone; there is an obvious want of

sequence between 32 and 36, and Holtzmann therefore seems to accept

33-35. But if they are accepted I fail to see any reason for rejecting

21-26; these two passages are so closely akin in purport and bearing on

the context that they must go together; and all the mischief attributed

to 21-26 as placing Paul on a higher plane is done in 33-35.

Further, the excision of 21-26 would cut away a vital part of the

narrative. (1) These verses contain the additional fact, natural in

itself and assumed in v. 34 as already known, that the crew and

passengers were starving and weak. (2) They fit well into the context,

for they follow naturally after the spiritlessness described in v. 20,

and Paul begins by claiming attention on the ground of his former

advice (advice that is accepted by the critics as genuine because it is

different in tone from the supposed interpolation). "In former

circumstances," says he, "I gave you different, but salutary advice,

which to your cost you disregarded; listen to me now when I tell you

that you shall escape." The method of escape, the only method that a

sailor could believe to be probable, is added as a concluding

encouragement.

But let us cut out every verse that puts Paul on a higher plane, and

observe the narrative that would result: Paul twice comes forward with

advice that is cautiously prudent, and shows keen regard to the chance

of safety. If that is all the character he displayed throughout the

voyage, why do we study the man and his fate? All experience shows that

in such a situation there is often found some one to encourage the

rest; and, if Paul had not been the man to comfort and cheer his

despairing shipmates, he would never have impressed himself on history

or made himself an interest to all succeeding time. The world's history

stamps the interpolation-theory here as false.

Moreover, the letters of Paul put before us a totally different

character from this prudent calculator of chances. The Paul of Acts

XXVII is the Paul of the Epistles: the Paul who remains on the

interpolation theory could never have written the Epistles.

Finally, the reason why the historian dwells at such length on the

voyage lies mainly in vv. 21-26 and 33-38. In the voyage he pictures

Paul on a higher plane than common men, advising more skillfully than

the skilled mariners, maintaining hope and courage when all were in

despair, and breathing his hope and courage into others, playing the

part of a true Roman in a Roman ship, looked up to even by the

centurion, and in his single self the saviour of the lives of all. But

the interpolation-theory would cut out the centre of the picture.

There remains no reason to reject vv. 21-26 which I can discover,

except that it introduces the superhuman element. That is an argument

to which I have no reply. It is quite a tenable position in the present

stage of science and knowledge to maintain that every narrative which

contains elements of the marvellous must be an unhistorical and

untrustworthy narrative. But let us have the plain and honest reasons;

those who defend that perfectly fair position should not try to throw

in front of it as outworks flimsy and uncritical reasons, which cannot

satisfy for a moment any one that has not his mind made up beforehand

on that fundamental premise. But the superhuman element is inextricably

involved in this book: you cannot cut it out by any critical process

that will bear scrutiny. You must accept all or leave all.

8. ON SHORE.

(XXVII 39) AND WHEN IT WAS DAY THEY DID NOT RECOGNISE THE LAND; BUT

THEY WERE AWARE OF A SORT OF BAY OR CREEK WITH A SANDY BEACH, AND THEY

TOOK COUNSEL, IF POSSIBLE, TO DRIVE THE SHIP UP ON IT. (40.) AND

CASTING OFF THE ANCHORS, THEY LEFT THEM IN THE SEA, WHILST LOOSING THE

FASTENINGS OF THE RUDDERS, AND SETTING THE FORESAIL TO THE BREEZE, THEY

HELD FOR, THE OPEN BEACH. (41) AND CHANCING ON A BANK BETWEEN TWO SEAS,

THEY DROVE THE SHIP ON IT; AND THE PROW STRUCK AND REMAINED IMMOVABLE,

BUT THE AFTER PART BEGAN TO BREAK UP FROM THE VIOLENCE. (42) AND THE

SOLDIERS COUNSEL WAS TO KILL THE PRISONERS, LEST ANY SHOULD SWIM AWAY

AND ESCAPE; (43) BUT THE CENTURION, WISHING TO SAVE PAUL, STAYED THEM

FROM THEIR PURPOSE, AND BADE THEM THAT COULD SWIM TO LEAP OVERBOARD AND

GET FIRST TO LAND, (44) AND THE REST, SOME ON PLANKS, AND SOME ON

PIECES FROM THE SHIP. AND SO IT CAME TO PASS THAT ALL ESCAPED SAFE TO

THE LAND.

No description could be more clear and precise, selecting the essential

points and omitting all others. Smith quotes some interesting parallels

from modern narratives of shipwreck. Some doubt has arisen whether "the

bank between two seas" was a shoal separated from the shore by deep

water, or, as Smith says, a neck of land projecting towards the island

of Salmonetta, which shelters St. Paul's Bay on the north-west. But the

active term "drove the ship on it" (epekeilan) implies purpose, and

decides in Smith's favour. The fact that they "chanced on a ridge

between two seas" might at the first glance seem to imply want of

purpose; but, as Smith points out, they could not, while lying at

anchor, see the exact character of the spot. They selected a promising

point, and as they approached they found that luck had led them to the

isthmus between the island and the mainland. In their situation the

main object was to get the ship close up to the shore, and safe from

being rapidly and utterly smashed up by the waves. No place could have

better favoured their purpose. The ship (which probably drew eighteen

feet of water) "struck a bottom of mud, graduating into tenacious clay,

into which the fore part would fix itself, and be held fast, while the

stern was exposed to the force of the waves". Thus the foreship was

held together, until every passenger got safe to dry land. Only the

rarest conjunction of favourable circumstances could have brought about

such a fortunate ending to their apparently hopeless situation; and one

of the completest services that has ever been rendered to New Testament

scholarship is James Smith's proof that all these circumstances are

united in St. Paul's Bay. The only difficulty to which he has applied a

rather violent solution is the sandy beach: at the traditional point

where the ship was run ashore there is no sandy beach; but he considers

that it is "now worn away by the wasting action of the sea". On this

detail only local knowledge would justify an opinion,

In v. 41 "the violence" is rate expression used by a person standing on

the shore and watching the waves smash up the ship: he does not need to

specify the kind of violence. This expression takes us on to the beach,

and makes us gaze on the scene. The humblest scribe can supply kumaton

here, and most of them have done so.

9. MALTA.

(XXVIII 1) AND WHEN WE WERE ESCAPED, THEN WE LEARNT THAT THE ISLAND IS

CALLED MELITA. (2) AND THE BARBARIANS SHOWED US NO COMMON KINDNESS; FOR

THEY KINDLED A FIRE, AND WELCOMED US ALL, BECAUSE OF THE PRESENT RAIN

AND BECAUSE OF THE COLD. (3) BUT WHEN PAUL HAD GATHERED A BUNDLE OF

STICKS AND LAID THEM ON THE FIRE, A VIPER CAME OUT BY REASON OF THE

HEAT AND FASTENED ON HIS HAND. (4) AND WHEN THE BARBARIANS SAW THE

BEAST HANGING FROM HIS HAND, THEY SAID TO ONE ANOTHER, "NO DOUBT THIS

MAN IS A MURDERER, WHOM, THOUGH HE HATH ESCAPED FROM THE SEA, YET

JUSTICE WILL NOT SUFFER TO LIVE". (5) HOWBEIT HE SHOOK OFF THE BEAST

INTO THE FIRE, AND TOOK NO HARM. (6) BUT THEY EXPECTED THAT HE WOULD

HAVE SWOLLEN OR FALLEN DOWN DEAD SUDDENLY; BUT WHEN THEY WERE LONG IN

EXPECTATION AND BEHELD NOTHING AMISS COME TO HIM, THEY CHANGED THEIR

MINDS, AND SAID THAT HE WAS A GOD. (7) NOW IN THE NEIGHBOURHOOD OF THAT

PLACE WERE LANDS BELONGING TO THE FIRST man OF THE ISLAND, NAMED

POPLIUS, WHO RECEIVED US AND ENTERTAINED US THREE DAYS COURTEOUSLY. (8)

AND IT WAS SO THAT THE FATHER OF POPLIUS LAY SICK OF A FEVER AND

DYSENTERY; AND PAUL ENTERED IN UNTO HIM, AND PRAYED, AND LAYING HIS

HANDS ON HIM HEALED HIM. (9) AND WHEN THIS WAS DONE THE REST ALSO WHICH

HAD DISEASES IN THE ISLAND CAME AND WERE CURED; (10) WHO ALSO HONOURED

US WITH MANY HONOURS, AND WHEN WE SAILED PUT ON BOARD SUCH THINGS AS WE

NEEDED.

The name Poplius is the Greek form of the pr�nomen Publius; but it is

not probable that this official would be called by a simple pr�nomen.

Poplius might perhaps be the Greek rendering of the nomen Popilius. Yet

possibly the peasantry around spoke familiarly of "Publius" his

pr�nomen simply; and Luke (who has no sympathy for Roman nomenclature)

took the name that he heard in common use. The title "first"

technically correct in Melita: it has inscriptional authority.

Doubtless many of the sailors had been at Malta before, for eastern

ships bound for Rome must have often touched at the island, v. 11. "But

St. Paul's Bay is remote from the great harbour, and possesses no

marked features by which it could be recognised" from the anchorage in

the bay.

The objections which have been advanced, that there are now no vipers

in the island, and only one place where any wood grows, are too trivial

to deserve notice. Such changes are natural and probable in a small

island, populous and long civilised.

The term "barbarians," v. 2, is characteristic of the nationality of

the writer. It does not indicate rudeness or uncivilised habits, but

merely non-Greek birth; and it is difficult to imagine that a Syrian or

a Jew or any one but a Greek would have applied the name to the people

of Malta, who had been in contact with Phoenicians and Romans for many

centuries.

