The Letters to the Seven Churches of Asia

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

Title: The Letters to the Seven Churches of Asia

Creator(s): Ramsay, W. M.

CCEL Subjects:

LC Call no: BS2825.R33

LC Subjects:

The Bible

New Testament

Special parts of the New Testament

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

The Letters to the Seven Churches of Asia

And their place in the plan of the Apocalypse

W. M. Ramsay, D.C.L., Litt.D., LL.D.

Professor of Humanity in the University of Aberdeen

1904

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

Preface

In the contact of East and West originates the movement of history. The

historical position of Christianity cannot be rightly understood except

in its relation to this immemorial meeting and conflict. The present

book is based on the view that Christianity is the religion which

associates East and West in a higher range of thought than either can

reach alone, and tends to substitute a peaceful union for the war into

which the essential difference of Asiatic and European character too

often leads the two continents. So profound is the difference, that in

their meeting either war must result, or each of them must modify

itself. There is no power except religion strong enough to modify both

sufficiently to make a peaceful union possible; and there is no

religion but Christianity which is wholly penetrated both with the

European and with the Asiatic spirit--so penetrated that many are

sensitive only to one or the other.

Only a divine origin is competent to explain the perfect union of

Eastern and Western thought in this religion. It adapted itself in the

earliest stages of its growth to the great Graeco-Asiatic cities with

their mixed population and social system, to Rome, not as the Latin

city, but as the capital of the Greek-speaking world, and to Corinth as

the halting-place between Greek Asia and its capital. Several chapters

of the present book are devoted to an account of the motley peoples and

manners of those cities. The adaptation of Christianity to the double

nationality can be best seen in the Apocalypse, because there the two

elements which unite in Christianity are less perfectly reconciled than

in any other book of the New Testament. The Judaic element in the

Apocalypse has been hitherto studied to the entire neglect of the Greek

element in it. Hence it has been the most misunderstood book in the New

Testament.

The collision of East and West throughout history has been a subject of

special interest to the present writer from early youth; and he has

watched for more than twenty-five years the recent revival of the

Asiatic spirit, often from a very close point of view. In 1897, in a

book entitled Impressions of Turkey, he tried to analyse and describe,

as he had seen it, "the great historic movement" through which

"Mohammedanism and Orientalism have gathered fresh strength to defy the

feeling of Europe." It is now becoming plain to all that the relation

of Asia to Europe is in process of being profoundly changed; and very

soon this will be a matter of general discussion. The long-unquestioned

domination of European over Asiatic is now being put to the test, and

is probably coming to an end. What is to be the issue? That depends

entirely on the influence of Christianity, and on the degree to which

it has affected the aims both of Christian and of non-Christian

nations: there are cases in which it has affected the latter almost

more than the former. The ignorant European fancies that progress for

the East lies in Europeanising it. The ordinary traveller in the East

can tell that it is as impossible to Europeanise the Asiatic as it is

to make an Asiatic out of a European; but he has not learned that there

is a higher plane on which Asia and Europe may "mix and meet." That

plane was once in an imperfect degree reached in the Graeco-Asiatic

cities, whose creative influence in the formation of Roman and modern

society is beginning to be recognised by some of the latest historical

students, and the new stage towards which Christianity is moving, and

in which it will be better understood than it has been by purely

European thought, will be a synthesis of European and Asiatic nature

and ideas.

This book is a very imperfect essay towards the understanding of that

synthesis, which now lies before us as a possibility of the immediate

future. How imperfect it is has become clearer to the writer as in the

writing of it he came to comprehend better the nature of the

Apocalypse.

The illustrations are intended to be steps in the argument. The

Apocalypse reads the history and the fate of the Churches in the

natural features, the relations of earth and sea, winds and mountains,

which affected the cities; this study distinguishes some of those

influences; and the Plates furnish the evidence that the natural

features are not misapprehended in the study.

The Figures in the text are intended as examples of the symbolism that

was in ordinary use in the Greek world; the Apocalypse is penetrated

with this way of expressing thought to the eye; and its symbolic

language is not to be explained from Jewish models only (as is

frequently done). It was written to be understood by the Graeco-Asiatic

public; and the Figures prove that it was natural and easy for those

readers to understand the symbolism. Most of the subjects are taken

from coins of the Imperial period; and hearty thanks are due to Mr.

Head of the British Museum for casts from originals under his care. If

the style of the coins were the subject of study, photographic

reproductions would be required. But what we are here interested in is

the method of expressing ideas by visible forms; and a line drawing,

which brings out the essential facts, is more useful for our purpose.

Examples are very numerous, and this small selection gives rather the

first that came to hand than the best that might be chosen.

Thanks are due to Miss A. Margaret Ramsay for drawing twenty-two of the

Figures, to Miss Mary Ramsay for two, and to Mr. John Hay for twelve.

In several cases it is pointed out that the spirit which is revealed in

the natural features of the city was recognised in ancient times, being

expressed by orators in counselling or flattering the citizens, and

becoming a commonplace in popular talk. It is right to point out that

in every case the impressions, gained first of all immediately from

scenery, were afterwards detected in the ancient writers (who usually

express them in obscure and elaborately rhetorical style).

The writing of a series of geographical articles in Dr. Hastings'

Dictionary of the Bible greatly facilitated the preparation of the

present book, though the writer has learned much since, often as a

result of writing those articles.

It has not been part of the writer's purpose to describe the Seven

Cities as they are at the present day. That was done in a series of

articles by Mrs. Ramsay in the British Monthly, November, 1901, to May,

1902, better than he could do it. He has in several places used ideas

and illustrations expressed in the articles, and some of the

photographs which were used in them are here reproduced afresh.

W. M RAMSAY
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Chapter 1: Writing, Travel, and Letters Among the Early Christians

Many writers on many occasions have perceived and described the

important part which intercommunication between the widely separated

congregations of early Christians, whether by travel or by letter,

played in determining the organisation and cementing the unity of the

Universal Church. Yet perhaps all has not been said that ought to be

said on the subject. The marvellous skill and mastery, with which all

the resources of the existing civilisation were turned to their own

purposes by St. Paul and by the Christians generally, may well detain

our attention for a brief space.

Travelling and correspondence by letter are mutually dependent. Letters

are unnecessary until travelling begins: much of the usefulness and

profit of travelling depends on the possibility of communication

between those who are separated from one another. Except in the

simplest forms, commerce and negotiation between different nations,

which are among the chief incentives to travelling in early times,

cannot be carried out without some method of registering thoughts and

information, so as to be understood by persons at a distance.

Hence communication by letter has been commonly practised from an

extremely remote antiquity. The knowledge of and readiness in writing

leads to correspondence between friends who are not within speaking

distance of one another, as inevitably as the possession of articulate

speech produces conversation and discussion. In order to fix the period

when epistolary correspondence first began, it would be necessary to

discover at what period the art of writing became common. Now the

progress of discovery in recent years has revolutionised opinion on

this subject. The old views, which we all used to assume as

self-evident, that writing was invented at a comparatively late period

in human history, that it was long known only to a few persons, and

that it was practised even by them only slowly and with difficulty on

some special occasions and for some peculiarly important purposes, are

found to be utterly erroneous. No one who possesses any knowledge of

early history would now venture to make any positive assertion as to

the date when writing was invented, or when it began to be widely used

in the Mediterranean lands. The progress of discovery reveals the

existence of various systems of writing at a remote period, and shows

that they were familiarly used for the ordinary purposes of life and

administration, and were not reserved, as scholars used to believe, for

certain sacred purposes of religion and ritual.

The discovery that writing was familiarly used in early time has an

important bearing on the early literature of the Mediterranean peoples.

For example, no scholar would now employ the argument that the

composition of the Iliad and the Odyssey must belong to a comparatively

late day, because such great continuous poems could not come into

existence without the ready use of writing--an argument which formerly

seemed to tell strongly against the early date assigned by tradition

for their origin. The scholars who championed the traditional date of

those great works used to answer that argument by attempting to prove

that they were composed and preserved by memory alone without the aid

of writing. The attempt could not be successful. The scholar in his

study, accustomed to deal with words and not with realities, might

persuade himself that by this ingenious verbal reasoning he had got rid

of the difficulty; but those who could not blind themselves to the

facts of the world felt that the improbability still remained, and

acquiesced in this reasoning only as the least among a choice of evils.

The progress of discovery has placed the problem in an entirely new

light. The difficulty originated in our ignorance. The art of writing

was indeed required as an element in the complex social platform on

which the Homeric poems were built up; but no doubt can now be

entertained that writing was known and familiarly practised in the East

Mediterranean lands long before the date to which Greek tradition

assigned the composition of the two great poems.

A similar argument was formerly used by older scholars to prove that

the Hebrew literature belonged to a later period than the Hebrew

tradition allowed; but the more recent scholars who advocate the late

date of that literature would no longer allow such reasoning, and

frankly admit that their views must be supported on other grounds;

though it may be doubted whether they have abandoned as thoroughly as

they profess the old prejudice in favour of a late date for any long

literary composition, or have fully realised how readily and familiarly

writing was used in extremely remote time, together with all that is

implied by that familiar use. The prejudice still exists, and it

affects the study of both Hebrew and Christian literature.

In the first place, there is a general feeling that it is more prudent

to bring down the composition of any ancient work to the latest date

that evidence permits. But this feeling rests ultimately on the fixed

idea that people have gradually become more familiar with the art of

writing as the world grows older, and that the composition of a work of

literature should not, without distinct and conclusive proof, be

attributed to an early period.

In the second place, there is also a very strong body of opinion that

the earliest Christians wrote little or nothing. It is supposed that

partly they were either unable to write, or at least unused to the

familiar employment of writing for the purposes of ordinary life;

partly they were so entirely taken up with the idea of the immediate

coming of the Lord that they never thought it necessary to record for

future generations the circumstances of the life and death of Jesus,

until lapse of long years on the one hand had shown that the Lord's

coming was not to be expected immediately, and that for the use of the

already large Church some record was required of those events round

which its faith and hope centred, while on the other hand it had

obscured the memory and disturbed the true tradition of those important

facts. This opinion also rests on and derives all its influence from

the same inveterate prejudice that, at the period in question, writing

was still something great and solemn, and that it was used, not in the

ordinary course of human everyday life and experience, but only for

some grave purpose of legislation, government, or religion,

intentionally registering certain weighty principles or important

events for the benefit of future generations. Put aside that prejudice,

and the whole body of opinion which maintains that the Christians at

first did not set anything down in writing about the life and death of

Christ--strong and widely accepted as it is, dominating as a

fundamental premise much of the discussion of this whole subject in

recent times--is devoid of any support.

But most discussions with regard to the origin, force, and spirit of

the New Testament are founded on certain postulates and certain initial

presumptions, which already contain implicit the whole train of

reasoning that follows, and which in fact beg the whole question at

starting. If those postulates are true, or if they are granted by the

reader, then the whole series of conclusions follows with unerring and

impressive logical sequence. All the more necessary, then, is it to

examine very carefully the character of such postulates, and to test

whether they are really true about that distant period, or are only

modern fallacies springing from the mistaken views about ancient

history that were widely accepted in the eighteenth and most part of

the nineteenth century.

One of those initial presumptions, plausible in appearance and almost

universally assumed and conceded, is that there was no early

registration of the great events in the beginning of Christian history.

This presumption we must set aside as a mere prejudice, contrary to the

whole character and spirit of that age, and entirely improbable;

though, of course, decisive disproof of it is no longer possible, for

the only definite and complete disproof would be the production of the

original documents in which the facts were recorded at the moment by

contemporaries. But so much may be said at once, summing up in a

sentence the result which arises from what is stated in the following

pages. So far as antecedent probability goes, founded on the general

character of preceding and contemporary Greek or Graeco-Asiatic

society, the first Christian account of the circumstances connected

with the death of Jesus must be presumed to have been written in the

year when Jesus died.

But the objection will doubtless be made at once--If that be so, how

can you account for such facts as that Mark says that the Crucifixion

was completed by the third hour of the day (9 a.m., according to our

modern reckoning of time), while John says that the sentence upon Jesus

was only pronounced about the sixth hour, i.e. at noon. The reply is

obvious and unhesitating. The difference dates from the event itself.

Had evidence been collected that night or next morning, the two diverse

opinions would have been observed and recorded, already hopelessly

discrepant and contradictory.

One was the opinion of the ordinary people of that period, unaccustomed

to note the lapse of time or to define it accurately in thought or

speech: such persons loosely indicated the temporal sequence of three

great events, the Crucifixion, the beginning and the end of the

darkness, by assigning them to the three great successive divisions of

the day--the only divisions which they were in the habit of noticing or

mentioning--the third, sixth, and ninth hours. Ordinary witnesses in

that age would have been nonplused, if they had been closely questioned

whether full three hours had elapsed between the Crucifixion and the

beginning of the darkness, and would have regarded such minuteness as

unnecessary pedantry, for they had never been trained by the

circumstances of life to accuracy of thought or language in regard to

the lapse of time. Witnesses of that class are the authority for the

account which is preserved in the three Synoptic Gospels. We observe

that throughout the Gospels of Mark and Luke only the three great

divisions of the day--the third, sixth and ninth hours--are mentioned.

Matthew once mentions the eleventh hour (20:9); but there his

expression does not show superior accuracy in observation, for he is

merely using a proverbial expression to indicate that the allotted

season had almost elapsed. A very precise record of time is contained

in the Bezan Text of Acts 19:9; "from the fifth to the tenth hour"; but

this is found only in two MSS, and is out of keeping with Luke's

ordinary looseness in respect of time and chronology; and it must

therefore be regarded as an addition made by a second century editor,

who either had access to a correct source of information, or explained

the text in accordance with the regular customs of Graeco-Roman

society.