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

[57] The owners of private merchant ships were distinguished as emporoi

from the captains, in a Delian inscription eis Bithunian emporoi kai

naukleroi, Bulletin de Corresp. Hellen. 1880, p. 222.

[58] oi naukleroi tou poreutikou Alexandreinou stulou, Kaibel,

Inscript. Grac. in Italia, No. 918.

[59] Literally, had got their purpose.

[60] Seventeen miles from shore on their course, according Smith.

[61] Resonare Gig. Compared with prosachein, B, as Prof. Rendel Harris

suggests to me, this implies an early Greek reading prosechein.

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

CHAPTER XV.

ST. PAUL IN ROME

1 THE COMING TO ROME.

(XXVIII 11) AFTER THREE MONTHS WE SET SAIL IN A SHIP OF ALEXANDRIA,

WHICH HAD WINTERED IN THE ISLAND, WHOSE SIGN WAS "THE TWIN BROTHERS".

(12) AND TOUCHING AT SYRACUSE, WE TARRIED THERE THREE DAYS. (13) AND

FROM THENCE, BY TACKING, WE ARRIVED AT RHEGIUM. AND AFTER ONE DAY A

SOUTH WIND SPRANG UP, AND ON THE SECOND DAY WE CAME TO PUTEOLI: (14)

WHERE, FINDING BRETHREN, WE WERE CONSOLED AMONG THEM, REMAINING SEVEN

DAYS; [62] AND THEREUPON WE CAME TO ROME. (15) AND FROM THENCE THE

BRETHREN, HEARING THE NEWS ABOUT US, CAME TO MEET US AS FAR AS "APPIUS

MARKET" AND "THREE TAVERNS": WHOM, WHEN PAUL SAW, HE THANKED GOD AND

TOOK COURAGE. (16) AND WHEN WE ENTERED INTO ROME [the centurion

delivered the prisoners to the stratopedarch, and] PAUL WAS SUFFERED TO

ABIDE BY HIMSELF WITH THE SOLDIER THAT GUARDED HIM [outside of the

camp]. . . . (30) HIRED DWELLING, AND RECEIVED ALL THAT WENT IN UNTO

HIM, (31) AND PREACHED THE KINGDOM OF GOD, AND TAUGHT WHAT CONCERNED

THE LORD JESUS CHRIST WITH ALL BOLDNESS, NONE FORBIDDING HIM (see note,

p. 362).

The wreck took place before the middle of November (p. 322); therefore

they sailed from Malta in February. That is earlier than the usual

beginning of over-sea navigation; but we may understand that favourable

weather tempted them to an early start; and as the autumn was unusually

tempestuous, it is probable that fine weather began early. Luke does

not tell what sort of wind blew, leaving the reader to understand that

it was from a southerly quarter (as otherwise no ancient ship would

attempt the over-sea voyage). The wind fell and they had to wait three

days in Syracuse. Then though the breeze was not from the south, they

were able by good seamanship to work up to Rhegium [63] . Here, after

one day, a south wind arose; and they sailed across to Puteoli,

arriving there on the second day.

The passage probably took not much over twenty-four hours, beginning

one day and ending the following morning: with a following wind, these

large merchant vessels sailed fast. The passengers landed in Puteoli;

but the cargo, doubtless, was carried to Ostia, where it had to be

transshipped to smaller vessels which could go up the Tiber to Rome.

Luke mentions the name of the last vessel, but not of any of the

others. The reason lies in the circumstances. He heard the news about

the last vessel before he saw it; but he became acquainted with the

others by seeing them. Probably the news that the Dioscuri, of the

Alexandrian Imperial fleet, was lying in the great harbour, reached the

shipwrecked party during the three days when they were in Poplius's

house; and was so noted in Luke's memoranda. But he had not the

sailor's mind, who thinks of his ship as a living friend, and always

speaks of her by her name; hence the other ships were to him only means

of conveyance, whereas the name of the Dioscuri was the first fact

which he learned about her.

Puteoli, as a great harbour, was a central point and a crossing of

intercourse; and thus Christianity had already established itself

there. All movements of thought throughout the Empire acted with

marvellous rapidity on Rome, the heart of the vast and complicated

organism; and the crossing-places or knots [64] on the main highways of

intercourse with the East--Puteoli, Corinth, Ephesus, Syrian

Antioch--became centres from which Christianity radiated. At Pompeii,

which is not far from Puteoli, the Christians were a subject of gossip

among loungers in the street before it was destroyed by the eruption of

Vesuvius in 79.

The double expression of arrival at Rome in vv. 14 and 16 is

remarkable; and has caused much speculation among commentators. Blass

is inclined to seek a change of text, giving the sense "we proceeded on

our way (imperfect) to Rome, then we came to Appii Forum, etc., and

finally we entered Rome ". Others prefer other interpretations. But the

double expression seems due to the double sense that every name of a

city-state bears in Greek: the word Rome might either include the

entire territory of the city, the XXXV tribes as they were completed in

B.C. 241, i.e., the whole ager Romanus, or be restricted to the walls

and buildings. Thus v. 13, "we reached the state Rome," the bounds of

which were probably pointed out as the party reached them; in 14, "we

passed through two points in the ager Romanus"; and in 15, "we entered

the (walls of) Rome" (see p. 111).

It is evident that Paul, when he reached this crisis of his fate, was

feeling dispirited; for the tendency to low spirits is always one of

the most trying concomitants of his chronic disorder, as described in

Ch. V � 2. The allusions to the consolation that he received from

meeting Brethren at Puteoli, Appius's Forum, and the Three Taverns,

must be taken as indications of some marked frame of mind. We have

already observed him in a similar state of depression when he was in

Troas and Philippi (p. 283 f.).

When the party reached Rome, the centurion delivered his charge to his

superior officer, who bears the title Chief of the Camp (Stratopedarch)

in the Greek text. [65] This title has always hitherto been interpreted

as denoting the Prefect of the Pr�torian Guard, stationed in a large

camp adjoining the wails of Rome. But that interpretation is not well

suited either to the natural character of language or to the facts of

the Roman service. The title could not properly designate an officer of

such high rank; and the Pr�torian Prefect would hardly be concerned

with a comparatively humble duty like the reception of and

responsibility for prisoners. The Greek title Stratopedarch very rarely

occurs; and it remained for Mommsen, aided by the form given in an old

Latin version, Princeps Peregrinorum, to explain who the officer really

was, and to place the whole episode of Paul's Roman residence in a new

light (see p. 315).

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 that demanded communication 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; and in time they became

detested as agents and spies of Government. 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 C�lian 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 command of the Princeps

Peregrinorum; and it is clear that Stratopedarch in Acts is the Greek

name for that officer (see p. 315). This whole branch of the service is

very obscure. Marquardt considers that it was first organised by

Hadrian; but Mommsen believes that it must have been instituted by

Augustus.

2. THE RESIDENCE IN ROME.

Paul was treated in Rome with the utmost leniency. He was allowed to

hire a house or a lodging in the city, and live there at his own

convenience under the surveillance of a soldier who was responsible for

his presence when required. A light chain fastened Paul's wrist to that

of the soldier. No hindrance was offered to his inviting friends into

his house, or to his preaching to all who came in to him; but he was

not allowed to go out freely.

After the depression of spirit in which Paul entered Rome, Acts

concludes with a distinct implication of easier and more hopeful

circumstances. His work went on unimpeded, while the rest after the

fatigue and hardships of the voyage would be beneficial to his physical

health (even though September might afterwards prove unhealthy); and

thus the two chief reasons for his gloomy frame of mind on landing in

Italy were removed. He regarded himself as "an ambassador in a chain"

(Eph. VI 20); he asked for the prayers of the Colossians and the Asian

Churches generally for his success in preaching; his tone is hopeful

and full of energy and spirit for the work (1. c., Col. IV 3, 4); and

he looked forward to acquittal and a visit to Colossai (Philem. 22). We

may date these letters to Philemon, to Colossai, and to the Asian

Churches generally (Eph.) near the middle of the long imprisonment; an

accurate date is impossible, but for brevity's sake we may speak of

their date as early in 61.

The presence of many friends in Rome also cheered Paul. He had been

permitted to take two personal attendants with him from C�sareia; but

though his other companions in Jerusalem were prevented from

accompanying him in his voyage, some of them followed him to Rome.

Timothy was with him during great part of his imprisonment, was sent on

a mission to Philippi about the end of 61 (Phil. II 19), and thereafter

seems to have had his headquarters in Asia, whence he was summoned by

Paul to join him during his second imprisonment. Tychicus also joined

Paul in Rome in 60, and was sent on a mission to Asia, and especially

to the Churches of the Lycos valley, early in 61. They probably left

C�sareia when Paul sailed for Rome, visited on the way their own homes,

and arrived in Rome not long after Paul himself.

Moreover, Mark, who had become reconciled with Paul (probably during

his residence at Jerusalem, or his imprisonment in C�sareia), came also

to Rome. He left Rome in 61, contemplating an extended tour in the

province Asia, in the course of which he would probably visit Colossai.

Oral instructions had been already sent to the Colossians, and,

doubtless, other Pauline Churches (probably by Onesimus and Tychicus),

to welcome him as Paul's deputy; and Paul writes to the Colossians a

formal recommendation of him (IV 10). The terms in which Paul speaks

suggest that he had not taken any active interest in the new Pauline

Churches since the unfortunate quarrel in Pamphylia, and that there was

likely to be some coldness towards him among the Pauline Christians.

From this year, apparently, began a new era in Mark's life. His work

seems to have lain in Asia during the next few years, for about the

close of his life Paul bids Timothy (IV 11) bring Mark with him to

Rome, implying that they were near each other; and Timothy was in

Ephesus at the time. Probably Paul had been informed of Mark's desire

to rejoin him in his troubles. At a later date Mark is associated with

the greeting of I Peter V 13 to the Churches of the provinces of Asia

Minor, in such a way as to imply personal acquaintance with them; and

this wide range of work, though not easily reconcilable with the

earlier dates assigned to that Epistle, suits naturally and well the

date about 80 (Church in R.E., p. 280 f). On this view Mark after

Paul's death must have devoted himself to work in the more easterly

provinces of Asia Minor; and returned to Rome ten or twelve years

later.

It is remarkable that Luke has not a word to say about the process by

which Christianity spread to Rome; but, according to the plan which we

have already seen to be shadowed forth for the sequel of this history,

the process would form part of the contemplated Third Book. That Book

would naturally open with a brief statement of the western dispersion

and the planting of Christianity in Italy, going back for the moment to

an earlier date, just as in XI 27 the historian, when he has to include

Antioch in the stage of his drama, turns back to the movement

originating in Stephen's work. So here he brings Paul to Rome; and

thereafter he would probably have made a new start with the Churches of

the West and the new impulse imparted to them by Paul's acquittal. We

are compelled to make some conjecture on this point; for no one can

accept the ending of Acts as the conclusion of a rationally conceived

history. Such an ending might exist in a diary, which has no

determining idea, but not in a history; and we, who work on the

hypothesis that Acts is a history, must strive to understand the

guiding idea of an unfinished work.

According to modern ideas, the rapidity with which every movement in

the provinces influenced Rome is a sign of strong vitality and intimate

union of the parts of that vast Empire. The Imperial policy fostered

intercommunication and unity to the utmost; and it is not too much to

say that travelling was more highly developed, and the dividing power

of distance was weaker, under the Empire than at any time before or

since, until we come down to the present century. But that fact, which

we estimate as probably the best measure of material civilisation, was

regarded with horror by the party of old Roman thought and manners,

which was stubbornly opposed in mind to the Imperial rule, though it

was powerless against it. They saw that the old Roman character was

changed, and the old Roman ideals of life and government were

destroyed, by the influx of provincial thoughts and manners. The

Orontes was pouring its waters into the Tiber; Syrian and Greek vices

were substituted for Roman virtues; and prominent among these vices

were Judaism, Christianity, and other "debasing superstitions"

The new movement made marked progress in the vast Imperial household;

and Paul, in sending to the Philippian Church the greetings of the

Roman Christians, says, "All the saints salute you, especially they

that are of C�sar's household ". This is quite to be expected. The

Imperial household was at the centre of affairs and in most intimate

relations with all parts of the Empire; and in it influences from the

provinces were most certain to be felt early. There can be no doubt

that Lightfoot is right in considering that Christianity effected an

entrance into C�esar's household before Paul entered Rome; in all

probability he is right also in thinking that all the slaves of

Aristobulus (son of Herod the Great) and of Narcissus (Claudius's

favourite freedman) had passed into the Imperial household, and that

members of these two famili� are saluted as Christians by Paul (Rom.

XVI 10 f.).

3. SENECA AND PAUL.

The question has been much discussed what relation, if any, existed

between Seneca and Paul at this time. A tradition existed in the fourth

century that they had been brought into close relation. It is, however,

exceedingly doubtful whether this tradition had any other foundation

than the remarkable likeness that many of Seneca's phrases and

sentiments show to passages in the New Testament. But, however striking

these extracts seem when collected and looked at apart from their

context, I think that a careful consideration of them as they occur in

the books, must bring every one to the conclusion advocated by

Lightfoot, by Aub�, and by many others, that the likeness affords no

proof that Seneca came into such relations with Paul as to be

influenced in his sentiments by him: resemblances quite as striking

occur in works written before Paul came Rome (according to the

received, although not always absolutely certain, chronology of

Seneca's works), as in those written after. Nor was it among the

professed philosophers that Paul was likely to be listened to: they

considered that they knew all he had to say, and could quote from their

own lectures a good moral precept to set alongside of anything he could

tell them.

Yet there can be no doubt that some very striking parallels between

Senecan and Pauline sayings occur; and this is true of Seneca to a

greater extent than of any other non-Christian writer. It is possible

that the philosophical school of Tarsus had exercised more influence on

Paul than is commonly allowed; and it is certain that Seneca was

influenced by Athenodorus of Tarsus. Lightfoot refers especially to the

fact that both Paul and Seneca "compare life to a warfare, and describe

the struggle after good as a contest with the flesh ". Seneca makes one

long quotation from Athenodorus (de Clem., 4), and in it the idea that

life is a warfare is worked out elaborately; and the saying (Ep. X),

"So live with men, as if God saw you; so speak with God, as if men

heard you," occurs immediately after a quotation from Athenodorus, [66]

and seems to be a reflection in Seneca's words of Athenodorus's

intention. Athenodorus lived much in Rome, and died there in Cato's

house, 60-50 B.C.; but it is probable both that his system exercised

great influence in the university of his own city, and that Paul's

expression and language may contain traces of his university training

in Tarsus.

But though there is no reason to think that Seneca was influenced by

Paul's language or thoughts, yet there is every reason to think that

the liberal policy of the Empire at this period in religion was due to

Seneca's broad views. It is certain that he had exercised very great

influence on the Imperial policy, since his pupil Nero became Emperor

in 54; and it is highly probable that the energy with which that policy

was carried out in the East, and the generous freedom with which all

religious questions were treated during that period, are due to

Seneca's spirit. He is perhaps the only distinguished politician of the

first century who shows some of the wide views of Hadrian; and it is

remarkable that both Seneca and Hadrian were sprung from Spain, being

thus thoroughly Roman and yet absolutely free from the old narrow Roman

spirit. It is clear that, in the later years of Nero's reign, the

Empire began to fall into dangerous disorganisation, while in his early

years the government at home and abroad seems to have been remarkably

successful; and it is not easy to account for the contrast, except by

connecting the success with Seneca's guiding spirit. Now, the tone

which marks the relations of the State to Paul throughout the period

described in Acts, is quite different from that which began in A.D. 64

and subsequently became intensified. Surely we can best account for the

change by the disgrace and retirement of Seneca in 62: his spirit

departed from the administration by rapid steps after that date.

Circumstances had given him for a few years such influence as perhaps

never again was exercised by a private citizen in the Empire. As a

rule, the Emperors held the reins of government tight in their own

hands, and allowed no subordinate to exert any influence on the general

conduct of affairs; and there are many great Emperors, but only one

great Minister under the Empire, Seneca.

The household of Seneca during his ascendancy was likely to be brought

into close relations with the great movements that were agitating the

Empire. It is therefore natural to expect that the new religion should

affect it in some degree, as it did the Imperial household. Nor are we

left to mere conjecture on this point. A remarkable inscription of

somewhat later date has been found at Ostia, "M. Annaeus Paulus to M.

Annaeus Paulus Petrus, his very dear son:" the name "Paul Peter" must

be taken as an indubitable proof of religion. These persons possibly

belong to a family of freed men connected with the household of Seneca;

but, assuming that, it is no more admissible to quote this inscription

as corroborating Seneca's traditional subjection to Christianity, than

it would be to quote the strong leaven of Christianity in C�sar's

household in proof of C�sar's amenability to the same influence.

4. THE TRIAL.

It is doubtful why Paul's trial was so long delayed. Perhaps his

opponents, despairing of obtaining his condemnation, preferred to put

off the trial as long as possible; and there were then, as there are

now, many devices in law for causing delay. Perhaps the case was being

inquired into by the Imperial Office: the trial had to take place

before the Emperor or one of his representatives (probably one of the

two Prefects of the Pr�torian Guard). The whole question of free

teaching of an oriental religion by a Roman citizen must have been

opened up by the case; and it is quite possible that Paul's previous

proceedings were inquired into.

The trial seems to have occurred towards the end of A.D. 61 Its

earliest stages were over before Paul wrote to the Philippians, for he

says, I 12, "the things which happened unto me have fallen out rather

unto the progress of the Good News; so that my bonds became manifest in

Christ in the whole Pr�torium, and to all the rest; and that most of

the Brethren in the Lord, being confident in my bonds, are more

abundantly bold to speak the word of God without fear". This passage

has been generally misconceived and connected with the period of

imprisonment; and here again we are indebted to Mommsen for the proper

interpretation. The Pr�torium is the whole body of persons connected

with the sitting in judgment, the supreme Imperial Court, doubtless in

this case the Prefect or both Prefects of the Pr�torian Guard,

representing the Emperor in his capacity as the fountain of justice,

together with the assessors and high officers of the court. The

expression of the chapter as a whole shows that the trial is partly

finished, and the issue as yet is so favourable that the Brethren are

emboldened by the success of Paul's courageous and free-spoken defence

and the strong impression which he evidently produced on the court; but

he himself, being entirely occupied with the trial, is for the moment

prevented from preaching as he had been doing when he wrote to the

Colossians and the Asian Churches generally.

That Philippians was written near the end of the imprisonment has been

widely recognised, though the powerful opposition of Lightfoot has

carried away the general current of opinion in England. When Paul was

writing to the Church at Philippi, his custom of sending his

subordinates on missions had stripped him of companions; and so he

says, "I have no man like-minded (with Timothy) who will show genuine

care for your state, for they all seek their own, not the things of

Jesus Christ, but ye recognise his proved character" (Phil II 20 f.).