The other statement, which is contained in the Fourth Gospel, records

the memory of an exceptional man, who through a certain idiosyncrasy

was observant and careful in regard to the lapse of time, who in other

cases noted and recorded accurate divisions of time like the seventh

hour and the tenth hour (John 1:39, 4:16, 4:52). This man, present at

the trial of Jesus, had observed the passage of time, which was

unnoticed by others. The others would have been astonished if any one

had pointed out that noon had almost come before the trial was

finished. He alone marked the sun and estimated the time, with the same

accuracy as made him see and remember that the two disciples came to

the house of Jesus about the tenth hour, that Jesus sat on the well

about the sixth hour, that the fever was said to have left the child

about the seventh hour. All those little details, entirely unimportant

in themselves, were remembered by a man naturally observant of time,

and recorded for not other reason than that he had been present and had

seen or heard.

It is a common error to leave too much out of count the change that has

been produced on popular thought and accuracy of conception and

expression by the habitual observation of the lapse of time according

to hours and minutes. The ancients had no means of observing precisely

the progress of time. They could as a rule only make a rough guess as

to the hour. There was not even a name for any shorter division of time

than the hour. There were no watches, and only in the rarest and most

exceptional cases were there any public and generally accessible

instruments for noting and making visible the lapse of time during the

day. The sun-dial was necessarily an inconvenient recorder, not easy to

observe. Consequently looseness in regard to the passage of time is

deep-seated in ancient thought and literature, especially Greek. The

Romans, with their superior endowment for practical facts and ordinary

statistics, were more careful, and the effect can be traced in their

literature. The lapse of time hour by hour was often noted publicly in

great Roman households by the sound of a trumpet or some other device,

though the public still regarded this as a rather overstrained

refinement--for why should one be anxious to know how fast one's life

was ebbing away? Such was the usual point of view, as is evident in

Petronius. Occasionally individuals in the Greek-speaking provinces of

the East were more accurate in the observation of time, either owing to

their natural temperament, or because they were more receptive of the

Roman habit of accuracy. On the other hand, the progress of invention

has made almost every one in modern times as careful and accurate about

time as even the exceptionally accurate in ancient times, because we

are all trained from infancy to note the time by minutes, and we suffer

loss or inconvenience occasionally from an error in observation. The

use of the trumpeter after the Roman fashion to proclaim the lapse of

time is said to have been kept up until recently in the old imperial

city of Goslar, where, in accordance with the more minute accuracy

characteristic of modern thought and custom, he sounded every quarter

of an hour.

But it does not follow that, because the ancients were not accustomed

to note the progress of the hours, therefore they were less habituated

to use the art of writing. It is a mere popular fallacy, entirely

unworthy of scholars, to suppose that people became gradually more

familiar with writing and more accustomed to use it habitually in

ordinary life as time progressed and history continued. The contrary is

the case; at a certain period, and to a certain degree, the ancients

were accustomed to use the art familiarly and readily; but at a later

time writing passed out of ordinary use and became restricted to a few

who used it only as a lofty possession for great purposes.

It is worth while to mention one striking example to give emphasis to

the fact that, as the Roman Empire decayed, familiarity with the use of

writing disappeared from society, until it became the almost exclusive

possession of a few persons, who were for the most part connected with

religion. About the beginning of the sixth century before Christ, a

body of mercenary soldiers, Greeks, Carians, etc., marched far away up

the Nile towards Ethiopia and the Sudan in the service of an Egyptian

king. Those hired soldiers of fortune were likely, for the most part,

to belong to the least educated section of Greek society; and, even

where they had learned in childhood to write, the circumstances of

their life were not of a kind likely to make writing a familiar and

ordinary matter to them, or to render its exercise a natural method of

whiling away an idle hour. Yet on the stones and the colossal statues

at Abu Simbel many of them wrote, not merely their name and legal

designation, but also accounts of the expedition on which they were

engaged, with its objects and its progress.

Such was the state of education in a rather humble stratum of Greek

society six centuries before Christ. Let us come down eleven centuries

after Christ, to the time when great armies of Crusaders were marching

across Asia Minor on their way to Palestine. Those armies were led by

the noblest of their peoples, by statesmen, warriors, and great

ecclesiastics. They contained among them persons of all classes,

burning with zeal for a great idea, pilgrims at once and soldiers, with

numerous priests and monks. Yet, so far as I am aware, not one single

written memorial of all those crusading hosts has been found in the

whole country. On a rock beside the lofty castle of Butrentum,

commanding the approach to the great pass of the Cilician Gates--that

narrow gorge which they called the Gate of Judas, because it was the

enemy of their faith and the betrayer of their cause--there are

engraved many memorials of their presence; but none are written; all

are mere marks in the form of crosses.

In that small body of mercenaries who passed by Abu Simbel 600 years

before Christ, there were probably more persons accustomed to use

familiarly the art of writing than in all the hosts of the Crusaders;

for, even to those Crusaders who had learned to write, the art was far

from being familiar, and they were not wont to use it in their ordinary

everyday life, though they might on great occasions. In those 1700

years the Mediterranean world had passed from light to darkness, from

civilisation to barbarism, so far as writing was concerned. Only

recently are we beginning to realise how civilised in some respects was

mankind in that earlier time, and to free ourselves from many unfounded

prejudices and prepossessions about the character of ancient life and

society.

The cumbrousness of the materials on which ancient writing was

inscribed may seem unfavourable to its easy or general use. But it must

be remembered that, except in Egypt, no material that was not of the

most durable character has been or could have been preserved. All

writing-materials more ephemeral than stone, bronze, or terra-cotta,

have inevitably been destroyed by natural causes. Only in Egypt the

extreme dryness of climate and soil has enabled paper to survive. Now

the question must suggest itself whether there is any reason to think

that more ephemeral materials for writing were never used by the

ancient Mediterranean peoples generally. Was Egypt the only country in

which writers used such perishable materials? The question can be

answered only in one way. There can be no doubt that the custom, which

obtained in the Greek lands in the period best known to us, had come

down from remote antiquity: that custom was to make a distinction

between the material on which documents of national interest and public

character were written and that on which mere private documents of

personal or literary interest were written. The former, such as laws,

decrees and other State documents, which were intended to be made as

widely known as possible, were engraved in one or two copies on tablets

of the most imperishable character and preserved or exposed in some

public place: this was the ancient way of attaining the publicity which

in modern time is got by printing large numbers of copies on ephemeral

material. But those public copies were not the only ones made; there is

no doubt that such documents were first of all written on some

perishable material, usually on paper. In the case of private

documents, as a rule, no copies were made except on perishable

materials.

Wills of private persons, indeed, are often found engraved on marble or

other lasting material; these were exposed in the most public manner

over the graves that lined the great highways leading out from the

cities; but wills were quasi-public documents in the classical period,

and had been entirely public documents at an earlier time, according to

their original character as records of a public act affecting the

community and acquiesced in by the whole body.

Similarly, it can hardly be doubted that, in a more ancient period of

Greek society, documents which were only of a private character and of

personal or literary interest were likely to be recorded on more

perishable substances than graver State documents. This view, of

course, can never be definitely and absolutely proved, for the only

complete proof would be the discovery of some of those old private

documents, which in the nature of the case have decayed and

disappeared. But the known facts leave no practical room for doubt.

Paper was in full use in Egypt, as a finished and perfect product, in

the fourth millennium before Christ. In Greece it is incidentally

referred to by Herodotus as in ordinary use during the fifth century

B.C. At what date it began to be used there no evidence exists; but

there is every probability that it had been imported from Egypt for a

long time; and Herodotus says that, before paper came into use on the

Ionian coast, skins of animals were used for writing. On these and

other perishable materials the letters and other commonplace documents

of private persons were written. Mr. Arthur J. Evans has found at

Cnossos in Crete "ink-written inscriptions on vases," as early as 1800

or 2000 years B.C.; and he has inferred from this "the existence of

writings on papyrus or other perishable materials" in that period,

since ink would not be made merely for writing on terra-cotta vases

(though the custom of writing in ink on pottery, especially on ostraka

or fragments of broken vases, as being cheap, persisted throughout the

whole period of ancient civilisation).

Accordingly, though few private letters older than the imperial time

have been preserved, it need not and should not be supposed that there

were only a few written. Those that were written have been lost because

the material on which they were written could not last. If we except

the correspondence of Cicero, the great importance of which caused it

to be preserved, hardly any ancient letters not intended for

publication by their writers have come down to us except in Egypt,

where the original paper has in a number of cases survived. But the

voluminous correspondence of Cicero cannot be regarded as a unique fact

of Roman life. He and his correspondents wrote so frequently to one

another, because letter-writing was then common in Roman society.

Cicero says that, when he was separated from his friend Atticus, they

exchanged their thought as freely by letter as they did by conversation

when they were in the same place. Such a sentiment was not peculiar to

one individual: it expressed a custom of contemporary society. The

truth is that, just as in human nature thought and speech are linked

together in such a way that (to use the expression of Plato) word is

spoken thought and thought is unspoken word, so also human beings seek

by the law of their nature to express their ideas permanently in

writing as well as momentarily in speech; and ignorance of writing in

any race points rather to a degraded and degenerate than to a truly

primitive condition.
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Chapter 2: Transmission of Letters in the First Century

While writing springs from a natural feeling of the human mind and must

have originated at a very remote period, and while letters must be

almost as old as travelling, the proper development of epistolary

correspondence depends on improvement in the method and the certainty

of transmission. The desire to write a letter grows weaker, when it is

uncertain whether the letter will reach its destination and whether

others may open and read it. In the first century this condition was

fulfilled better than ever before. It was then easier and safer to send

letters than it had been in earlier time. The civilised world, i.e. the

Roman world, was traversed constantly by messengers of government or by

the letter-carriers of the great financial and trading companies.

Commercial undertakings on such a vast scale as the Roman needed

frequent and regular communication between the central offices in Rome

and the agents in the various provinces. There was no general postal

service; but each trading company had its own staff of letter-carriers.

Private persons who had not letter-carriers of their own were often

able to send letters along with those business communications.

In the early Roman Empire travelling, though not rapid, was performed

with an ease and certainty which were quite remarkable. The provision

for travelling by sea and by land was made on a great scale. Travellers

were going about in great numbers, chiefly during the summer months,

occasionally even during the winter season. Their purposes were varied,

not merely commerce or government business, but also education,

curiosity, search for employment in many departments of life. It is

true that to judge from some expressions used in Roman literature by

men of letters and moralists, travelling might seem not to have been

popular. Those writers occasionally speak as if travelling, especially

by sea, were confined to traders who risked their life to make money,

and as if the dangers were so great that none but the reckless and

greedy would incur them; and the opinion is often expressed, especially

by poets, that to adventure oneself on the sea is an impious and

unnatural act. The well-known words of Horace's third Ode are

typical:--

Oak and brass of triple fold

Encompassed sure that heart, which first made bold

To the raging sea to trust

A fragile bark, nor feared the Afric gust;

Heaven's high providence in vain

Has severed countries with the estranging main,

If our vessels ne'ertheless

With reckless plunge that sacred bar transgress

But that point of view was traditional among the poets; it had been

handed down from the time when travelling was much more dangerous and

difficult, when ships were small in size and fewer in numbers, when

seamanship and method were inferior, when few roads had been built, and

travel even by land was uncertain. Moreover, seafaring and land travel

were hostile to the contentment, discipline, and quiet orderly spirit

which Greek poetry and philosophy, as a rule, loved to dwell on and to

recommend: they tended to encourage the spirit of self-confidence,

self-assertiveness, daring and rebellion against authority, which was

called by Euripides "the sailors' lawlessness" (Hecuba, 602). In Roman

literature the Greek models and the Greek sentiments were looked up to

as sacred and final; and those words of the Roman writers were a proof

of their bondage to their Greek masters in thought.

When we look deeper, we find that very different views were expressed

by the writers who came more in contact with the real facts of the

Imperial world. They are full of admiration of the Imperial peace and

its fruits: the sea was covered with ships interchanging the products

of different regions of the earth, wealth was vastly increased, comfort

and well-being improved, hill and valley covered with the dwellings of

a growing population: wars and pirates and robbers had been put an end

to, travel was free and safe, all men could journey where they wished,

the most remote and lonely countries were opened up by roads and

bridges. It is the simple truth that travelling, whether for business

or for pleasure, was contemplated and performed under the Empire with

an indifference, confidence, and, above all, certainty, which were

unknown in after centuries until the introduction of steamers and the

consequent increase in ease and sureness of communication.

This ease and frequency of communication under the Roman Empire was

merely the culmination of a process that had long been going on. Here,

as in many other departments of life, the Romans took up and improved

the heritage of Greece. Migration and intermixture of peoples had been

the natural law of the Greek world from time immemorial; and the

process was immensely stimulated in the fourth century B.C. by the

conquests of Alexander the Great, which opened up the East and gave

free scope to adventure and trade. In the following centuries there was

abundant opportunity for travelling during the fine season of the year.

The powerful Monarchies and States of the Greek world keep the sea

safe; and during the third century B.C., as has been said by Canon

Hicks, a scholar who has studied that period with special care, "there

must have been daily communication between Cos (on the west of Asia

Minor) and Alexandria" (in Egypt).

When the weakness of the Senatorial administration at Rome allowed the

pirates to increase and navigation too become unsafe between 79 and 67

B.C., the life of the civilised world was paralysed; and the success of

Pompey in re-opening the sea was felt as the restoration of vitality

and civilisation, for civilised life was impossible so long as the sea

was an untraversable barrier between the countries instead of a pathway

to unite them.

Thus the deep-seated bent of human nature towards letter-writing had

been stimulated and cultivated by many centuries of increasing

opportunity, until it became a settled habit and in some cases, as we

see it in Cicero, almost a passion.