It seems impossible to believe that Paul could have written like this,

if he had had with him Tychicus, "faithful minister and fellow-servant

in the Lord," Aristarchus, Mark, and above all Luke. Yet, if anything

is sure about that period, it is that Aristarchus and Luke had been

with Paul from his arrival in Rome till after Coloss., Philem. and Eph.

were written, while Tychicus probably joined him with Timothy in 60. On

our supposition, Mark and Tychicus had already been sent on missions to

Asia; Luke is either the "true yoke-fellow" addressed in Phil IV 3, or

was actually the bearer of the letter to Philippi; Aristarchus also had

been sent on a mission during the summer of 61; and Epaphras naturally

had returned to the Lycos valley. There remained some friends with Paul

(IV 21), probably Demas among them (Col. IV 14, Philem. 24); but he did

not feel sure of their thorough trustworthiness, and his doubt about

Demas was afterwards justified (II Tim. IV 10). Hence his eagerness to

get back to the company of real and trusty friends (II 24 ff.).

Amid the general tone of hopefulness and confidence in Philippians,

there are some touches of depression, which may be attributed to the

absence of so many intimate friends, to the increased strain that the

trial now proceeding must have put on his powers (p. 94 f.), and to the

probable closer confinement necessitated by the trial, that he might

always be accessible in case of need. There is more eagerness for the

issue of the long proceedings manifest in Phil. than in the other

letters from Rome; but it is part of human nature to be more patient

when the end is still far off, and more excited and eager as the end

approaches.

The letter to Philippi was not called forth by any dangerous crisis

there, as were the letters to Colossai and to the Asian Churches

generally (Eph.). Hence Col. and Eph. "exhibit a more advanced stage in

the development of the Church" than Phil. Lightfoot and others are

indubitably right in that point; but their inference that Phil. was

written earlier than the others does not follow. The tone of Col. and

Eph. is determined by the circumstances of the Churches addressed. The

great cities of Asia were on the highway of the world, which traversed

the Lycos valley, and in them development took place with great

rapidity. But the Macedonians were a simple-minded people in comparison

with Ephesus and Laodiceia and Colossai, living further away from the

great movements of thought. It was not in Paul's way to send to

Philippi an elaborate treatise against a subtle speculative heresy,

which had never affected that Church. His letter was called forth by

the gifts which had been sent by the Philippians; it is a recognition

of their thoughtful kindness; and hence it has a marked character,

being "the noblest reflection of St. Paul's personal character and

spiritual illumination, his large sympathies, his womanly tenderness,

his delicate courtesy" (to use once more the words of Lightfoot). It is

plain that he did not actually need the help that the), now sent; but

his gratitude is as warm and genuine as if he had been in deep need,

and he recurs to the former occasions when his real poverty had been

aided by them. The freedom from anxiety about the development at

Philippi, and the hearty affection for kind friends, make this in many

respects the most pleasing of all Paul's letters.

Though prepared to face death if need be, Paul was comparatively

confident of the issue when he wrote to Philippi: "I have the confident

conviction that I shall remain and abide for you all to your progress

and joy of believing," and "I trust that I shall come to you shortly"

That he was acquitted is demanded both by the plan evident in Acts (p.

308) and by other reasons well stated by others.

5. LAST TRIAL AND DEATH OF PAUL.

His later career is concealed from us, for the hints contained in the

Pastoral Epistles hardly furnish even an outline of his travels, which

must have lasted three or four years, 62-65 A.D. At his second trial

the veil that hides his fate is raised for the moment. On that occasion

the circumstances were very different from his first trial. His

confinement was more rigorous, for Onesiphorus had to take much trouble

before obtaining an interview with the prisoner (II Tim. I 17): "he

fared ill as far as bonds, like a criminal" (II 9). He had no hope of

acquittal: he recognised that he was "already being poured forth as an

offering, and the time of his departure was come". The gloom and

hopelessness of the situation damped and dismayed all his friends: at

his first hearing "all forsook" him; yet for the time he "was delivered

out of the mouth of the lion". In every respect the situation thus

indicated is the opposite of the circumstances described on the first

trial. Phil. occupies the same place in the first as II Tim. in the

second trial; but Phil. looks forward to a fresh career among the

Churches, while II Tim. is the testament of a dying man. In one

respect, however, the second trial was like the first. Paul again

defended himself in the same bold and outspoken way as before,

expounding the principles of his life to a great audience, "that all

the Gentiles might hear".

Yet the circumstances of this second trial are totally different from

that "short way with the dissenters" which was customary under Domitian

and Trajan and later Emperors. After his first examination Paul could

still write to Asia bidding Timothy and Mark come to him, which shows

that he looked forward to a considerable interval before the next stage

of his trial. He was charged as a malefactor, crimes had to be proved

against him, and evidence brought; and the simple acknowledgment that

he was a Christian was still far from sufficient to condemn him, as it

was under Domitian. It is a plausible conjecture of Conybeare and

Howson that the first hearing, on which he was acquitted and "delivered

out of the lion's mouth," was on the charge of complicity and sympathy

with the incendiaries, who had burned Rome in 64; and that charge was

triumphantly disproved. The trial in that case did not occur until the

first frenzy of terror and rage against the supposed incendiaries was

over; and some other species of crime had to be laid to the account of

the Christians charged before the courts. The second and fatal charge,

heard later, was doubtless that of treason, shown by hostility to the

established customs of society, and by weakening the Imperial

authority.

If our conception of the trial is correct, the precedent of the first

great trial still guided the courts of the empire (as we have elsewhere

sought to prove). It had then been decided that the preaching of the

new religion was not in itself a crime; and that legal offences must be

proved against Christians as against any other subjects of the empire.

That was the charter of freedom (p. 282) which was abrogated shortly

after; and part of Luke's design was, as we have seen (p. 307), to

record the circumstances in which the charter had been obtained, as a

protest against the Flavian policy, which had overturned a well-weighed

decision of the supreme court.

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

[62] The text of most MSS., "we were entreated to tarry with them seven

days," seems irreconcilable with Paul's situation as a prisoner.

However friendly Julius was to Paul, he was a Roman officer, with whom

discipline and obedience to rule were natural. With Blass, we follow

the text of the inferior MSS. (see p. 212).

[63] Westcott and Hort prefer the text of the great MSS. perielontes,

which could hardly mean more than "casting off," an unnecessary piece

of information here, though important in XXVII.

[64] Each of them may be called parodos, the epithet applied to Ephesus

by Ignatius, Rom. 12, Church in R. E., p. 318 f.

[65] Text of XXVIII 16. The failure in the great MSS. of the delivery

of Paul to the Stratopedarch is a very clear case of omitting a Lukan

detail, which had only a mundane interest; and the failure of similar

details in XXVII 5, XVI 30, etc., may be estimated by the analogy of

this case.

[66] The owners of private merchant ships are distinguished as emporoi

from the captains, in a Delian inscription eis Bithunian emporoi kai

naukleroi, Bulletin de Corresp. Hellen. 1880, p. 222.

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

CHAPTER XVI.

CHRONOLOGY OF EARLY CHURCH HISTORY -- 30-40 A.D.

1. THE STATE OF THE CHURCH IN A.D. 30.

The chronological difficulty has probably weighed with many, as it has

with Lightfoot (Ed. Gal. p. 124), in rejecting the identification which

we advocate of the visit in Acts XI with that in Gal. II 1-10. It is

therefore necessary to glance briefly at the chronology of the early

chapters of Acts, in order to show that there is no real difficulty for

those who (like Lightfoot) date the Crucifixion in A.D. 30. Our

identification, if proved, would make it certain that the Death of

Christ cannot be dated so late as 33.

Luke's historical method required him in the opening of his Second Book

to give a full account of the first condition of the Church in

Jerusalem, and then to concentrate attention on the critical steps and

persons by whom the Universal Church was moulded to the form it had in

his time.

In I, after a short preamble, connecting the narrative with the

preceding book, he describes how the number of the Apostles was filled

up. The organisation of the Church was always a subject of keen

interest to Luke; he "evidently had the impression that the guidance of

affairs rested with the Apostles in Jerusalem" (p. 53); and the

appointment of this important official was in his estimation a matter

of great moment. Peter took the lead; two were selected by common

agreement and vote; and out of these the lot showed which was preferred

by the Divine will.

In II 1-42 the events of Pentecost (May 26, A.D. 30), and the effect

produced on the character of the converts, are described; and the

general state and conduct of this primitive Church is summed up in II

43-47.

The second part of II 47, "the Lord added to them day by day those that

were being saved," is one of those phrases in which Luke often hits off

a long, steady, uniform process. It is to be taken as a general

description of subsequent progress in Jerusalem, during the course of

which occurred the events next related.

The space devoted by Luke to Pentecost shows that he considered the

events of that day to be of the highest importance. On that day the

Divine grace was given to the Apostles, qualifying them (p. 45) for the

work which they were now required to perform since their Master had

left them. Luke shows true historical insight in fixing the reader's

attention on Pentecost. For the permanence of a movement of this kind,

much depends on the successors of the first leader; and the issue is

determined in the period following the leader's removal. Has the leader

shown that electrical creative power that remoulds men and communicates

his own spirit to his disciples, or will the movement be found

leaderless and spiritless, when the originator is taken away? While the

leader is with his disciples, they have little or no opportunity of

showing independence and originality and capacity for command. When he

is re moved from them, the first effect must be discouragement and a

sense of emptiness, proportionate to the influence exerted by the

leader. Then comes the real test, which determines the vitality and

permanence of the movement. Has the spirit of the founder descended on

his followers? With Luke, and with all the great leaders of the first

century, that was the test of every new man and every new congregation:

had the Spirit been granted to them?

In the second month after their leader was taken away, on the day of

Pentecost, the test was fulfilled in the primitive Church; and the

capacity of his disciples to carry on his work was shown. They became

conscious of the power that had been given them, and their new power

was recognised by the multitude in their words and in their looks. The

same impression of a transformed and recreated nature was made on the

elders and scribes, when they examined Peter and John (IV 13 f., see

� 2).