The impression given by the early Christian writings is in perfect

agreement with the language of those writers who spoke from actual

contact with the life of the time, and did not merely imitate older

methods and utter afresh old sentiments. Probably the feature in those

Christian writings, which causes most surprise at first to the

traveller familiar with those countries in modern time, is the easy

confidence with which extensive plans of travel were formed and

announced and executed by the early Christians.

In Acts 16:1ff a journey by land and sea through parts of Syria,

Cilicia, a corner of Cappadocia, Lycaonia, Phrygia, Mysia, the Troad,

Thrace, Macedonia, and Greece is described, and no suggestion is made

that this long journey was anything unusual, except that the heightened

tone of the narrative in 16:7-9 corresponds to the perplexingly rapid

changes of scene and successive frustrations of St. Paul's intentions.

But those who are most intimately acquainted with those countries know

best how serious an undertaking it would be at the present time to

repeat that journey, how many accidents might occur in it, and how much

care and thought would be advisable before one entered on so extensive

a programme.

Again, in 18:21 St. Paul touched at Ephesus in the ordinary course of

the pilgrim-ship which was conveying him and many other Jews to

Jerusalem for the Passover. When he was asked to remain, he excused

himself, but promised to return as he came back from Jerusalem by a

long land-journey through Syria, Cilicia, Lycaonia, and Phrygia. That

extensive journey seems to be regarded by speaker and hearers as quite

an ordinary excursions. "I must by all means keep this feast that

cometh in Jerusalem; but I will again return unto you, if God will."

The last condition is added, not as indicating uncertainty, but in the

usual spirit of Eastern religion, which forbids a resolve about the

future, however simple and easy, to be declared without the express

recognition of Divine approval--like the Mohammedan "inshallah," which

never fails when the most ordinary resolution about the morrow is

stated.

In Romans 15:24, when writing from Corinth, St. Paul sketches out a

comprehensive plan. He is eager to see Rome: first he must go to

Jerusalem, but thereafter he is bent on visiting Spain, and his course

will naturally lead him through Rome, so that he will, without

intruding himself on them, have the opportunity of seeing the Romans

and affecting their Church on his way.

Throughout medieval times nothing like this off-hand way of sketching

out extensive plans was natural or intelligible; there were then,

indeed, many great travellers, but those travellers knew how uncertain

their journeys were; they were aware that any plans would be frequently

liable to interruption, and that nothing could be calculated on as

reasonably certain; they entered on long journeys, but regarded them as

open to modification or even frustration; in indicating their plans

they knew that they would be regarded by others as attempting something

great and strange. But St. Paul's method and language seem to show

clearly that such journeys as he contemplated were looked on as quite

natural and usual by those to whom he spoke or wrote. He could go off

from Greece or Macedonia to Palestine, and reckoned with practical

certainty on being in Jerusalem in time for a feast day not far

distant.

It is the same with others: Aquila and Priscilla, Apollos, Silas,

Epaphroditus, Timothy, etc., move back and forward, and are now found

in one city, now in another far distant. Unobservant of this

characteristic, some writers have argued that Romans 16:3 could not

have been addressed to correspondents who lived in Rome, because Aquila

and Priscilla, who were in Ephesus not long before the Epistle was

written, are there spoken of as living among those correspondents. Such

an argument could not be used by people who had fully understood that

independence of mere local trammels and connections, and quite a

marvellous freedom in locomotion, are a strongly marked feature of the

early Church. That argument is one of the smallest errors into which

this false prepossession has led may scholars.

Communication by letter supplemented mere travelling. Such

communication is the greatest factor in the developing of the Church;

it kept alive the interest of the Christian congregations in one

another, and strengthened their mutual affection by giving frequent

opportunity of expressing it; it prevented the strenuous activity of

the widely scattered local Churches from being concentrated on purely

local matters and so degenerating into absorption in their own

immediate surroundings. Thus it bound together all the Provincial

Churches in the one Universal Church. The Christian letters contained

the saving power of the Church; and in its epistolary correspondence

flowed its life-blood. The present writer has elsewhere attempted to

show that the early Bishops derived their importance in great degree

from their position as representatives of the several congregations in

their relations with one another, charged with the duty of hospitality

to travellers and the maintenance of correspondence, since through this

position they became the guardians of the unity of the Universal Church

and the channels through which its life-blood flowed.

The one condition which was needed to develop epistolary correspondence

to a very much greater extent in the Roman Empire was a regular postal

service. It seems a remarkable fact that the Roman Imperial government,

keenly desirous as it was of encouraging and strengthening the common

feeling and bond of unity between different parts of the Empire, never

seems to have thought of establishing a general postal service within

its dominions. Augustus established an Imperial service, which was

maintained throughout subsequent Roman times; but it was strictly

confined to Imperial and official business, and was little more than a

system of special Emperor's messengers on a great scale. The

consequence of this defect was that every great organisation or trading

company had to create a special postal service for itself; and private

correspondents, if not wealthy enough to send their own slaves as

letter-carriers, had to trust to accidental opportunities for

transmitting their letters.

The failure of the Imperial government to recognise how much its own

aims and schemes would have been aided by facilitating communication

through the Empire was connected with one of the greatest defects of

the Imperial administration. It never learned that the strength and

permanence of a nation and of its government are dependent on the

education and character of the people: it never attempted to educate

the people, but only to feed and amuse them. The Christian Church,

which gradually established itself as a rival organisation, did by its

own efforts what the Imperial government aimed at doing for the nation,

and succeeded better, because it taught people to think for themselves,

to govern themselves, and to maintain their own union by their own

exertions. It seized those two great facts of the Roman world,

travelling and letter-writing, and turned them to its own purposes. The

former, on its purely material side, it could only accept: the latter

it developed to new forms as an ideal and spiritual instrument.

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

Chapter 3: The Christian Letters and Their Transmission

In the preceding chapter we have described the circumstances amid which

the Christian letter-writing was developed; and it was pointed out in

conclusion that in the pressure of those circumstances, or rather in

the energetic use of the opportunities which the circumstances of the

Roman Empire offered, there came into existence a kind of letter,

hitherto unknown in the world. The Christians developed the older class

of letter into new forms, applied it to new purposes, and placed it on

a much higher plane than it had ever before stood upon. In their hands

communication by letter became one of the most important, if not the

most important, of the agencies for consolidating and maintaining the

sense of unity among the scattered members of the one universal Church.

By means of letters the congregations expressed their mutual affection

and sympathy and sense of brotherhood, asked counsel of one another,

gave advice with loving freedom and plain speaking to one another,

imparted mutual comfort and encouragement, and generally expressed

their sense of their common life. Thus arose a new category of

epistles.

Dr. Deissmann in Bible Studies, p. 1ff, following older scholars, has

rightly and clearly distinguished two previously existing categories,

the true letter-written by friend to friend or to friends, springing

from the momentary occasion, intended only for the eye of the person or

persons to whom it is addressed--and the literary epistle--written with

an eye to the public, and studied with literary art. The literary

epistle is obviously later in origin than the true letter. It implies

the previous existence of the true letter as a well-recognised type of

composition, and the deliberate choice of this type for imitation. Soon

after the death of Aristotle in 322 B.C. a fictitious collection of

letters purporting to have been written by him was published. Such

forged letters are composed for a literary purpose with an eye to the

opinion of the world. The forger deliberately writes them after a

certain type and with certain characteristics, which may cause them to

be taken for something which they are not really. A fabrication like

this proves at least that the letter was already an established form of

composition; and the forger believed that he could calculate on rousing

public interest by falsely assuming this guise.

But it is impossible to follow Dr. Deissmann, it seems to me, when he

goes on to reduce all the letters of the New Testament to one or other

of those categories. He shows, it is true, some consciousness that the

two older categories are insufficient, but the fact is that in the new

conditions a new category had been developed--the general letter

addressed to a whole congregation or to the entire Church of Christ.

These are true letters, in the sense that they spring from the heart of

the writer and speak direct to the heart of the readers; that they were

often written in answer to a question, or called forth by some special

crisis in the history of the persons addressed, so that they rise out

of the actual situation in which the writer conceives the readers to be

placed; that they express the writer's keen and living sympathy with

and participation in the fortunes of the whole class addressed; that

they are not affected by any thought of a wider public than the persons

whom he directly addresses; in short, he empties out his heart in them.

On the other hand, the letters of this class express general principles

of life and conduct, religion and ethics, applicable to a wider range

of circumstances than those which have called forth the special letter;

and they appeal as emphatically and intimately to all Christians in all

time as they did to those addressed in the first instance.

It was not long before this wider appeal was perceived. It is evident

that when St. Paul bade the Colossians send his letter to be read in

the Laodicean Church, and read themselves the Laodicean letter, he saw

that each was applicable to a wider circle than it directly addressed.

But it is equally evident that the Colossian letter was composed not

with an eye to that wider circle, but directly to suit the critical

situation in Colossae. The wider application arises out of the

essential similarity of human nature in both congregations and in all

mankind. The crisis that has occurred in one congregation is likely at

some period to occur in other similar bodies; and the letter which

speaks direct to the heart of one man or one body of men will speak

direct to the heart of all men in virtue of their common human nature.

Here lies the essential character of this new category of letters. In

the individual case they discover the universal principle, and state it

in such a way as to reach the heart of every man similarly situated;

and yet they state this, not in the way of formal exposition, but in

the way of direct personal converse, written in place of spoken.

Some of those Christian letters are more diverse from the true letter

than others; and Dr. Deissmann tries to force them into his too narrow

classification by calling some of them true letters and others literary

epistles. But none of the letters in the New Testament can be

restricted within the narrow range of his definition of the true

letter: even the letter to Philemon, intimate and personal as it is,

rebels in some parts against this strictness, and rises into a far

higher and broader region of thought: it is addressed not only to

Philemon and Apphia and Archippus, but also "to the Church in thy

house."

Such letters show a certain analogy to the Imperial rescripts. The

rescript was strictly a mere reply to a request for guidance in some

special case, addressed by an official to the Emperor; yet it came to

be regarded as one of the chief means of improving and developing Roman

public law. A rescript arose out of special circumstances and stated

the Emperor's opinion on them in much the same way as if the official

had consulted him face to face; the rescript was written for the eye of

one official, without any thought of others; but it set forth the

general principle of policy which applied to the special case. The

rescripts show how inadequate Dr. Deissmann's classification is. It

would be a singularly incomplete account of them to class them either

as true letters or as literary epistles. They have many of the

characteristics of the true letter; in them the whole mind and spirit

of the Imperial writer was expressed for the benefit of one single

reader; but they lack entirely the spontaneity and freshness of the

true letter. As expressing general truths and universal principles,

they must have been the result of long experience and careful thought,

though the final expression was often hasty and roused by some special

occasion. This more studied character differentiates them from the mere

unstudied expression of personal affection and interest.

Similarly, those general letters of the Christians express and embody

the growth in the law of the Church and in its common life and

constitution. They originated in the circumstances of the Church. The

letter of the Council at Jerusalem (Acts 15:23ff) arose out of a

special occasion, and was the reply to a question addressed from Syria

to the central Church and its leaders; the reply was addressed to the

Churches of the province of Syria and Cilicia, and specially the Church

of the capital of that province; but it was forthwith treated as

applicable equally to other Christians, and was communicated as

authoritative by Paul and Silas to the Churches of Galatia (Acts 16:4).

The peculiar relation of fatherhood and authority in which Paul stood

to his own Churches developed still further this category of letters.

Mr. V. Bartlet has some good remarks on it in Dr. Hastings' Dictionary

of the Bible, i., p. 730, from which we may be allowed to quote two

sentences. "Of a temper too ardent for the more studied forms of

writing, St. Paul could yet by letter, and so on the spur of occasion,

concentrate all his wealth of thought, feeling and maturing experience

upon some particular religious situation, and sweep away the difficulty

or danger . . . The true cause of" all his letters "lay deep in the

same spirit as breathes in First Thessalonians, the essentially

pastoral' instinct."

A still further development towards general philosophico-legal

statement of religious dogma is apparent on the one hand in Romans,

addressed to a Church which he had not founded, and on the other hand

in the Pastoral Epistles. The latter have a double character, being

addressed by Paul to friends and pupils of his own, partly in their

capacity of personal friends--such portions of the letters being of the

most intimate, incidental, and unstudied character--but far more in

their official capacity as heads and overseers of a group of

Churches--such parts of the letters being really intended more for the

guidance of the congregations than of the nominal addressees, and

being, undoubtedly, to a considerable extent merely confirmatory of the

teaching already given to the congregations by Timothy and Titus. The

double character of these Epistles is a strong proof of their

authenticity. Such a mixture of character could only spring from the

intimate friend and leader, whose interest in the work which his two

subordinates were doing was at times lost in the personal relation.

The Catholic Epistles represent a further stage of this development.

First Peter is addressed to a very wide yet carefully defined body of

Churches in view of a serious trial to which they are about to be

exposed. Second Peter, James, and First John are quite indefinite in

their address to all Christians. But all of them are separated by a

broad and deep division from the literary epistle written for the

public eye. They are informed and inspired with the intense personal

affection which the writers felt for every individual of the thousands

whom they addressed. They are entirely devoid of the artificiality

which is inseparable from the literary epistle; they come straight from

the heart and speak straight to the heart; whereas the literary epistle

is always and necessarily written with a view to its effect on the

public, and the style is affected and to a certain degree forced and

even unnatural. It was left for the Christian letter to prove that the

heart of man is wide enough and deep enough to entertain the same love

for thousands as for one. The Catholic Epistles are therefore quite as

far removed from the class of "literary epistles" as the typical

letters of Paul are from the class of "true letters," as those classes

have been defined; and the resemblance in essentials between the

Catholic and the typical Pauline Epistles is sufficient to overpower

the points of difference, and to justify us in regarding them as

forming a class by themselves.