By virtue of that Divine grace, "many wonders and signs were done by

the Apostles," v. 43, during the following time. But it is vital to

Luke's method not to rest contented with. that general statement, but

to give one special, clear example of the power communicated to the

Apostles and to the Church of which they were the leaders. It would be

waste of time to regret that he passes over so much that we should like

to know, and devotes so much space to a marvel that is to us a

difficulty: our present aim is to understand the purpose of what he

does say, not to long after what he omits.

The example is given in III; the subsequent events of the same day are

narrated IV 1-4; and the following day is described IV 5-31, when Peter

and John, in whom the proof of Divine grace had been shown forth. were

examined before a meeting of "the rulers and eiders and scribes". These

are represented as realising now for the first time, v. 13, the change

that had come over Peter and John, who from "unlearned and ignorant

men" had been transformed into bold and eloquent preachers. Evidently.

the historian conceives that this transformation, wrought at Pentecost,

was now beginning to be generally felt; and therefore he is still (as

we have said) describing the immediate issue of Pentecost. Thereafter

comes a second general statement of the state and character of the

primitive Church, startlingly similar to II 43-47.

Thus the whole passage II 43-IV 35 hangs very closely together, and

describes the Church in the period immediately succeeding May 26, A.D.

30. Two episodes of this period, exemplifying the conduct of the true

and the false convert, are described IV 36-V 11; and then comes a third

general description of the state of the Church in this period V 12-16,

followed by a statement of the attempt made by the Jewish leaders to

coerce the Apostles into silence V 17-41.

That at least two accounts by two different authorities underlie Luke's

narrative, and have been worked up by him with little change, seems

clear. It is, of course, obvious that he was entirely dependent for

this period of his history on the authority of other persons; and we

see in the Third Gospel how much he was influenced by the very language

of his authorities, and how little change he made on their words. [67]

2. TRUSTWORTHINESS OF THE NARRATIVE.

Acts I-V. It is obvious that the trustworthiness of this part of Acts

stands on quite a different footing from that of the Pauline narrative,

which we have hitherto discussed. The author had means of knowing the

later events with perfect accuracy (so far as perfection can be

attained in history); but the means which helped him there fail in I-V,

and the scene and surroundings were to him strange and remote (p. 19

f.). He was here dependent entirely on others, and it was more

difficult for him to control and make himself master of the evolution

of events. We discern the same guiding hand and mind, the same clear

historical insight seizing the great and critical steps, in the early

chapters, as in the later; but the description of the primitive Church

wants precision in the outline and colour in the details. It seems

clear that the authorities on which Luke depended were not equally

good; and here second-rate incidents are admitted along with first-rate

in a way that has done his reputation serious injury in the estimation

of those who begin to study Acts from this, its necessarily weakest

part. One or two examples will bring out our meaning. First we take an

incident related also by Matthew.

Matthew XXVII 5-8 Acts I 18-19.

AND HE WENT AWAY AND HANGED HIMSELF. AND THE CHIEF PRIESTS TOOK THE

PIECES OF SILVER, AND SAID, "IT IS NOT LAWFUL TO PUT THEM INTO THE

TREASURY, SINCE. IT IS THE PRICE OF BLOOD". AND THEY TOOK COUNSEL, AND

BOUGHT WITH THEM THE POTTER'S FIELD, TO BURY STRANGERS IN. WHEREFORE

THAT FIELD WAS CALLED THE FIELD OF BLOOD. UNTO THIS DAY. NOW THIS MAN

OBTAINED A FIELD WITH THE REWARD OF HIS INIQUITY; AND FALLING HEADLONG,

HE BURST ASUNDER IN THE MIDST, AND ALL HIS BOWELS GUSHED. AND IT BECAME

KNOWN TO ALL THE DWELLERS AT JERUSALEM; INSOMUCH THAT IN THEIR LANGUAGE

THAT FIELD WAS CALLED AKELDAMA, THAT IS, THE FIELD OF BLOOD.

There can be no hesitation in accepting the vivid and detailed

description which Matthew gives of this incident. But, if so, the

account given in Acts cannot be accepted as having any claim to

trustworthiness in any point of discrepancy. The character of this

account is marked, and its origin obvious. It is a growth of popular

fancy and tradition, which preserved the main facts, viz., the

connection between the name, Field of Blood, and the price paid to the

betrayer. But it is characteristic of popular tradition, while it

preserves some central fact, to overlay it with fanciful accretions,

which often conceal completely the historical kernel. In this case, we

have the tale arrested at an early point in its growth, when its

elements are still separable. The name Field of Blood had to be

explained suitably to the remembered fact that it was bought with the

betrayer's reward; but its meaning was mistaken. Popular fancy always

craves for justice; it connected the name with the betrayer's

punishment, took the Blood, which formed one element of the name, as

the betrayer's blood, and evolved a myth which united fact and

retributory justice in a moral apologue.

It is a remarkable thing that popular tradition should so soon distort

a tale so simple and so impressive. But oriental tradition never clings

to fact with anything like the same tenacity as Greek tradition; and we

know how much even the latter distorts and covers over the facts that

it preserves. The oriental mind has little or nothing of the proper

historical tone. It remembers facts, not for their own value, but for

the lesson they can convey. It substitutes the moral apologue for

history in the strict sense of the term, craving for the former, and

possessing little regard for the latter. It acts with great rapidity,

transforming the memory of the past within the lapse of a few years;

and probably those who know the East best will find least difficulty in

believing that the stow which Luke here gives might have been told him,

when the Field of Blood was pointed out to him at Jerusalem in 57 A.D.

But in this rapid transformation of fact in Eastern popular tradition

lies the best safeguard of the historical student against it. He rarely

needs to doubt, as he often must in Greece, whether any narrative is

history or mere popular tradition. Greek tradition often has such a

natural appearance that it is hard to say where fact ends and fancy

begins. But oriental tradition is so free in its creation, so

unfettered by any thought of suitability in the accessories, that it is

marked off from history by a broad and deep gap. By history we mean

narrative rounded on documents that are nearly contemporary with the

actual facts, or on the accounts of eye-witnesses, not implying that

"history" must be absolutely true. To give a true account even of a

single incident that one has actually participated in is not within the

power of all, for it needs education, skill in selection, and an eye to

distinguish the relative importance of different points. To give a true

account of a long series of incidents is, of course, much more

difficult. No history is absolutely true; all give accounts that are

more or less distorted pictures of fact. But the conception of history

as an attempt to represent facts in correct perspective, even when it

is poorly and feebly carried out, is a great and sacred possession,

which we owe to the Greeks; and is a generically different thing from

popular tradition, which aims either at the moral apologue, or the glow

of an individual or a family, and regards faithfulness to actual facts

as quite a secondary thing.

The episode of Ananias and Sapphira V 1 f. excites reasonable

suspicion. That Ananias should be carried forth and buried unknown to

his family, unmourned by his kindred and friends, is not merely

contrary to right conduct, but violates the deepest feelings of

oriental life. That a man should be properly lamented and wept for by

his family is and has always been a sacred right, which even crime does

not forfeit. But the desire to bring into strong relief the

unselfishness of the primitive Church has worked itself out in a moral

apologue, which has found here an entrance alongside of real history.

Again in II 5-11 another popular tale seems to obtrude itself. In these

verses the power of speaking with tongues, which is clearly described

by Paul as a species of prophesying (I Cor. XII 10 f., XIV 1 f.), is

taken in the sense of speaking in many languages. Here again we observe

the distorting influence of popular fancy. Yet alongside of these

suspicious stories we find passages which show strongly the

characteristic method of Luke; and the entire plan of the narrative,

concentrating attention on the successive critical steps, is thoroughly

Lukan. We take one example of a Lukan passage.

The incident in IV 13 f. is especially characteristic of Luke's style;

and it has been widely misunderstood. Zeller, Holtzmann, Meyer-Wendt

and others, understand these verses to mean that the members of the

Sanhedrim became aware only during the trial that Peter and John had

been disciples of Jesus: which, as they justly point out, is most

unnatural and unsuitable. But the force of the passage seems to be very

different: the Jewish leaders perceived the bold and fluent speech of

Peter and John, and yet they observed from their dress and style of

utterance that they were not trained scholars; and they marvelled (for

there was then probably an even more marked distinction than at the

present day between the speech and thought of a fisherman or shepherd

and of an educated person); and they further took cognisance of the

fact that they were disciples of Jesus; and they gazed on the man that

had been cured standing along with his preservers. These were the facts

of the case: all were undeniable; and all were vividly brought before

them. What conclusion could be drawn from them? The historian's point

is that there was only one possible inference; and, as the Jewish

leaders were unwilling to draw that inference, they perforce kept

silence, not having wherewithal to dispute the obvious conclusion.

Here, as usual, the historian does not himself draw the inference; but

merely states the main facts, and leaves them to tell their own tale.

But in no passage does he state the facts in more dramatic form. The

conclusion lies close at hand, rig., that these illiterate fishermen

had acquired the art and power of effective oratory through their

having been the disciples of Jesus, and through the Divine grace and

power communicated to them.

We notice also that John's speech has not previously been mentioned,

yet now it is assumed that he had spoken. This is characteristic of the

writer's style, as we have seen it in the second part of the work. It

is evident that Peter's single speech did not exhaust the proceedings

at the trial; but Luke assumes that the reader conceives the general

situation and the style of procedure in such trials; and he quotes the

most telling utterance, and leaves the rest to the reader's

imagination.