This remarkable development, in which law, statesmanship, ethics, and

religion meet in and transform the simple letter, was the work of St.

Paul more than of any other. But it was not due to him alone, nor

initiated by him. It began before him and continued after him. It

sprang from the nature of the Church and the circumstances of the time.

The Church was Imperial, the visible Kingdom of God. Its leaders felt

that their letters expressed the will of God; and they issued their

truly Imperial rescripts. "It seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us"

is the bold and regal exordium of the first Christian letter.

Christian letters in the next two or three centuries were often

inspired by something of the same spirit. Congregation spoke boldly and

authoritatively to congregation, as each was moved by the Spirit to

write: the letter partook of the nature of an Imperial rescript, yet it

was merely the expression of the intense interest taken by equal in

equal, and brother in brother. The whole series of such letters is

indicative of the strong interest of all individuals in the government

of the entire body; and they form one of the loftiest and noblest

embodiments of a high tone of feeling common to a very large number of

ordinary, commonplace, undistinguished human beings.

Such a development of the letter was possible in that widely scattered

body of the Church only through the greatly increased facilities for

travel and intercourse. The Church showed its marvellous intuition and

governing capacity by seizing this opportunity. In this, as in many

other ways, it was the creature of its time, suiting itself to the

needs of the time, which was ripe for it, and using the conditions and

opportunities of the time with true creative statesmanship.

As has been said, correspondence is impossible without some safe means

of conveyance. A confidential letter, the real outpouring of one's

feelings, is impossible unless the writer feels reasonably sure that

the letter will reach the proper hands, and still more that it will not

fall into the wrong hands. Further, it has been pointed out that there

was no public post, and that any individual or any trading company

which maintained a large correspondence was forced to maintain an

adequate number of private letter-carriers. The great financial

associations of publicani in the last century B.C. had bodies of slave

messengers, called tabellarii, to carry their letters between the

central administration in Rome and the agents scattered over every

province where they conducted business. Wealthy private persons

employed some of their own slaves as tabellarii. But if such messengers

were to be useful, they must be experienced, and they must be familiar

with roads and methods of travel: in short, any great company which

maintained a large correspondence must necessarily organise a postal

service of its own. The best routes and halts were marked out, the

tabellarii travelled along fixed roads, and the administration could

say approximately where any messenger was likely to be at any moment,

when a letter would arrive and the orders which it contained be put in

execution, when each messenger would return and be available for a new

mission. All this lies at the basis of good organisation and successful

conduct of business. As to the details we know nothing; no account of

such things has been preserved. But the existence of such a system must

be presupposed as a condition, before great business operations like

the Roman could be carried on. A large correspondence implies a special

postal system.

Now we must apply this to the Christian letters. Many such letters were

sent: those which have been preserved must be immensely multiplied to

give any idea of the number really despatched. The importance of this

correspondence for the welfare and growth of the Church was, as has

been shown, very great. Some provision for the safe transmission of

that large body of letters, official and private, was obviously

necessary. Here is a great subject, as to which no information has been

preserved.

It must be supposed as was stated above, that the bishops had the

control of this department of Church work. In the first place the

bishop wrote in the name of the congregation of which he was an

official: this is known from the case of the Roman Clement, whose

letter to the Corinthians is expressed in the name of the Roman Church.

The reference to him in the Shepherd of Hermas, Vision, ii., 4, 3, as

entrusted with the duty of communicating with other Churches, confirms

the obvious inference from his letter, and the form of the reference

shows that the case was not an exceptional, but a regular and typical

one. This one case, therefore, proves sufficiently what was the

practice in the Church.

In the second place the bishop was charged with the duty of

hospitality, i.e. of receiving and providing for the comfort of the

envoys and messengers from other Churches: this is distinctly stated in

1 Timothy 3:1ff and Titus 1:5ff. To understand what is implied in this

duty, it is necessary to conceive clearly the situation. As has been

already pointed out, the Christian letter-writers had to find their own

messengers. It cannot be doubted that, as an almost invariable rule,

those messengers were Christians. Especially, all official letters from

one congregation to another must be assumed to have been borne by

Christian envoys. Epaphroditus, Tychicus, Silas and others, who occur

as bearers of letters in the New Testament, must be taken as examples

of a large class. St. Paul himself carried and delivered the first

known Christian letter. That class of travelling Christians could not

be suffered to lodge in pagan inns, which were commonly places of the

worst character in respect of morality and comfort and cleanliness.

They were entertained by their Christian brethren; that was a duty

incumbent on the congregation; and the bishops had to superintend and

be responsible for the proper discharge of this duty. It must therefore

be understood that such envoys would address themselves first to the

bishop, when they came to any city where there was an organised body of

Christians resident, and that all Christian travellers would in like

manner look to the bishop for guidance to suitable quarters.

Considering that the number of Christian travellers must have been

large, it is entirely impossible to interpret the duty of hospitality,

with which the bishop was charged, as implying that he ought to

entertain them in his own house.

In the third place, it seems to follow as a necessary corollary from

the two preceding duties, that the letters addressed to any

congregation were received by the bishop in its name and as its

representative.

From the fact that the letter-carriers were usually Christian, we must

infer that they were not likely as a rule to be, like the tabellarii of

the great Roman companies, slaves trained to the duty and doing nothing

else. In many cases, certainly, the letters were carried by persons who

had other reasons for travelling. But in a great province like Asia, it

was necessary to have more regular messengers within the province, and

not to depend entirely on accidental opportunities. Undoubtedly,

messengers had often to be sent with letters round the congregations of

the province. In the earlier stages of Church development, probably,

those messengers were volunteers, discharging a duty which among the

pagans was almost entirely performed by slaves: just as Luke and

Aristarchus, when they travelled with St. Paul to Rome, must have

voluntarily passed as his servants, i.e. as slaves, in order to be

admitted to the convoy. In such cases, it is apparent how much this

sense of duty ennobled labour and raised the social standing of the

labourer, who was not a volunteer, making himself like a slave in the

service of the Church. In this there is already involved the germ of a

general emancipation of slaves and the substitution of free for slave

labour.

As time passed, and the work grew heavier, the organisation must have

become more complex, and professional carriers of letters were probably

required. But as to the details we know nothing, though the general

outlines of the system were dictated by the circumstances of the

period, and can be restored accordingly. Thus, as soon as we begin to

work out the idea of the preparations and equipment required in

practice for this great system, we find ourselves obliged to admit the

existence of a large organisation. The Church stands before those who

rightly conceive its practical character, as a real antagonist in the

fullest sense to the Imperial government, creating and managing its own

rival administration. We thus understand better the hatred which the

Imperial government could not but feel for it, a hatred which is

altogether misapprehended by those who regard it as springing from

religious ground. We understand too how Constantine at last recognised

in the Church the one bond which could hold together the disintegrating

Empire. Whether or not he was a Christian, he at least possessed a

statesman's insight. And his statesmanlike insight in estimating the

practical strength of rival religions stands out as all the more

wonderful, if he were not a Christian at heart; for (though many years

of his youth and earlier manhood had been spent in irksome detention in

the East, where Christianity was the popular and widely accepted

religion), yet his choice was made in the West, the country of his

birth and of his hopes, where Mithraism was the popular and most

influential religion: it was made amid the soldiery, which was almost

entirely devoted to the religion of Mithras.

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

Chapter 4: The Letters to the Seven Churches

One of the most remarkable parts of that strange and difficult book,

the Revelation of St. John, is the passage 2:1 to 3:22, containing the

Seven Letters. The Apocalypse as a whole belongs to a large and

well-known class of later Jewish literature, and has many features in

common with previous Apocalypses of Jewish origin. St. John was using

an established literary form, which he adapted in a certain degree to

his purposes, but which seriously fettered and impeded him by its

fanciful and unreal character. As a general rule he obeys the

recognised laws of apocalyptic composition, and imitates the current

forms so closely that his Apocalypse has been wrongly taken by some

scholars, chiefly German, as a work of originally pure and unmixed

Jewish character, which was modified subsequently to a Christian type.

In this work, Jewish in origin and general plan, and to a great extent

Jewish in range of topics, there is inserted this episode of the Seven

Letters, which appears to be almost entirely non-Jewish in character

and certainly non-Jewish in origin and model. There must have been

therefore some reason which seemed to the author to demand imperatively

the insertion of such an episode in a work of diverse character. The

reason was that the form of letters had already established itself as

the most characteristic expression of the Christian mind, and as almost

obligatory on a Christian writer. Though many other forms have been

tried in Christian literature, e.g. the dialogue, the formal treatise,

etc., yet the fact remains that--apart from the fundamental four

Gospels--the highest and most stimulating and creative products of

Christian thought have been expressed in the epistolary form. This was

already vaguely present in the mind of St. John while he was composing

the Apocalypse. Under this compelling influence he abandons the

apocalyptic form for a brief interval, and expresses his thought in the

form of letters. In them he makes some attempt to keep up the symbolism

which was prescribed by the traditional principles of apocalyptic

composition; but such imagery is too awkward and cumbrous for the

epistolary form, and has exerted little influence on the Seven Letters.

The traditional apocalyptic form breaks in his hands, and he throws

away the shattered fragments.

In the subsequent development of St. John's thought it is plain that he

had recognised the inadequacy and insufficiency of the fashionable

Jewish literary forms. It seems highly probable that the perception of

that fact came to him during the composition of the Revelation, and

that the Seven Letters, though placed near the beginning and fitted

carefully into that position, were the last part of the work to be

conceived.

It must also be noticed that the book of the Revelation, as a whole,

except the first three verses, is cast in the form of a letter. After

the brief introduction, the fourth verse is expressed in the regular

epistolary form:--

John, to the Seven Asian Churches:

Grace to you and peace, from him which is and which was and which is

to come; and from the Seven Spirits, etc.

Such a beginning is out of keeping with the ordinary apocalyptic form;

but the pastoral instinct was strong in the writer, and he could never

lose the sense of responsibility for the Churches that were under his

charge. Just as the Roman Consul read in the sky the signs of the will

of heaven on behalf of the State, so St. John saw in the heavens the

vision of trial and triumph on behalf of the Churches entrusted to his

care. All that he saw and heard was for them rather than for himself;

and this is distinctly intimated to him, 1:11, What thou seest, write

in a book, and send to the Seven Churches.

The expression just quoted from 1:11, write in a book, and send,

obviously refers to the vision as a whole. It is not an introduction to

the Seven Letters: it is the order to write out and send the entire

Apocalypse. This the writer does, and sends it with the covering

letter, which begins in 1:4. Hence 1:11 explains the origin of 1:4. The

idea of the letter as the inevitable Christian form was firmly in the

writer's mind. He must write an Apocalypse with the record of his

vision; but he must enclose it in a letter to the Churches.

The Apocalypse would be quite complete without the Seven Letters:

chapter 4 follows chapter 1 naturally. The Seven Letters spring from

the sense of reality, the living vigorous instinct, from which the

Christian spirit can never free itself. An Apocalypse could not content

St. John: it did not bring him in close enough relation to his

Churches. And so, as a second thought, he addressed the Seven

representative Churches one by one; and, as the letters could not be

placed last, he placed them near the beginning; but the one link of

connection between them and the Apocalypse lies in the words with which

each is finished: he that hath an ear, let him hear what the spirit

saith to the Churches, i.e. not merely the words of the Letter, but the

Apocalypse which follows.

It is also not improbable that St. John had received a greater share of

the regular Jewish education than most of his fellow-Apostles, and

that, through his higher education, the accepted Jewish forms of

composition had a greater hold on his mind, and were more difficult for

him to throw off, than for Peter, who had never been so deeply imbued

with them. However that may be, it is at least evident in his later

career that a new stage began for him at this point, that he discarded

Hebrew literary models and adopted more distinctly Greek forms, and

that his literary style and expression markedly improved at the same

time. Proper consideration of these facts must surely lead to the

conclusion that no very long interval of time must necessarily be

supposed to have elapsed between the composition of the Revelation and

of the Gospel. The change in style is indeed very marked; but it is

quite in accordance with the observed facts of literary growth in other

men that a critical and epoch-making step in mental development, when

one frees oneself from the dominion of a too narrow early education,

and strikes out in a path of originality, may be accompanied by a very

marked improvement in linguistic expression and style.

The Seven Letters are farther removed from the type of the "true

letter" than any other compositions in the New Testament. In their

conception they are strictly "literary epistles," deliberate and

intentional imitations of a literary form that was already firmly

established in Christian usage. They were not intended to be sent

directly to the Churches to which they were addressed. They had never

any separate existence apart from one another and from the book of

which they are a part. They are written on a uniform plan, which is

absolutely opposed to the spontaneity and directness of the true

letter. At the stage in his development, which we have supposed the

author to be traversing, he passed from the domination of one literary

form, the Jewish apocalyptic, to the domination of another literary

form, the Christian epistolary. He had not yet attained complete

literary freedom: he had not yet come to his heritage, emancipated

himself from the influence of models, and launched forth on the ocean

of his own wonderful genius. But he was just on the point of doing so.

One step more, and he was his own master.

How near that step was is obvious, when we look more closely into the

character of the Seven Letters. It is only by very close study, as in

the chapters below devoted to the individual letters, that the reader

can duly appreciate the special character of each. To sum up and

anticipate the results of that closer study, it may here be said that

the author of the Seven Letters, while composing them all on the same

general lines, as mere parts of an episode in a great work of

literature, imparts to them many touches, specially suitable to the

individual Churches, and showing his intimate knowledge of them all. In

each case, as he wrote the letter, the Church to which it was addressed

stood before his imagination in its reality and its life; he was

absorbed with the thought of it alone, and he almost entirely forgot

that he was composing a piece of literature, and apostrophised it

directly, with the same overmastering earnestness and sense of

responsibility that breathe through St. Paul's letters.

As will be shown fully in chapter 14, the Seven Churches stood as

representative of seven groups of congregations; but the Seven Letters

are addressed to them as individual Churches, and not to the groups for

which they stand. The letters were written by one who was familiar with

the situation, the character, the past history, the possibilities of

future development, of those Seven Cities. The Church of Sardis, for

example, is addressed as the Church of that actual, single city: the

facts and characteristics mentioned are proper to it alone, and not

common to the other Churches of the Hermus Valley. Those others were

not much in the writer's mind: he was absorbed with the thought of that

one city: he saw only death before it. But the other cities which were

connected with it may be warned by its fate; and he that overcometh

shall be spared and honoured. Similarly, St. Paul's letter to Colossae

was written specially for it alone, and with no reference to Laodicea;

yet it was ordered to be communicated to Laodicea, and read publicly

there also.

This singleness of vision is not equally marked on the surface of every

letter. In the message to Laodicea, the thought of the other cities of

the group is perhaps apparent; and possibly the obscurity of the

Thyatiran Letter may be due in some degree to the outlook upon the

other cities of its group, though a quite sufficient and more probable

reason is our almost complete ignorance of the special character of

that city.

To this singleness of vision, the clearness with which the writer sees

each single city, and the directness with which he addresses himself to

each, is due the remarkable variety of character in the whole series.

The Seven Letters were evidently all written together, in the

inspiration of one occasion and one purpose; and yet how different each

is from all the rest, in spite of the similarity of purpose and plan

and arrangement in them all! Each of the Seven Churches is painted with

a character of its own; and very different futures await them. The

writer surveys them from the point of view of one who believes that

natural scenery and geographical surroundings exercise a strong

influence on the character and destiny of a people. He fixes his eye on

the broad features of the landscape. In the relations of sea and land,

river and mountains--relations sometimes permanent, sometimes

mutable--he reads the tale of the forces that insensibly mould the

minds of men. Now that is not a book which he that runs may read. It is

a book with seven seals, which can be opened only by long familiarity,

earnest patient thought, and the insight given by belief and love. The

reader must have attuned himself to harmony with the city and the

natural influences that had made it. St. John from his lofty standpoint

could look forward into the future, and see what should come to each of

his Churches.

He assumes always that the Church is, in a sense, the city. The local

Church does not live apart from the locality and the population, amid

which it has a mere temporary abode. The Church is all that is real in

the city: the rest of the city has failed to reach its true self, and

has been arrested in its development. Similarly, the local Church in

its turn has not all attained to its own perfect development: the

"angel" is the truth, the reality, the idea (in Platonic sense) of the

Church. Thus in that quaint symbolism the city bears to its Church the

same relation that the Church bears to its angel. But here we are led

into subjects that will be more fully discussed in chapters 6 and 16.

For the present we shall only review in brief the varied characters of

the Seven Churches and the Seven Cities, constituting among them an

epitome of the Universal Church and of the whole range of human life.

The note alike in the Church and in the history of Ephesus has been

change. The Church was enthusiastic; but it has been cooling. It has

fallen from its high plane of conduct and spirit. And the penalty

denounced against it is that it shall be moved out of its place, unless

it recreates its old spirit and enthusiasm: "I have this against thee

that thou didst leave thy first love. Remember therefore from whence

thou art fallen and repent and do the first works; or else I come to

thee, and will move thy lamp out of its place." And, similarly, in the

history of the city the same note is distinct. An extraordinary series

of changes and vicissitudes had characterised it, and would continue to

do so. Mutability was the law of its being. The land and the site of

the city had varied from century to century. What was water became

land; what was city ceased to be inhabited; what was bare hillside and

cultivated lowland became a great city crowded with a teeming

population; what was a harbour filled with the shipping of the whole

world has become a mere inland sea of reeds, through which the wind

moans with a vast volume of sound like the distant waves breaking on a

long stretch of sea-coast in storm.

The distinctive note of the letter to Smyrna is faithfulness that gives

life, and appearance bettered by reality. The Church "was dead and

lived," like Him who addressed it: it was poor, but rich: it was about

to suffer for a period, but the period is definite, and the suffering

comes to an end, and the Church will prove faithful through it all and

gain "the crown of life." Such also had the city been in history: it

gloried in the title of the faithful friend of Rome, true to its great

ally alike in danger and in prosperity. The conditions of nature amid

which it was planted were firm and everlasting. Before it was an arm of

the vast, unchanging, unconquerable sea, its harbour and the source of

its life and strength. Behind it rose its Hill (Pagos) crowned with the

fortified acropolis, as one looks at it from the front apparently only

a rounded hillock of 450 feet elevation; but ascend it, and you

discover it to be really a corner of the great plateau behind,

supported by the immeasurable strength of the Asian continent which

pushes it forward towards the sea. The letter is full of joy and life

and brightness, beyond all others of the Seven; and such is the

impression the city still makes on the traveller (who usually comes to

it as his first experience of the towns of Asia Minor), throwing back

the glittering rays of the sun with proportionate brightness, while its

buildings spring sharp out of the sea and rise in tiers up the front

slopes of its Pagos.

Pergamum stands before us in the letter as the city of authority,

beside the throne--the throne of this world and of the power of evil,

where the lord of evil dwelleth. And to its victorious Church is

promised a greater authority, the power of the mighty name of God,

known only to the giver and the receiver. It was the royal city of

history, seat of the Attalid Kings and chief centre of the Roman

Imperial administration; and the epithet "royal" is the one that rises

unbidden to the traveller's lips, especially as he beholds it after

seeing the other great cities of the land, with its immense acropolis

on a rock rising out of the plain like a mountain, self-centred in its

impregnable strength, looking out over the distant sea and over the

land right away to the hills beside far off Smyrna.

Thyatira, with its low and small acropolis in its beautiful valley,

stretching north and south like a long funnel between two gently

swelling ridges of hill, conveys the impression of mildness, and

subjection to outward influence, and inability to surmount and dominate

external circumstances. The letter to Thyatira is mainly occupied with

the inability of the Church to rise superior to the associations and

habits of contemporary society, and its contented voluntary

acquiescence in them (which was called the Nicolaitan heresy). Yet even

in the humble Thyatira he that perseveres to the end and overcomes

shall be rewarded with irresistible power among the nations, that

smashing power which its own deity pretends to wield with his

battle-axe, a power like but greater than that of mighty Rome itself.

In the remnant of the Thyatiran Church, which shall have shown the will

to resist temptation, weakness shall be made strong.

The letter to the Sardian Church breathes the spirit of death, of

appearance without reality, promise without performance, outward show

of strength betrayed by want of watchfulness and careless confidence.

Thou hast a name that thou livest and thou art dead . . . I have found

no works of thine fulfilled . . . I will come as a thief comes; and

thou shalt not know what hour I will come upon thee. And such also was

the city and its history. Looked at from a little distance to the north

in the open plain, Sardis wore an imposing, commanding, impregnable

aspect, as it dominated that magnificent broad valley of the Hermus

from its robber stronghold on a steep spur that stands out boldly from

the great mountains on the south. But, close at hand, the hill is seen

to be but mud, slightly compacted, never trustworthy or lasting,

crumbling under the influences of the weather, ready to yield even to a

blow of the spade. Yet the Sardians always trusted to it; and their

careless confidence had often been deceived, when an adventurous enemy

climbed in at some unguarded point, where the weathering of the soft

rock had opened a way.

Philadelphia was known to the whole world as the city of earthquakes,

whose citizens for the most part lived outside, not venturing to remain

in the town, and were always on the watch for the next great

catastrophe. Those who knew it best were aware that its prosperity

depended on the great road from the harbour of Smyrna to Phrygia and

the East. Philadelphia, situated where this road is about to ascend by

a difficult pass to the high central plateau of Phrygia, held the key

and guarded the door. It was also of all the Seven Cities the most

devoted to the name of the Emperors, and had twice taken a new title or

epithet from the Imperial god, abandoning in one case its own ancient

name. The Church had been a missionary Church, and Christ Himself,

bearer of the key of David, had opened the door before it, which none

shall shut. He Himself "will keep thee from the hour of trial," the

great and imminent catastrophe that shall come upon the whole world.

But for the victor there remains stability, like that of the strong

column that supports the temple of God; and he shall not ever again

need to go out for safety; and he shall take as his new name the name

of God and of His city.

The Laodicean Church is strongly marked in the letter as the irresolute

one, which had not been able to make up its mind, and halted

half-heartedly, neither one thing nor another. It would fain be

enriched, and clad in righteousness, and made to see the truth; but it

would trust to itself; in its own gold it would find its wealth, in its

own manufactures it would make its garments, in its own famous medical

school it would seek its cure; it did not feel its need, but was

content with what it had. It was neither truly Christian, nor frankly

pagan. This letter, alone among the Seven, seems not to bring the

character of the Church into close relation to the great natural

features amid which the city stood; but on the other hand it shows a

very intimate connection between the character attributed to the Church

and the commerce by which the city had grown great.

The second half of this letter gradually passes into an epilogue to the

whole Seven; and this proves that, in spite of the individual character

of each letter, they form after all only parts in an elaborate and

highly wrought piece of literature. It is hardly possible to say

exactly where the individual letter ends and the epilogue begins; in

appearance the whole bears the form after which all the letters are

modelled; but there is a change from the individualisation of the

letter to the general application of the epilogue.

To comprehend more fully the individuality of the Seven Letters one

should compare them with the letters of Ignatius to the five Asian

Churches, Ephesus, Smyrna, Magnesia, Tralleis, Philadelphia, or with

the letter of Clement to the Corinthian Church. Ignatius, it is true,

had probably seen only two of the five, and those only cursorily; so

that the vagueness, the generality, and the lack of individual traits

in all his letters were inevitable. He insists on topics which were

almost equally suitable to all Christians, or on those which not

unnaturally filled his own mind in view of his coming fate.

But it is a remarkable fact that the more definite and personal and

individual those old Christian letters are, the more vital and full of

guidance are they to all readers. The individual letters touch life

most nearly; and the life of any one man or Church appeals most

intimately to all men and all Churches.

The more closely we study the New Testament books and compare them with

the natural conditions, the localities and the too scanty evidence from

other sources about the life and society of the first century, the more

full of meaning do we find them, the more strongly impressed are we

with their unique character, and the more wonderful becomes the picture

that is unveiled to us in them of the growth of the Christian Church.

It is because they were written with the utmost fulness of vigour and

life by persons who were entirely absorbed in the great practical tasks

which their rapidly growing organisation imposed on them, because they

stand in the closest relation to the facts of the age, that so much can

be gathered from them. They rise to the loftiest heights to which man

in the fulness of inspiration and perfect sympathy with the Divine will

and purpose can attain, but they stand firmly planted on the facts of

earth. The Asian Church was so successful in moulding and modifying the

institutions around it because with unerring insight its leaders saw

the deep-seated character of those Seven Cities, their strength and

their weakness, as determined by their natural surroundings, their past

history, and their national character.

This series of studies of the Seven Letters may perhaps be exposed to

the charge of imagining fanciful connections between the natural

surroundings of the Seven cities and the tone of the Letters. Those who

are accustomed to the variety of character that exists in the West may

refuse to acknowledge that there exists any such connection between the

character of the natural surroundings and the spirit, the Angel, of the

Church.

But Western analogy is misleading. We Occidentals are accustomed to

struggle against Nature, and by understanding Nature's laws to

subjugate her to our needs. When a waterway is needed, as at Glasgow,

we transform a little stream into a navigable river. Where a harbour is

necessary to supply a defect in nature, we construct with vast toil and

at great cost an artificial port. We regulate the flow of dangerous

rivers, utilising all that they can give us and restraining them from

inflicting the harm they are capable of. Thus in numberless ways we

refuse to yield to the influences that surround us, and by hard work

rise superior in some degree to them.

Such analogy must not be applied without careful consideration in Asia.

There man is far more under the influence of nature; and hence results

a homogeneity of character in each place which is surprising to the

Western traveller, and which he can hardly believe or realise without

long experience. Partly that subjection may be due to the fact that

nature and the powers of nature are on a vaster scale in Asia. You can

climb the highest Alps, but the Himalayas present untrodden peaks,

where the powers of man fail. The Eastern people have had little chance

of subduing and binding to their will the mighty rivers of Asia (except

the Chinese, who regulated their greatest rivers more than 2,000 years

ago). The Hindus have come to recognise the jungle as unconquerable,

and its wild beasts as irresistible; and they passively acquiesce in

their fate. Vast Asiatic deserts are accepted as due to the will of

God; and through this humble resignation other great stretches of land,

which once were highly cultivated, have come to be marked on the maps

as desert, because the difficulties of cultivation are no longer

surmountable by a passive and uninventive population. In Asia mankind

has accepted nature; and the attempts to struggle against it have been

almost wholly confined to a remote past or to European settlers.

How it was that Asiatic races could do more to influence nature at a

very early time than they have ever attempted in later times is a

problem that deserves separate consideration. Here we only observe that

they themselves attributed their early activity entirely to religion:

the Mother-Goddess herself taught her children how to conquer Nature by

obeying her and using her powers. In its subsequent steady degradation

their religion lost that early power.

But among the experiences which specially impress the traveller who

patiently explores Asia Minor step by step, village by village, and

province by province, perhaps the most impressive of all is the extent

to which natural circumstances mould the fate of cities and the

character of men. The dominance of nature is, certainly, more complete

now than it was of old; but still even in the early ages of history it

was great; and it is a main factor both in molding the historical

mythology, or mythical explanations of historical facts that were

current among the ancient peoples, and in guiding the more reasoned and

pretentious scientific explanations of history set forth by the

educated and the philosophers. The writer of the Seven Letter has

stated in them his view of the history of each Church in harmony with

the prominent features of nature around the city.