We are struck with the marked difference of Acts I-V, not merely from

the later chapters, but also from Luke's First Book, the Gospel. In

composing his Book I, he had formal works of a historical kind to use

for his authorities (Luke I 1); and he followed them very closely, not

giving scope to his own method of narration or of grouping. But these

formal works seem all to have ended either with the death or the

ascension of the Saviour; and the most obscure and difficult period for

a historian writing about 80-85 A.D. was the time that immediately

succeeded the death of Jesus. Luke was dependent here on informal

narratives, and on oral tradition; and, if we be right in our view that

he did not live to put the last touches to his work, we may fairly

suppose that the most difficult period was left the least perfect part

of the whole. But we must content ourselves here with this slight

indication of a view that would require much minute argument to state

properly. There is a marked resemblance between I-V and XIX. In both,

episodes that savour of popular fancy stand side by side with Lukan

work of the best kind.

3. APPOINTMENT OF STEPHEN AND THE SEVEN.

The first distinct step in development from the primitive condition of

the Church, when it was a mere small and almost unorganised community,

was due to the pressure of poverty. In Jerusalem very poor Jews were

numerous, and many of them had become Christian. Hence from the

beginning the Church had to contend against a chronic state of want

among its adherents. Probably we are apt to find a more communistic

sense than Luke intended in II 44, IV 32; for II 4, IV 35 indicate

judicious charity, and even the action of Barnabas in IV 37 looks more

like charity than communism: [68] he and others sold their possessions

and gave the money in trust to the Apostles for the good of the Church.

In later years, as the Church spread, the pressure of need in Jerusalem

acted as a bond to unite the scattered congregations in active

ministration (pp. 49 f., 288); and at the beginning it stimulated the

primitive Church to originate a better organisation.

The difficulties in which the Church was placed, which would have

killed a weakly life, only stimulated its vigour and its creative

energy. This creative vitality is to the historian the most interesting

side of the early Church; it was free from dead conservatism; it

combined the most perfect reverence for its earliest form with the most

perfect freedom to adapt that form to new exigencies; it did not stifle

growth on the plea that it must remain exactly as it was. It was

growing so rapidly that it burst through its earliest forms, before

they could acquire any binding force, or fix themselves in the

prejudices of its members. This free untrammeled expansion was the law

of its life, and the Divine reality of its being. In later times, on

the contrary, many of its adherents have maintained that its Divine

life lies in its preserving unchanged from the beginning the form that

was prescribed for it. Thus the view taken in Acts is that the Church's

Divine character lies in the free unceasing growth of its form and

institutions; but the common view of later times has been that its

Divine character lies in the permanence and unchangeability of its form

from the beginning onwards.

At first Luke represents the superintendence and distribution of these

charities as undertaken solely by the Apostles, who soon found that "it

was not meet that they should forsake preaching and perform the

ministration at tables" (VI 2). Moreover, in the pressure of claims and

accumulation of duties, complaint was made that the widows among the

Hellenist Jews were neglected in favour of the native Hebrews. It was

therefore arranged that a new class of officers should be

instituted,--for whom no name is here given, but who were the origin

out of which the "Deacons" of the developed Church arose.

It is a remarkable fact that the Elders are not mentioned here; and

this is one of the points which show Luke's want of proper authorities

about the primitive Church. When we come to a period, where his

information was good, we find the Elders prominent, and specially in

practical business matters (pp. 52, 166, 171); and there can be no

doubt that this characteristic Jewish institution existed as a matter

of course in the primitive Church. The superintendence of relief

measures was recognised as peculiarly their province (XI 30). It seems

clear that in the memory of tradition the Apostles had survived alone

as being the far more prominent figures, while the first Elders had

been almost forgotten.

The new officers are here termed simply "Seven Men in charge of this

duty" (i.e., septem viri mensis ordinandis). It would be easy to find

Jewish analogies that would explain the original idea; but it would not

be easy to find any Jewish analogy to explain the vitality and

adaptability of the institution. We must turn to Roman organising

methods to find anything that will explain the importance and lasting

effect of this step. Roman ideas were in the air; and the vigorous life

of the Church was shown in its power of seizing and adapting to its own

purposes all that was strong and serviceable in the world. It suited

itself to its surroundings, and used the existing political facts and

ideas, "learning from the surrounding world everything that was

valuable in it" (p. 149).

The Seven who were appointed bear purely Greek names; and one was not a

Jew, but a proselyte of Antioch. There can, therefore, be no doubt that

a distinct step towards the Universalised Church was here made; it was

already recognised that the Church was wider than the pure Jewish race;

and the non-Jewish element was raised to official rank. Nikolaos was a

proselyte of the higher and completer type (p. 43); and his case was

therefore quite different in character from that of Cornelius (p. 42

f.), who was only God-fearing. In the conferring of office on Nikolaos

a distinct step was made; but it was quite in accordance with the

principle of the extreme Judaistic party in the Church (p. 157). The

case of Cornelius was a second and more serious step.

The consequences of this first step in advance were soon apparent. The

wider sympathies and wider outlook of Hellenistic Jews quickened the

life of the young community; and Stephen, especially, was conspicuous

for the boldness with which he advocated the faith and opposed the

narrowness of Judaism, saying, as his accusers alleged, "that this

Jesus or Nazareth shall destroy this place, and shall change the

customs which Moses delivered unto us ". Even though this is a

perversion of Stephen's meaning, yet the form implies that Stephen had

advanced beyond the previous position of the Apostles as regards their

relation to Judaism.

The critical point in chronology is to determine the date or Stephen's

accusation and martyrdom. Luke gives us no clear evidence as to the

length of the two periods that he describes, viz., (1) between

Pentecost and the election of the Seven, (2) between the election and

the death of Stephen. The latest date which our view leaves open is

A.D. 33, for Paul's conversion followed shortly after Stephen's death,

and in the fourteenth year after his conversion he visited Jerusalem

for the second time, probably in 46 (though 45 is not absolutely

excluded, pp. 51, 68). Can we suppose that the necessity for the

admission of the Hellenistic Jews to official rank was felt already in

A.D. 32, and that Stephen's brief career ended in 33? The space of two

years has seemed sufficient to many scholars; some have been content

with one. The difficulties which the primitive Church had to meet by

appointing the Seven faced it from the first; and that step was

probably forced on it very soon. The wider spirit shown in the

selection of the Seven was likely to cause an early collision with

Jewish jealousy; and the party which had cut off Jesus was not likely

to suffer His followers to increase so rapidly without an effort to

stop the movement. Now the persecution that caused and followed

Stephen's death was the first attempt at coercion; the actions

described in IV 5 f. and V 17 f. were mere warnings and threats, which

naturally resulted soon in active measures. We cannot easily believe

that repressive measures were delayed more than two or three years at

the utmost; we should rather have expected them even sooner. It is

therefore quite fair to date Stephen's death about two and a half or

three years after the great Pentecost.

4. PHILIP THE EVANGELIST AND PETER.

After the death of Stephen, the history widens, and several threads

appear in it. The foundation of a series of Churches over Judea and

Samaria is first described; and the author's attention is directed

chiefly on three steps in the progress towards the Universalised

Church, the foundation of an extra-Judean Church in the city of

Samaria, and the admission of an Ethiopian [69] and of a Roman

centurion as Christians. These steps are connected with the names of

Philip and Peter. The institution of a series of Churches in Palestine,

a process which must have occupied a long time, is briefly but clearly

indicated in VIII 40, IX 31-35, 42f; but Luke's personal interest in

the expansion of a still purely Judaic Church was not great. Yet the

episodes of �neas and Dorcas, IX 33-42, show that, though the details

seemed to Luke not required for his purpose, the spread of the Church

over Palestine was conceived by him as an important step in history.

These episodes are introduced, because they proved that the Divine

power worked in the process whereby the Church of Jerusalem expanded

into the Church of all Palestine. In the utter absence of statement as

to Luke's authority for the two episodes, they cannot be placed by the

historian on a higher level than general belief. It is remarkable that

we have no knowledge whether Luke ever met Peter. The want of any

reference to Peter in XXI 18 must, in our view, be taken as a proof

that he was not in Jerusalem at the time.

In the midst of the narrative describing this expansion is interposed

an account of Saul's life during the three years 33-5; [70] and this

arrangement is obviously intended to bring out the long period over

which that process of expansion was spread. According to our theory it

continued from A.D. 33 until it was checked to some extent by the

development of the Pauline idea and the jealousy roused thereby among

almost all Jews except the great and leading minds, which were able to

rise more or less completely above it. Then came the supreme

catastrophe of the great war, the destruction of Jerusalem, and the

suppression of "the Nation" of the Jews.

The expansion of the Church beyond Palestine is first alluded to in XI

19, where the dispersion of missionaries over Phoenice, Cyprus, and

Syria is mentioned (Ch. III, � 1). It is remarkable that Luke never

alludes to the development of the Church towards the south or east. Yet

the dispersion that followed Stephen's death must have radiated in all

directions; and II 7-11, and VIII 27 f., lead naturally to some general

spread of the new teaching in all directions. It is obvious that Luke

has not made it his object to write the history of the whole expansion

of the Church; but selected the facts that bore on a narrower theme,

viz., the steps by which the Church of Jerusalem grew into the Church

of the Empire, and the position of the Church in the Empire. Egypt,

Ethiopia, and the East and South are therefore excluded from his

narrative.

5. PAUL IN JUDEA AND ARABIA.

The introduction of Paul is connected with the death of Stephen: he was

then a young man, and probably was entering for the first time on

public life. At this point the subjective touch in VIII 1, "Saul was

consenting unto his death," is a clear indication that Luke's authority

was Paul himself. The phrase is a confession of inward feeling, not a

historian's account of action; and the words are Paul's own (XXII 20).

A dramatic touch like this is, on our theory, deliberately calculated.

Luke intends to set before his readers the scene at C�sareia, where

Philip narrated the story of Stephen and of his own early work, and

Paul interposed the agonised confession of VIII 1 The narrative from VI

9 to VIII 39 probably reproduces Philip's words very closely; while

Luke has inserted touches, as VII 58, VIII 1, and adapted the whole to

his plan. [71]

The slight variations in the three accounts of Paul's conversion do not

seem to be of any consequence. Luke did not seek to modify Paul's

speeches in order to produce verbal conformity with the account which

seemed to him to represent the facts fairly; but the spirit and tone

and the essential facts are the same, IX 3-18, XXII 6-16, XXVI 12-18.

Two difficulties, however, deserve notice in the account of Paul's

conduct during the first years after his conversion. In the first

place, why does Luke say nothing about Paul's journey into Arabia? But

we have no authority for believing that the journey was of such

importance as to require a place in this history, for Luke does not

enumerate all the influences that moulded Paul's development. Paul's

reference to the incident (Gal. I 17) is clear and complete in itself,

if it was not a serious journey, but a small episode in his private

life. "When it pleased God to call me to the work of my life, so far

was I from needing counsel or instruction from Jerusalem, that I

retired into Arabia, and came back again to Damascus." Damascus was at

the time subject to the King of Arabia Petr�a; and the natural

interpretation is that a person describing incidents of his experience

in Damascus means by Arabia the adjacent country on the east. Had this

excursion been an important step in the development of Paul's thought

(as Lightfoot inclines to think, when he sees in it a sojourn on Mount

Sinai after the style of Moses), Luke might be expected to mention it

and show how much underlies Paul's words; but, as he does not mention

it, the fair inference is that there was no more in it than Paul says

explicitly.

Moreover, Luke divides Paul's stay in Damascus into two periods, a few

days residence with the disciples IX 19, and a long period of preaching

20-23. The quiet residence in the country for a time, recovering from

the serious and prostrating effect of his conversion (for a man's life

is not suddenly reversed without serious claim on his physical power),

is the dividing fact between the two periods. The division is certainly

very awkwardly and insufficiently indicated; but Luke everywhere shows

similar weakness in indicating the temporal relations of events.

In the second place, the accounts of Paul's first visit to Jerusalem,

in the third year after his conversion, are obscure. In Gal. I 18 f.

Paul says he went up to see Peter (evidently regarding him as the

leading spirit in the development of the Church), and saw no other

Apostle, except James the Lord's brother. But in Acts IX 28 f. "he was

with the Apostles going in and going out at Jerusalem, preaching boldly

in the name of the Lord. And he spake and disputed against the Grecian

Jews; but they went about to kill him." In weighing this account we

must bear in mind Luke's intention: he conceived the Apostles as the

permanent governing body in Jerusalem (p. 53), and they dwarfed in his

estimation any other administrative body in the primitive Church (p.

374). Here, therefore, he speaks loosely of "the Apostles," meaning the

governing body of the Church, without implying that they were all

present in Jerusalem. It was one of his objects to insist on the

agreement between Paul and the leaders of the Church; and he distinctly

had, and communicates, the impression that the opposition of the

extreme Judaistic party to Paul was factious, and was condemned by the

leaders. It therefore seemed important to him to emphasise the harmony

between Paul and the Jewish leaders at this first visit; and, though

most of the Apostles were absent, yet the two real leaders were

present. We certainly should not naturally infer from Luke's words that

the visit lasted only fifteen days; but there is no real difficulty in

supposing that Paul's life was at this time in danger from the first.

He had deserted his former friends, and they would feel towards him the

hatred that always pursues a deserter.

On the other hand, XXVI 20 is distinctly in contradiction with all

other authorities; but, as Dr. Blass points out, the Greek is

solecistic, and his altered reading, "in every land to both Jews and

Gentiles," seems to me to carry conviction with it. [72]

The difficulty with regard to the interval between Paul's first and

second visit to Jerusalem (which we consider to have been only eleven

years, whereas many take it as fourteen, Gal. II 1) disappears when we

take the Greek in its real sense. Paul says to the Galatians, "Then, in

the third year, [73] I went up to Jerusalem... then, when the

fourteenth year was ending ". The two reckonings go together, and are

estimated from the same starting-point.

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

[67] Thus the particle men oun, so common in Acts, occurs only once in

the Third Gospel, in a passage peculiar to Luke III 18. In XXII 56 he

added the little touch atenisasa to the narrative as used by Matthew

and Mark, see p. 39.

[68] The story of Ananias points more to communism. Yet even here

Peter's speech regards the act of a purely voluntary one, though V 2

seems to represent it a duty.

[69] He was evidently a proselyte (VIII 27), like Nikolaos.

[70] We shall speak of 33 as the date of Stephen's death and Paul's

conversion, acknowledging, however, that perhaps 32 is the proper year.

[71] The enumeration of synagogues in VI 9, which does not agree with

Luke's manner, was perhaps noted down verbatim (Expositor, July 1895,

p. 35).

[72] pasan te ten choran tes Ioudaias is not Lukan, and hardly Greek,

read eis pasan choran Ioudaiois te.

[73] "After three years" misrepresents the meaning.

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

CHAPTER XVII.

COMPOSITION AND DATE OF ACTS.

1. HYPOTHESIS OF "THE TRAVEL DOCUMENT".

We have seen that Luke represents himself as having been an eye-witness

of some of the incidents which he describes; and we have inferred, from

the pointed way in which he does this, that he was not an eye-witness

of the rest. In the parts where he had no personal knowledge his

trustworthiness depends on his authority in each case. In a former work

I have tried to show that there lies behind the narrative of Paul's

journeys a document originating "from a person acquainted with the

actual circumstances," and therefore "composed under St. Paul's own

influence". I was careful "to express his influence in the most general

terms, and to avoid any theorising about the way in which it was

exercised"; and I purposely left the question untouched whether the

"Travel-Document" was composed by the author of Acts or by a different

person; for my object then was to show that the document was a

trustworthy record of facts, to avoid constructing a system, to

investigate each fact independently on its own evidence, and to give no

opening to the criticism that I was twisting the evidence at any point

in order to suit an idea derived from elsewhere.

In the present work the reasons on which the supposition of a

"Travel-Document" was rounded are much strengthened; and we must now

put the question in a more precise form. What is the relation between

the "Travel-Document" and the completed text of Acts? To this the

answer must be that the "Travel Document" was Luke's own written notes

(supplemented by memory, and the education of further experience and

reading and research). His diary, where he was an eye-witness, and his

notes of conversation with Paul, and doubtless others also, were worked

into the book of Acts suitably to the carefully arranged plan on which

it is constructed. We have found traces of deep and strong emotion

which must be understood as Paul's own feeling: the technical term for

making a missionary progress through a district [74] is used only by

Paul (I Cor. XVI 5) and by Luke in describing Paul's work; [75] while

in describing the precisely similar work of other missionaries, he uses

a different and a more usual Greek construction. [76] This line of

investigation might be carried much further so as to show that Luke

everywhere follows with minute care the best authority accessible to

him; and in Acts especially Paul and Philip. As we have seen, Ch. XVI,

� 2, the period in which he found greatest difficulty was that which

intervened between the conclusion of his formal historical authorities

for the life of the Saviour, and the beginning of the careful

narratives which he had noted down from Paul and Philip about their own

personal experiences.

One episode, which bears all the marks of vivid personal witness, comes

under neither of these categories, viz., the story of Peter's

imprisonment and escape, XII. Here some other authority was used; and

the narrative suggests distinctly that the authority was not Peter

himself, but one of those in the house of Mary. John Mark, who is

pointedly mentioned as being in Jerusalem, XII 25, and who was

afterwards with Luke and Paul in Rome, was almost certainly (v. 12) the

ultimate authority here.

Luke added to these authorities an obvious acquaintance with Paul's own

letters. He rarely states anything that is recorded in them; he assumes

them as known; and he makes it one of his objects to set them in a

clearer light.

The whole of his materials he used with the true historical sense for

the comparative importance of events and for the critical steps in a

great movement, and also with a wide and careful study of the general

history of the contemporary world (i.e., the Roman Empire). The

research which Luke applied in the execution of his work is shown with

especial clearness in the chronological calculations which he

introduced in Book I (similar to those which he would probably have

added in Book II, see p. 23). These calculations deserve fresh study

with a view to estimate the work which the author has compressed into

them. The accuracy of one of them (viz., the statement about Philip in

Luke III 1) I have defended elsewhere, and, as I believe, on grounds

which would carry conviction to every one, were it not that they are

inconsistent with the dominant North-Galatian theory. Again the census

(Luke II 1) under Quirinius is pointedly called the first, implying

that it was the first of a series of census. A census is known to have

been made in Syria by Quirinius in his second government, about 6 A.D.,

which suggests that they were perhaps decennial. We have no other

evidence as to a census in 5-4 B.C.; but when we consider how purely

accidental is the evidence [77] for the second census, the want of

evidence for the first seems to constitute no argument against the

trustworthiness of Luke's statement. It is certain that the dependent

kingdoms paid tribute to Rome exactly as if they had been part of the

Empire; and it is in perfect accord with the methodical character of

Augustus's administration that he should order such census to be made

regularly throughout "the whole world". Incidentally we observe in this

phrase that Luke's view is absolutely confined to the Roman Empire,

which to him is "the world". Luke investigated the history of this

series of census.