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

Chapter 5: Relation of the Christian Books to Contemporary Thought and

Literature

Symbolism does not take up so large a space in the Seven Letters as it

does in the rest of the Apocalypse. In the letters the writer was

brought more directly in contact with real life and human conduct; and

the practical character of Christian teaching had a stronger hold on

him when he felt himself, even in literature, face to face with a real

congregation of human beings, and pictured to himself in imagination

their history and their needs, their faults and excellencies. Yet even

in the letters symbolism plays some part; ideas and objects are

sometimes named, not in their immediate sense, but as representatives

or signs of something else. Not merely is the general setting, the

Seven Stars, the Lamps (candle-sticks in the Authorised and the Revised

Versions), etc., symbolical: even in the letters there are many

expression whose real meaning is not what lies on the surface. The

"crown of life," indeed, may be treated as a mere figure of speech; but

the "ten days" of suffering through which Smyrna must pass can hardly

be regarded as anything more than "a time which comes to an end." Even

the metaphors and other figures are not purely literary: they have had

a history, and have acquired a recognised and conventional meaning. The

"door," which is mentioned in 3:7, would hardly be intelligible without

regard to current Christian usage.

Two points of view must be distinguished in this case. In the first

place a regular, generally accepted conventional symbolism was growing

up among the Christians, in which Babylon meant Rome, a door meant an

opening for missionary work, and so on: this subject has not yet been

properly investigated in a scientific way, apart from prejudices and

prepossessions.

In the second place, the letters were written to be understood by the

Asian congregations, which mainly consisted of converted pagans. The

ideas expressed in the letters had to be put in a form which the

readers would understand; to suit their understanding the figures and

comparisons must be drawn from sources and objects familiar to them;

the words must be used in the sense in which they were commonly

employed in the cities addressed; illustrations, which were needed to

bring home to the readers difficult ideas, must be drawn from the

circle of their experience and education, chapters 11 and 13.

It has been too much the custom to regard the earliest Christian books

as written in a specially Christian form of speech, standing apart and

distinguishable from the common language of the eastern Roman

Provinces. Had that been the case, it is not too bold to say that the

new religion could not have conquered the Empire. It was because

Christianity appealed direct to the people, addressed them in their own

language, and made itself comprehensible to them on their plane of

thought, that it met the needs and filled the heart of the Roman world.

It is true that the Christian books and letters had to express

doctrines, thought, ideas, truths, which were in a sense new. But the

newness and strangeness lay in the spirit, not in the words or the

metaphors or the illustrations. In the spirit lies the essence of the

new thought and the new life, not in the words. This may seem to be,

and in a sense it is, a mere truism. Every one says it, and has been

saying it from the beginning; yet it is sometimes strangely ignored and

misunderstood, and in the last few years we have had some remarkable

examples of this. We have seen treatises published in which the most

remarkable second-century statement of the essential doctrines and

facts of Christianity, the epitaph of Avircius Marcellus,--a statement

intended and declaring itself to be public, popular, before the eyes

and minds of all men--has been argued to be non-Christian, because

every single word, phrase and image in it is capable of a pagan

interpretation, and can be paralleled from pagan books and cults. That

is perfectly true; it is an interesting fact, and well worthy of being

stated and proved; but it does not support the inference that is

deduced. The parts, the words, are individually capable of being all

treated as pagan, but the essence, the spirit, of the whole is

Christian. As Aristotle says, a thing is more than the sum of its

parts; the essence, the reality, the Ousia, is that which has to be

added to the parts in order to make the thing.

It is therefore proposed in the present work to employ the same method

as in all the writer's other investigations--to regard the Apocalypse

as written in the current language familiar to the people of the time,

and not as expressed in a peculiar and artificial Christian language:

the term "artificial" is required, because, if the Christians used a

kind of language different from that of the ordinary population, it

must have been artificial.

Nor are the thoughts--one might almost say, though the expression must

not be misapplied or interpreted in a way different from what is

intended--nor are the thoughts of the Christian books alien from and

unfamiliar to the period when they were written. They stand in the

closest relation to the period. They are made for it: they suit it:

they are determined by it.

We take the same view about all the books of the New Testament. They

spring from the circumstances of their period, whatever it was in each

case; they are suited to its needs; in a way they think its thoughts,

but think them in a new form and on a higher plane; they answer the

questions which men were putting, and the answers are expressed in the

language which was used and understood at the time. Hence, in the first

place, their respective dates can be assigned with confidence, provided

we understand the history and familiarise ourselves with the thoughts

and ways of the successive periods. No one, who is capable of

appreciating the tone and thought of different periods, could place the

composition of any of the books of the New Testament in the time of the

Antonines, unless he were imperfectly informed of the character and

spirit of that period; and the fact that some modern scholars have

placed them (or some of them) in that period merely shows with what

light-hearted haste some writers have proceeded to decide on difficult

questions of literary history without the preliminary training and the

acquisition of knowledge imperatively required before a fair judgment

could be pronounced.

From this close relation of the Christian books to the time in which

they originated, arises, e.g., the marvellously close resemblance

between the language used about the birth of the divine Augustus and

the language used about the birth of Christ. In the words current in

the Eastern Provinces, especially in the great and highly educated and

"progressive" cities of Asia, shortly before the Christian era, the day

of the birth of the (Imperial) God was the beginning of all things; it

inaugurated for the world the glad tidings that came through him;

through him there was peace on earth and sea: the Providence, which

orders every part of human life, brought Augustus into the world, and

filled him with the virtue to do good to men: he was the Saviour of the

race of men, and so on. Some of these expressions became, so to say,

stereotyped for the Emperors in general, especially the title "Saviour

of the race of men," and phrases about doing good to mankind; others

were more peculiarly the property of Augustus.

All this was not merely the language of courtly panegyric. It was in a

way thoroughly sincere, with all the sincerity that the people of that

overdeveloped and precocious time, with their artificial, highly

stimulated, rather feverish intellect, were capable of feeling. But the

very resemblance--so startling, apparently, to those who are suddenly

confronted with a good example of it--is the best and entirely

sufficient proof that the idea and narrative of the birth of Christ

could not be a growth of mythology at a later time, even during the

period about A.D. 60-100, but sprang from the conditions and thoughts,

and expressed itself in the words, of the period to which it professes

to belong. It is to a great extent on this and similar evidence that

the present writer has based his confident and unhesitating opinion as

to the time of origin of the New Testament books, ever since he began

to understand the spirit and language of the period. Before he began to

appreciate them, he accepted the then fashionable view that they were

second century works.

But so far removed are some scholars from recognising the true bearing

of these facts, and the true relation of the New Testament to the life

and thought of its own time, that probably the fashionable line of

argument will soon be that the narrative of the Gospels was a mere

imitation of the popular belief about the birth of Augustus, and

necessarily took its origin during the time when that popular belief

was strong, viz., during the last thirty years of his reign. The belief

died with him, and would cease to influence thought within a few years

after his death: he was a god only for his lifetime (though a pretence

was made of worshipping all the deceased Emperors who were properly

deified by decree of the Senate): even in old age it is doubtful if he

continued to make the same impression on his people, but as soon as he

died a new god took his place. New ideas and words then ruled among

men, for the new god never was heir to the immense public belief which

hailed the divine Augustus. With Tiberius began a new era, new

thoughts, and new forms: he was the New Caesar, Neos Kaisar.

There are already some signs that, as people begin to learn these

facts, which stand before us on the stones engraved before the birth of

Christ, this line of argument is beginning to be developed. It will at

least have this great advantage, that it assigns correctly the period

when the Christian narrative originated, and that it cuts away the

ground beneath the feet of those who have maintained that the Gospels

are the culmination of a long subsequent growth of mythology about a

more or less historical Jesus. The Gospels, as we have them, though

composed in the second half, and for the most part in the last quarter,

of the first century, are a faithful presentation in thought and word

of a much older and well-attested history, and are only in very small

degree affected by the thoughts and language of the period when their

authors wrote, remaining true to the form as fixed by earlier

registration.

Similarly, the Seven Letters are the growth of their time, and must be

studied along with it. They belong to the last quarter of the first

century; and it is about that time that we may look for the best

evidence as to the meaning that they would bear to their original

readers.

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

Chapter 6: The Symbolism of the Seven Letters

In attempting to get some clear idea with regard to the symbolism

involved in the Seven Letters, it is not proposed to discuss the

symbolism of the Apocalypse as a whole, still less the religious or

theological intention of its author. The purpose of this chapter is

much more modest--merely to try to determine what was the meaning which

ordinary people in the cities of Asia would gather from the symbolism:

especially how would they understand the Seven Stars, the Lamps and the

Angels. That is a necessary preliminary, if we are to appreciate the

way in which Asian readers would understand the book and the letters

addressed to them.

In the Seven Letters symbolism is less obtrusive and more liable to be

unnoticed than in the visions that follow; and it will best show their

point of view to take first a simple example of the figures which march

across the stage of the Apocalypse itself in the later chapters. Those

figures are to be interpreted according to the symbols which they bear

and the accompaniments of their progress before the eyes of the seer.

It is the same process of interpretation as is applied in the study of

Greek art: for example a horseman almost identical in type and action

appears on the two coins represented in chapter 23, figures 26 and 27.

In one this horseman is marked by the battle-axe which he carries as

the warlike hero of the military colony Thyatira. The other shows a

more peaceful figure, the Emperor Caracalla visiting Thyatira.

Similarly, in 6:2 the bowman sitting on a white horse, to whom a crown

was given, is the Parthian king. The bow was not a Roman weapon: it was

not used in Roman armies except by a few auxiliaries levied among

outlying tribes, who carried their national weapon. The Parthian weapon

was the bow; the warriors were all horsemen; and they could use the bow

as well when they were fleeing as when they were charging. The writers

of that period often mention the Parthian terror on the East, and their

devastating incursions were so much dreaded at that time that Trajan

undertook a Parthian war in 115. Virgil foretells a Roman victory: the

bow and the horse have been useless:--

With backward bows the Parthians shall be there,

And, spurring from the fight, confess their fear.

Colour was also an important and significant detail. The Parthian king

in 6:2 rides on a white horse. White had been the sacred colour among

the old Persians, for whom the Parthians stood in later times; and

sacred white horses accompanied every Persian army. The commentators

who try to force a Roman meaning on this figure say that the Roman

general, when celebrating a Triumph, rode on a white horse. This is a

mistake; the general in a Triumph wore the purple and gold-embroidered

robes of Jupiter, and was borne like the god in a four-horse car. (See

chapter 26.)

The use of colour here as symbolical is illustrated by the custom of

Tamerlane. When he laid siege to a city, he put up white tents,

indicating clemency to the enemy. If resistance was prolonged forty

days, he changed the tents, and put up red ones, portending a bloody

capture. If obstinate resistance was persisted in for other forty days,

black tents were substituted: the city was to be sacked with a general

massacre. The meaning of the colours differs; there was no universal

principle of interpretation; significance depended to some extent on

circumstances and individual preference.

Figure 1

Figure 1: The ideal Parthian king, as he appears on Parthian coins, 150

B.C.--A.D. 200

It is not to be supposed that St. John consciously modelled his

descriptions on works of art. He saw the figures march across the

heavens. But such ideas and symbolic forms were in the atmosphere and

in the minds of men at the time; and the ideas with which he was

familiar moulded the imagery of his visions, unconsciously to himself.

It is quite in the style of Greek art that one monster in 13 should

rise from the sea and the other appear out of the earth (as we shall

see in chapter 7); but those ideas are used with freedom. The shapes of

the monsters are not of Greek art; they are modifications of

traditional apocalyptic devices; but the seer saw them in situations

whose meaning we interpret from the current ideas and forms of art.

Hence, e.g., in the Pergamenian letter, the white stone is not to be

explained as an imitation of a precisely similar white stone used in

ordinary pagan life (as most recent commentators suppose); it is a free

employment of a common form in a new way to suit a Christian idea. The

current forms are used in the Apocalypse, not slavishly, but creatively

and boldly; and they must not be interpreted pedantically. A new spirit

has been put into them by the writer.

Figure 2

Figure 2: The Parthian king welcomed by the genius of the capital.

Parthian coins, A.D. 42-65

Thus to refer to the Parthian king of 6:2: the type of the

archer-horseman was familiar to the thought of all in the eastern

Provinces; but if we look at the most typical representations, those

which occur on coins, we find the various elements separately, but not

united. The regular reverse type on Parthian coins shows the founder of

the race, Arsaces, deified as Apollo, sitting on the holy omphalos, and

holding the bow, the symbol of authority based on military power (see

Fig. 1). A rarer type, though common on coins of King Vonones (83-100

A.D.) and of Artabanus III (42-65), shows the monarch on horseback

welcomed by the genius of the State: Fig. 2 gives the type of

Artabanus: the king wears Oriental attire with characteristic full

trousers. The coins of Vonones have a type similar, but complicated by

the addition of a third figure.

Figure 3

Figure 3: Parthian captives sitting under a Roman trophy. Coin of

Trajan, A.D. 116

In Greek and Roman art the Parthian appears, not as victor, but as

vanquished. The coins of Trajan show two Parthian captives, a man and a

woman, under a trophy of Roman victory. St. John describes the Parthian

king as seen by Roman apprehension, followed by Bloodshed, Scarcity and

Death; but that point of view was naturally alien to art, except the

art practised in Parthia. The spirit of the artist, or of the seer of

the visions, gives form to the pictures, and they must be interpreted

by the spirit.