2. DATE OF THE COMPOSITION OF ACTS.

The elaborate series of synchronisms by which Luke dates the coming of

John the Baptist are especially remarkable; and it is to them we turn

for evidence as to the date of composition. On our view the Crucifixion

took place at the Passover of A.D. 30, the fourth Passover in the

public career of Jesus. Now John was six months older than Jesus; and

his career began in his thirtieth year, a little before the coming of

Jesus. Thus we reach the conclusion that the synchronisms of Luke III

1, 2, are calculated for the summer (say July) of A.D. 26; and he calls

this year the fifteenth of the reign of Tiberius, implying that he

reckoned his reign to begin A.D. 12, when Tiberius was associated by

Augustus in the Empire. But such a method of reckoning the reign of

Tiberius was unknown. According to Roman reckoning, Tiberius, in July

A.D. 26, was either in his twelfth year (reckoning from the death of

his predecessor) or in his twenty-eighth year (reckoning his tenure of

the tribunician power). No other way of reckoning his reign was ever

employed by Romans. How then could Luke speak of his fifteenth year?

There can hardly be any other reason than that the calculation was made

under an Emperor whose years were reckoned from his association as

colleague; so that Luke, being familiar with that method, applied it to

the case of Tiberius. Now that was the case with Titus. His reign began

from his association with his father on 1st July A.D. 71.

We thus get a clue, though in itself an uncertain one, to suggest the

date when Luke was at work. His chronological calculations were

probably inserted as the finishing touches of Book I (p. 23), while

Titus was reigning as sole Emperor, 79-81 A.D.; and the composition of

that book belongs to the years immediately preceding, while the

composition of Book II belongs to the years immediately following. This

argument, taken by itself, would be insufficient; but it is confirmed

by the impression which the book as a whole makes. Acts could not have

been written so late as Trajan, when long persecution had altered the

tone and feeling of the Church towards the State. It is the work of a

man whose mind has been moulded in a more peaceful time. and who has

not passed through a time like the reign of Domitian (p. 22). On the

other hand, its tone is not that of assured conviction about the

relation to the State, such as we observe in Paul's Epistles. It is the

tone of one who seeks to prove a position that is doubtful and

assailed, but still of one who believes that it may be proved. As we

have seen, there runs through the entire work a purpose which could

hardly have been conceived before the State had begun to persecute on

political grounds. So long as Christians were proceeded against merely

on the ground of crimes, which the accuser sought to prove by evidence

(as was the case with Paul, p. 360), there was no necessity to

establish that Christianity was legal. Defence then consisted in

disproving the specific crimes charged against the individual

Christian; but, after the Flavian policy had declared Christianity

illegal and proscribed the Name, the first necessity for defence was to

claim legal right.

3. THEOPHILUS.

It has an important bearing on Luke's attitude towards the Roman State

that his work is addressed to a Roman officer, [78] who had become a

Christian. We may safely say that in the first century a Roman official

would hardly bear the name Theophilus; and therefore it must be a name

given to him at baptism, and used or known only among the Christians.

The fact that his public name is avoided, and only the baptismal name

used, favours the supposition (though not absolutely demanding it) that

it was dangerous for a Roman of rank to be recognised as a Christian.

In the narrative of Acts there is not the slightest trace of private or

baptismal names. These seem to have been adopted under the pressure of

necessity and from the desire for concealment. Thus the very dedication

of the work points to a developed state of the relations between Church

and State, and carries us down to the time of Domitian.

4. THE FAMILY OF LUKE.

We have made it an object to collect the scanty traces of Luke's

personality that remain in Acts; and we may therefore conclude our task

by referring to the tradition about his birthplace. The later

tradition, as it appears in Jerome, Euthalius, etc., declares that Luke

was an Antiochian, [79] but it is practically certain that the

authority for all the later statements is Eusebius. Eusebius, however,

does not say that Luke was an Antiochian; he merely speaks of him as

"being according to birth of those from Antioch". [80] This curious and

awkward expression is obviously chosen in order to avoid the statement

that Luke was an Antiochian; and it amounts to an assertion that Luke

was not an Antiochian, but belonged to a family that had a connection

with Antioch. Eusebius therefore had access to a more detailed and

distinct tradition, which he reproduces in this brief form. The older

tradition must have told that Luke had a family connection with

Antioch; and Eusebius carefully restricts himself to that statement;

but the tradition probably set forth the exact connection, and it is

perhaps allowable to conclude our study with a conjecture.

Antioch, as a Seleucid foundation, had almost certainly a Macedonian

element in its population. It is now well established that the military

strength of the Seleucid colonies lay usually in a contingent of

Macedonians; and a considerable number of Seleucid cities style

themselves Macedones on coins or inscriptions. It is quite probable

that intercourse and connection may have been maintained between the

Macedonian element in Antioch and their original home; and migrations

to and fro are likely to have occurred between Macedonia and Antioch in

the constant and easy intercourse of the centuries following the

foundation. Thus it may very well have happened that Luke was a

relative of one of the early Antiochian Christians; and this

relationship was perhaps the authority for Eusebius's carefully guarded

statement. Further, it is possible that this relationship gives the

explanation of the omission of Titus from Acts, an omission which every

one finds it so difficult [81] to understand. Perhaps Titus was the

relative of Luke; and Eusebius found this statement in an old

tradition, attached to II Cor. VIII 18, XII 18, where Titus and Luke

(the latter not named by Paul, but identified by an early tradition)

are associated as envoys to Corinth. Luke, as we may suppose, thought

it right to omit his relative's name, as he did his own name, from his

history. There is not sufficient evidence to justify an opinion; but

this conjecture brings together an enigmatic expression in Eusebius and

a serious difficulty in Acts, and finds in each a satisfactory solution

of the other.

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

[74] Itinerating is the modern equivalent, I am told.

[75] XIII 6, XIV 24, XV 3, 41, XVI 6, XVIII 23, XIX 1, 21, XX 2.

[76] VIII 4, 40, XI 19, IX 32, Luke IX 6.

[77] An inscription found in Venice is the sole authority. As the stone

was lost, the inscription was pronounced a forgery, apparently for no

reason except that it mentioned Quirinius's census. Even Mommsen

refused to admit it as genuine, until, fortunately, part of the stone

was rediscovered.

[78] The epithet kratistos is technical and distinctive, and not a mere

usitata appellatio hominum dignitate proestantium as even Blass takes

it, on Acts XXIII 26. Luke uses it strictly here and in XXIV 3, XXVI

25, implying equestrian rank. Some Greeks were not so accurate as Luke.

[79] Antiocheus gar outos huparchon to genos, Euthalius in Migne, Patr.

Gr. vol. 85, p 85, p. 633. Lucas medicus Antiochensis Jerome, Vir. Ill.

[80] Loukas de to men genos on ton ap Antiocheias, Hist. Eccles. III 4.

[81] We cannot agree with Lightfoot, who solves the difficulty by

denying that Titus was important enough to deserve mention in Acts

(Biblical Essays, p. 281).

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

III. CHRONOLOGICAL INDEX TO THE LIFE OF ST. PAUL

Entrance on public life (in his thirtieth year); see Preface, Ed. II.

A.D. 30 or 31

Events culminating in the death of Stephen pp. 363-376 30-33

Journey to Damascus and Conversion 376, 378 note (year ending 2nd

Sept.) 33

Retirement into Arabia 380 34

First visit to Jerusalem 381 35

Residence in Tarsus, etc. 46 35-43

Barnabas brings Saul to Antioch 45 43

The Prophecy of Agabus 49 early in 44

The famine in Jerusalem begins with failure of harvest 49-54, 68 45

Second visit to Jerusalem 55-62 winter 45-46

Return to Antioch 62-64 winter 46-47

First journey ordered 64-67 not later than Passover, 29th March, 47

In Cyprus 70-88 (Church p. 60 f.) till July 47

In Pamphylia 89-97 (Church 16-18, 61-65) July 47

In Pisidian Antioch 98-107 (Church 25-27, 66-68) till winter of 47

In Iconium (Church 36-46, 68) till summer 48

In Lystra 110-119, 128 (Church 47-54, 68 f.) till autumn 48

In Derbe 120 (Church 54-55, 59) winter 48-49

Return by stages through Lystra, Iconium, Antioch, and across Pisidia

120-123 (Church 70-73)

Feb.-May 49

Short stay in Perga 124 (Church 72) June-July 49

Return by Attalia to Syrian Antioch 125 August 49

Third visit to Jerusalem: the Council 153-174 winter 49-50

Second journey begins 176 after the Feast, 25th March to 1st April 50

In Galatia 178-189 summer 50

Across Asia to Troas 194-212, 225 f. about Oct. 50

In Philippi 213-226, 235 till about Dec. 50

In Thessalonica 227-231, 235 f. Dec. 50-May 51

In Berea 232-234 May-July 51

In Athens 234, 237-252, 260 f. August 51

In Corinth 252-261, 264 Sept. 51 to March 53

Arrival of Gallio 258 f. July 52

Fourth visit to Jerusalem 263-266 at the Feast, 22nd-29th March 53

Short visit to Syrian Antioch: epistle to Galatians 265, 184-192 May 53

Third Journey begins 265 about June 53

In Galatia 265 July and August 53

In Ephesus, 265. 269-282 Oct. 53 to Jan. 56

Wrote first Epistle to Corinthians 275 about Oct. 55

In Troas 283 Feb. 56

In Macedonia 286 till late autumn 56

Wrote second Epistle to Corinthians 286 summer 56

In Achaia three months 285 Dec. 56 to Feb. 57

Journey to Philippi 287 March 57

Start from Philippi for Troas on the way to Jerusalem 289 15th April 57

Fifth visit to Jerusalem: arrival 295 (day before) Pentecost, 28th May

57

Imprisonment in Palestine June 57 to July 59

Voyage to Rome 314-345 August 59 to Feb. 60

In Rome 346-360 until end of 61

Epistles to Colossians and Philemon 349 early in 61

Epistle to Philippians 357 late in 61

Trial and acquittal 356-360 end of 61

Later travels 360 62-66

Second trial 300-362 67
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