As to the letters, we notice that there are two pairs of ideas

mentioned in 1:20, "the seven stars are the angels of the Seven

Churches; and the seven lamps are Seven Churches." Of these, the second

pair stand on the earth; and in the first pair, since the stars belong

to heaven, the angels also must belong to heaven. There is the earthly

pair, the Churches and the lamps that symbolise them; and there is the

corresponding heavenly pair, the angels and the stars which symbolise

them.

A similar correspondence between a higher and a lower embodiment of

Divine character may frequently be observed in the current religious

conceptions of that time. We find amid the religious monuments of Asia

Minor certain reliefs, which seem to represent the Divine nature on two

planes, expressed by the device of two zones in the artistic grouping.

There is an upper zone showing the Divine nature on the higher, what

may be called the heavenly plane; and there is a lower zone, in which

the God is represented as appearing, under the form of his priest and

representative, among the worshippers who come to him on earth, to whom

he reveals the right way of approaching him and serving him, and whom

he benefits in return for their service and offering duly completed.

One of the best examples of this class of monuments, dated A.D. 100,

and belonging to the circuit of Philadelphia, is published here for the

first time after a sketch made by Mrs. Ramsay in 1884. The lower zone

is a scene representing, according to a type frequent in late art, an

ordinary act of public worship. At the right hand side of an altar,

which stands under the sacred tree, a priest is performing on the altar

the rite by means of which the worshippers are brought into

communication with the god. The priest turns towards the left to face

the altar, and behind him are five figures in an attitude nearly

uniform (the position of the left hand alone varies slightly), who must

represent the rest of the college of priests attached to the sanctuary.

Their names are given in the inscription which is engraved under the

relief. There was always a college of priests, often in considerable

numbers, attached to the great sanctuaries or hiera of Anatolia; those

priests must be distinguished from the attendants, ministers, and

inferiors, of whom there were large numbers (in some cases several

thousands).

Figure 4

Figure 4: The sacrifice on earth and in heaven: relief from Koloe in

Lydia

The existence of such colleges gives special importance to the Bezan

text of Acts 14:13 in which the priests of the shrine of Zeus

"Before-the-City," at Lystra, are mentioned--whereas the accepted text

mentions only a single priest. Professor Blass in his note rejects the

Bezan reading on the ground that there was only one priest for each

temple; but his argument is founded on purely Greek custom and is not

correct for Anatolian temples, like the one at Lystra, where there was

always a body or college of priests. In the relief which we are now

studying the mutilation of the inscription makes the number of the

priests uncertain; but either seven or eight were mentioned. At the

Milyadic hieron of the same god, Zeus Sabazios, the college numbered

six: at Pessinus the college attached to the hieron of the Great Mother

contained at least ten.

On the left side of the altar stand seven figures looking towards the

altar and the priest. These represent the crown of worshippers.

In the upper zone the central action corresponds exactly to the scene

in the lower zone: the god stands on a raised platform on the right

hand side of an altar, on which he performs the same act of ritual

which his priest is performing straight below him on the lower plane,

probably pouring out a libation over offerings which lie on the altar.

In numerous reliefs and coins of Asia Minor a god or goddess is

represented performing the same act over an altar. That one act stands

symbolically for the whole series of ritual acts, just as in Revelation

2:13 Antipas stands for the entire body of the martyrs who had suffered

in Asia. The deity has revealed to men the ritual whereby they can

approach him in purity, and present their gifts and prayers with

assurance that these will be favourably received: thus the god is his

own first priest, and later priests were regarded by the devout as

representatives of the god on earth, wearing his dress, acting for him

and performing before his worshippers on earth the life and actions of

the god on his loftier plane of existence. In this relief the intention

is obvious: as a sign and guarantee that he accepts the sacred rite,

the god is doing in heaven exactly the same act that his priest is

performing on earth.

On the right of the raised platform stand three figures, with the right

hand raised in adoration. These represent the college of priests,

headed by the chief priest; and all must be understood to make the same

gesture, though the right hands of the second and third are hidden. The

action of the priests who stand in the lower zone behind the chief

priest must be interpreted in the same way. The gesture of adoration is

illustrated by figure 23 in chapter 21 and figure 27 in chapter 23.

On the left of the platform another scene in the ritual and life of the

god is represented. He drives forth in his car to make his annual

progress through his own land to receive the homage of his people. He

is marked as Zeus by the eagle which sits on the reins or the trappings

of the horses, and as Sabazios by the serpent on the ground beneath

their feet. Beside the horses walks his companion god, regarded as his

son in the divine genealogy, and marked as Hermes by the winged

caduceus which he carries, and as Men by the crescent and the pointed

Phrygian cap. The divine nature regarded as male was commonly conceived

in this double form as father and son; and when these Anatolian ideas

were expressed under Greek forms and names, they were described

sometimes as Zeus and Hermes (so in Acts 14:10, and in this relief),

sometimes as Zeus and Apollo or Dionysus. When the deity in his male

character was conceived as a single impersonation, he was called in

Greek sometimes by one, sometimes by another of those four names. The

Greek names were used in this loose varying way, because none of them

exactly corresponded to the nature of the Anatolian conception; and

sometimes one name, sometimes another, seemed to correspond best to the

special aspect of the Anatolian god which was prominent at the moment.

The god on the car is here represented as beardless, but the god on the

platform is bearded; and yet the two are presentments of the same

divine power. But this relief is a work of symbolism, not a work of

art: it aims not at artistic or dramatic truth, but at showing the

divine nature in two of the characters under which it reveals itself to

man: the object of the artist was to express a meaning, not to arrive

at beauty or consistency.

The interpretation which has just been stated of this symbolical relief

would be fairly certain from the analogy of other monuments of the same

class; but it is placed beyond doubt by the inscription which occupies

the broad lower zone of the stone: "in the year 185 (A.D. 100-101), the

thirtieth of Daisios (22nd May), when Glykon was Stephanephoros, the

people of Koloe consecrated Zeus Sabazios, the priests being

Apollonius," etc. (probably seven others were named).

The people consecrated Zeus Sabazios either by building him a temple,

or simply by erecting a statue in his honour: in either case the action

was a stage in the gradual Hellenising of an Anatolian cult in outward

show by making it more anthropomorphic. The original Anatolian religion

was much less anthropomorphic; it had holy places rather than temples,

and worshipped "the God" rather than individualised and specialised

embodiments of him. Under the influence of Greek and other foreign

examples, temples and statues were introduced into that simple old

religion. It is impossible to get back to a stage in which it was

entirely imageless and without built temples; but certainly in its

earlier stages images and temples played a much smaller part than in

the later period.

The symbolism of this monument is so instructive with regard to the

popular religious views in Anatolia that a detailed study of it forms

the best introduction to this subject. The monument is now built into

the inner wall of a house at Koula, a considerable town in Eastern

Lydia; but it was brought there from a place about twenty-five miles to

the north. It originates therefore from a secluded part of the country,

where Anatolian religious ideas were only beginning to put on an

outward gloss of Hellenism, though their real character was purely

Asian. Greek however was the language of the district.

It is fundamentally the same idea of a higher and a lower plane of

existence that is expressed in the symbolism of the Angels and the

Stars in heaven, corresponding to the Churches and the Lamps on earth.

The lamp, which represents the Church, is a natural and obvious symbol.

The Church is Divine: it is the kingdom of God among men: in it shines

the light that illumines the darkness of the world.

The heavenly pair is more difficult to express precisely in its

relation to the earthly pair. There seems to be involved here a

conception, common in ancient time generally, that there are

intermediate grades of existence to bridge over the vast gap between

the pure Divine nature and the earthly manifestation of it. Thus the

star and the angel, of whom the star is the symbol, are the

intermediate stage between Christ and His Church with its lamp shining

in the world. This symbolism was taken over by St. John from the

traditional forms of expression in theories regarding the Divine nature

and its relation to the world.

Again, we observe that, in the religious symbolic language of the first

century, a star denoted the heavenly existence corresponding to a

divine being or divine creation or existence located on earth. Thus, in

the language of the Roman poets, the divine figure of the Emperor on

earth has a star in heaven that corresponds to it and is its heavenly

counterpart. So the Imperial family as a whole is also said to have its

star, or to be a star. It is a step towards this kind of symbolic

phraseology when Horace (Odes, i, 12) speaks of the Julian star shining

like the moon amid the lesser fires; but probably Horace was hardly

conscious of having advanced in this expression beyond the limits of

mere poetic metaphor. But when Domitian built a Temple of the Imperial

Flavian family, the poet Statius describes him as placing the stars of

his family (the Flavian) in a new heaven (Silvae, v, I, 240f). There is

implied here a similar conception to that which we are studying in the

Revelation: the new Temple on earth corresponds to a new heaven framed

to contain the new stars; the divine Emperors of the Flavian family

(along with any other member of the family who had been formally

deified) are the earthly existences dwelling in the new Temple, as the

stars, their heavenly counterparts, move in the new heaven. The

parallel is close, however widely separate the theological ideals are;

and the date of Statius' poem is about the last year of Domitian's

reign, A.D. 95-96.

The star, then, is obviously the heavenly object which corresponds to

the lamp shining on the earth, though superior in character and purity

to it; and, as the lamp on earth is to the star in heaven, so is the

Church on earth to the angel. Such is the relation clearly indicated.

The angel is a corresponding existence on another and higher plane, but

more pure in essence, more closely associated with the Divine nature

than the individual Church on earth can be.

Now, what is the angel? How shall he be defined or described? In answer

to this question, then, one must attempt to describe what is meant by

the angels of the Churches in these chapters, although as soon as the

description is written, one recognises that it is inadequate and hardly

correct. The angel of the Church seems to embody and gather together in

a personification the powers, the character, the history and life and

unity of the Church. The angel represents the Divine presence and the

Divine power in the Church; he is the Divine guarantee of the vitality

and effectiveness of the Church.

This seems clear; but the difficulty begins when we ask what is the

relation of the angel to the faults and sins of his Church, and, above

all, to the punishment which awaits and is denounced against those

sins. The Church in Smyrna or in Ephesus suffers from the faults and

weaknesses of the men who compose it: it is guilty of their crimes, and

it will be punished in their person. Is the angel, too, guilty of the

sins? Is he to bear the punishment for them?

Undoubtedly the angel is touched and affected by the sins of his

Church. Nothing else is conceivable. He could not be the counterpart or

the double of a Church, unless he was affected in some way by its

failings. But the angels of the Churches are addressed, not simply as

touched by their faults, but as guilty of them. Most of the angels have

been guilty of serious, even deadly sins. The angel of Sardis is dead,

though he has the name of being alive. The angel of Laodicea is

lukewarm and spiritless, and shall be rejected. Threats, also, are

directed against the angels: "I will come against thee," "I will spit

thee out of my mouth," "I will come to thee" (or rather "I will come in

displeasure at thee" is the more exact meaning, as Professor Moulton

points out). Again, the angel is regarded as responsible for any

neglect of the warning now given, "and thou shalt not know what hour I

will come upon thee": "thou art the wretched one, and poor, and

miserable, and blind, and naked."

These expressions seem to make it clear that the angel could be guilty,

and must suffer punishment for his guilt. This is certainly surprising,

and, moreover, it is altogether inconsistent with our previous

conclusion that the angel is the heavenly counterpart of the Church. He

who is guilty and responsible for guilt cannot stand anywhere except on

the earth.

The inconsistency, however, is due to the inevitable failure of the

writer fully to carry out the symbolism. It is not so difficult to

follow out an allegory perfectly, so long as the writer confines

himself to the realm of pure fancy; but, if he comes into the sphere of

reality and fact, he soon finds that the allegory cannot be wrought out

completely; it will not fit the details of life. When John addresses

the angels as guilty, he is no longer thinking of them, but of the

actual Churches which he knew on earth. The symbolism was complicated

and artificial; and, when he began to write the actual letters, he

began to feel that he was addressing the actual Churches, and the

symbolism dropped from him in great degree. Nominally he addresses the

Angel, but really he writes to the Church of Ephesus or of Sardis; or

rather, all distinction between the Church and its angel vanishes from

his mind. He comes into direct contact with real life, and thinks no

longer of correctness in the use of symbols and in keeping up the

elaborate and rather awkward allegory. He writes naturally, directly,

unfettered by symbolical consistency.

The symbolism was imposed on the writer of the Apocalypse by the rather

crude literary model, which he imitated in obedience to a prevalent

Jewish fashion. He followed his model very faithfully, so much so that

his work has by some been regarded as a purely Jewish original,

slightly modified by additions and interpolations to a Christian

character, but restorable to its original Jewish form by simple

excision of a few words and paragraphs. But we regard the Jewish

element in it as traditional, due to the strong hold which this

established form of literature exerted on the author. That element only

fettered and impeded him by its fanciful and unreal character, making

his work seem far more Jewish than it really is. Sometimes, however,

the traditional form proves wholly inadequate to express his thoughts;

and he discards it for the moment and speaks freely.

It is therefore vain to attempt to give a rigidly accurate definition

of the meaning which is attached to the term "angel" in these chapters.

All that concerns the angels is vague, impalpable, elusive, defying

analysis and scientific precision. You cannot tell where in the Seven

Letters, taken one by one, the idea "angel" drops and the idea "Church"

takes its place. You cannot feel certain what characteristics in the

Seven Letters may be regarded as applying to the angels, and what must

be separated from them. But the vague description given in preceding

paragraphs will be sufficient for use; and it may be made clearer by

quoting Professor J. H. Moulton's description of angels: "Spiritual

counterparts of human individuals or communities, dwelling in heaven,

but subject to changes depending on the good or evil behaviour of their

complementary beings on earth."

How far did St. John, in employing the symbolism current at the time,

accept and approve it as a correct statement of truth? That question

naturally arises; but the answer seems inevitable. He regards this

symbolism merely as a way of making spiritual ideas intelligible to the

ordinary human mind, after the fashion of the parables in the life of

Christ. He was under the influence of the common and accepted ways of

expressing spiritual, or philosophical, or theological truth, just as

he was under the influence of fashionable forms in literature. He took

these and made the best he could of them. The apocalyptic form of

literature was far from being a high one; and the Apocalypse of John

suffers from the unfortunate choice of this form: only occasionally is

the author able to free himself from the chilling influence of that

fanciful and extravagant mode of expression. The marked difference in

character and power between the Apocalypse and the Gospel of St. John

is in great measure due to the poor models which he followed in the

former.

It is interesting that one of the most fashionable methods of

expressing highly generalised truths or principles--the genealogical

method--is never employed by John (except in the universally accepted

phrases, "son of man," "Son of God"). The contempt expressed by Paul

for the "fables and endless genealogies" of current philosophy and

science seems to have been shared by most of the Christian writers; and

it is true that no form of veiling ignorance by a show of words was

ever invented more dangerous and more tempting than the genealogical.

An example of the genealogical method may be found in Addison's 35th

Spectator, an imitation of the old form, but humorous instead of

pedantic.

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

Chapter 7: Authority of the Writer of the Seven Letters

In what relation did the writer of the Seven Letters stand to the Asian

Churches which he addressed? This is an important question. The whole

spirit of the early development of law and procedure and administration

in the early Church is involved in the answer. That the writer shows so

intimate a knowledge of those Churches that he must have lived long

among them, will be proved by a detailed examination of the Seven

Letters, and may for the present be assumed. But the question is

whether he addressed the Churches simply as one who lived among them

and knew their needs and want, who was qualified by wisdom and age and

experience, and who therefore voluntarily offered advice and warning,

which had its justification in its excellence and truth; or whether he

wrote as one standing in something like an official and authoritative

relation to them, charged with the duty of guiding, correcting and

advising those Asian Churches, feeling himself directly responsible for

their good conduct and welfare.

The question also arises whether he was merely a prophet according to

the old conception of the prophetic mission, coming, as it were, forth

from the desert or the field to deliver the message which was dictated

to him by God, and on which his own personality and character and

knowledge exercised no formative influence; or whether the message is

full of his own nature, but his nature raised to its highest possible

level through that sympathy and communion with the Divine will, which

constitutes, in the truest and fullest sense, "inspiration." The first

of these alternatives we state only to dismiss it as bearing its

inadequacy plainly written on its face. The second alone can satisfy

us; and we study the Seven Letters on the theory that they are as truly

and completely indicative of the writer's character and of his personal

relation to his correspondents as any letters of the humblest person

can be.

Probably the most striking feature of the Seven Letters is the tone of

unhesitating and unlimited authority which inspires them from beginning

to end. The best way to realise this tone and all that it means is to

compare them with other early Christian letters: this will show by

contrast how supremely authoritative is the tone of the Seven Letters.

The letter of Clement to the Church of Corinth is not expressed as his

own (though undoubtedly, and by general acknowledgment, it is his

letter, expressing his sentiments regarding the Corinthians), but as

the letter of the Roman Church. All assumption or appearance of

personal authority is carefully avoided. The warning and advice are

addressed by the Romans as authors, not to the Corinthians only, but

equally to the Romans themselves. "These things we write, not merely as

admonishing you, but also as reminding ourselves." The first person

plural is very often used in giving advice: "let us set before

ourselves the noble examples"; and so on in many other cases. Rebuke,

on the other hand, is often expressed in general terms. Thus, e.g., a

long panegyric on the Corinthians in sect. 2: "Ye had conflict day and

night for all the brotherhood...Ye were sincere and simple and free

from malice one towards another. Every sedition and every schism was

abominable to you, etc.," is concluded in sect. 3 with a rebuke and

admonition couched in far less direct terms: "that which is written was

fulfilled; my beloved ate and drank, and was enlarged and waxed fat and

kicked; hence come jealousy and envy, strife and sedition, etc." The

panegyric is expressed in the second person plural, but the blame at

the end is in this general impersonal form.

A good example of this way of expressing blame in perfectly general,

yet quite unmistakable, terms is found in sect. 44. Here the

Corinthians are blamed for having deposed certain bishops or

presbyters; but the second personal form is never used. "Those who were

duly appointed...these men we consider to be unjustly thrust out from

their ministration. For it will be no light sin for us if we thrust out

those who have offered the gifts of the bishop's office unblamably and

holily." It would be impossible to express criticism of the conduct of

others in more courteous and modest form, and yet it is all the more

effective on that account: "if we do this, we shall incur grievous

sin."

The most strongly and directly expressed censure is found in sect. 47.

It is entirely in the second person plural; but here the Romans shelter

themselves behind the authority of Paul, who "charged you in the

Spirit...because even then ye had made parties." On this authority the

direct address continues to the end of the chapter: "it is shameful,

dearly beloved, yes, utterly shameful and unworthy of your conduct in

Christ, that it should be reported that the very steadfast and ancient

Church of the Corinthians, for the sake of one or two persons, maketh

sedition against its presbyters, etc." But the next sentence resumes

the modest form: "let us therefore root this out quickly."

An example equally good is found in the letters of Ignatius; and this

example is even more instructive than that of Clement, because

Ignatius' letters were addressed to several of the Seven Churches not

many years after the Revelation was written. Here we have letters

written by the Bishop of Antioch, the mother Church of all the Asian

Churches, and by him when raised through the near approach of death to

a plane higher than mere humanity. He was already marked out for

death--in the estimation of Christians the most honourable kind of

death--as the representative of his Church; and he was on his way to

the place of execution. He was eager to gain the crown of life. He had

done with all thought of earth. If there was any one who could speak

authoritatively to the Asian Churches, it was their Syrian mother

through this chosen representative. But there is not, in any of his

letters, anything approaching, even in the remotest degree, to the

authoritative tone of John's letters to the Seven Churches, or of

Paul's letters, or of Peter's letter to the Churches of Anatolia.

The Ephesians especially are addressed by Ignatius with profound

respect. He ought to "be trained by them for the contest in faith." He

hopes to "be found in the company of the Christians of Ephesus." He is

"devoted to them and their representatives." He apologises for seeming

to offer advice to them, who should be his teachers; but they may be

schoolfellows together--a touch which recalls the tone of Clement's

letter; he does not give orders to them, as though he were of some

consequence. The tone throughout is that of one who feels deeply that

he is honoured in associating with the Ephesian Church through its

envoys.

There is not the same tone of extreme respect in Ignatius' letters to

Magnesia, Tralleis, Philadelphia, and Smyrna, as in his letter to

Ephesus. It is apparent that the Syrian bishop regarded Ephesus as

occupying a position of loftier dignity than the other Churches of the

Province; and this is an important fact in itself. It proves that

already there was the beginning of a feeling, in some minds at least,

that the Church of the leading city of a Province was of higher dignity

than those of the other cities, a feeling which ultimately grew into

the recognition of metropolitan bishoprics and exarchates, and a fully

formed and graded hierarchy.

But even to those Churches of less splendid history, his tone is not

that of authority. It is true that he sometimes uses the imperative;

but in the more simple language of the Eastern peoples, as in modern

Greek and Turkish (at least in the conversational style), the

imperative mood is often used, without any idea of command, by an

inferior to a superior, or by equal to equal; and in such cases it

expresses no more than extreme urgency. In Magn. sect. 3 the tone is

one of urgent reasoning, and Lightfoot in his commentary rightly

paraphrases the imperative of the Greek by the phrase "I exhort you."

In sect. 6 the imperative is represented in Lightfoot's translation by

"I advise you." In sect. 10 the advice is expressed in the first person

plural (a form which we found to be characteristic of Clement), "let us

learn to live," "let us not be insensible to His goodness." Then

follows in sect. 11 an apology for even advising his correspondents,

"not because I have learned that any of you are so minded, but as one

inferior to you, I would have you be on your guard betimes." When in

Trall. sect. 3 he is tempted to use the language of reproof, he

refrains: "I did not think myself competent for this, that being a

convict I should give orders to you as though I were an Apostle."

It is needless to multiply examples. The tone of the letters is the

same throughout. Ignatius has not the right, like Paul or Peter or an

Apostle, to issue commands to the Asian Churches. He can only advise,

and exhort, and reason--in the most urgent terms, but as an equal to

equals, as man to men, or, as he modestly puts it, as inferior to

superiors. He has just the same right and duty that every Christian has

of interesting himself in the life of all other Christians, of advising

and admonishing and entreating them to take the course which he knows

to be right.

The best expression of his attitude towards his correspondents is

contained in a sentence which he addresses to the Romans, in which he

contrasts his relation to them with the authority that belonged to the

Apostles: "I do not give orders to you, as Peter and Paul did: they

were Apostles, I am a convict: they were free, but I am a slave to this

very hour."

But John writes in an utterly different spirit, with the tone of

absolute authority. He carries this tone to an extreme far beyond that

even of the other Apostles, Paul and Peter, in writing to the Asian

Churches. Paul writes as their father and teacher: authority is stamped

on every sentence of his letters. Peter reviews their circumstances

points out the proper line of conduct in various situations and

relations, addresses them in classes--the officials and the general

congregation--in a tone of authority and responsibility throughout: he

writes because he feels bound to prepare them in view of coming trials.

St. John expresses the Divine voice with absolute authority of

spiritual life and death in the present and the future. Such a tone

cannot be, and probably hardly ever has been, certainly is not now by

any scholar, regarded as the result of mere assumption and pretence.

Who can imagine as a possibility of human nature that one who can think

the thoughts expressed in these letters could pretend to such authority

either as a fanciful dreamer deluding himself or as an actual impostor?

Such suggestions would be unreal and inconceivable.

It is a psychological impossibility that these Letters to the Asian

Churches could have been written except by one who felt himself, and

had the right to feel himself, charged with the superintendence and

oversight of all those Churches, invested with Divinely given and

absolute authority over them, gifted by long knowledge and sympathy

with insight unto their nature and circumstances, able to understand

the line on which each was developing, and finally bringing to a focus

in one moment of supreme inspiration--whose manner none but himself

could understand or imagine--all the powers he possessed of knowledge,

of intellect, of intensest love, of gravest responsibility of sympathy

with the Divine life, of commission from his Divine Teacher.

Moreover, when we consider how sternly St. Paul denounced and resented

any interference from any quarter, however influential, with the

conduct of his Churches, and how carefully he explained and apologised

for his own intention of visiting Rome, that he might not seem to

"build on another's foundation," and again when we take into

consideration the constructive capacity of the early Church and all

that is implied therein, we must conclude that St. John's authority was

necessarily connected with his publicly recognised position as the head

of those Asian Churches, and did not arise merely from his general

commission as an Apostle.

In a word, we must recognise the authoritative succession in the Asian

Churches of those three writers: first and earliest him who speaks in

the Pauline letters; secondly, him who wrote "to the Elect who are

sojourners of the Dispersion in...Asia" and the other Provinces;

lastly, the author of the Seven Letters.

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

Chapter 8: The Education of St. John in Patmos

Closely related to this authority claimed and exercised by the writer

of the Apocalypse over the Church--so closely related that it is merely

another aspect of that authority--is the claim which he makes to speak

in the name of Christ. He writes in a book what he has seen and heard.

The words of the letter are given him to set down. It is the Divine

Head of the Church Himself, from whom all the letters and the book as a

whole originate. The writer is distinguished from the Author; though

the distinction is not to be regarded as carried through the book with

unbroken regularity, and must not be pressed too closely. The one idea

melts into the other with that elusive indefiniteness which

characterises the book as a whole.

On his credentials as a legate or messenger is founded the authority

which the writer exercise over the Church. Over the Church God alone

has authority; and no man may demand its obedience except in so far as

he has been directly commissioned by God to speak. Only the messenger

of God has any right to obedience: other men can only offer advice.

Let us try to understand this attitude and this claim by first of all

understanding more clearly the situation in which the writer was

placed, and the circumstances in which the work originated. Only in

that way can the problem be fairly approached. It may prove insoluble.

In a sense it must prove insoluble. At the best we cannot hope to do

more than state the conditions and the difficulties clearly in a form

suited to the mind and thoughts of our own time. But a clear

understanding of the difficulties involved is a step towards the

solution. The solution however must be reached by every one for

himself: it is a matter for the individual mind, and depends on the

degree to which the individual can even in a dim vague way comprehend

the mind of St. John. It involves the personal element, personal

experience and personal opinion; and he who tries to express the

solution is exposed to subjectivity and error. The solution is to be

lived rather than spoken.

St. John had been banished to Patmos, an unimportant islet, whose

condition in ancient times is little known. In the Imperial period

banishment to one of the small rocky islands of the Aegean was a common

and recognised penalty, corresponding in some respects (though only in

a very rough way and with many serious differences) to the former

English punishment of transportation. It carried with it entire loss of

civil rights and almost entire loss of property; usually a small

allowance was reserved to sustain the exile's life. The penalty was

life-long; it ended only with death. The exile was allowed to live in

free intercourse with the people of the island, and to earn money. But

he could not inherit money nor bequeath his own, if he saved or earned

any: all that he had passed to the State at his death. He was cut off

from the outer world, though he was not treated with personal cruelty

or constraint within the limits of the islet, where he was confined.

But there are serious difficulties forbidding the supposition that St.

John was banished to Patmos in this way.

In the first place this punishment was reserved for persons of good

standing and some wealth. Now it seems utterly impossible to admit that

St. John could have belonged to that class. In Ephesus he was an

obscure stranger of Jewish origin; and under the Flavian Emperors the

Jews of Palestine were specially open to suspicion on account of the

recent rebellion. There is no evidence, and no probability, that he

possessed either the birth, or the property, or the civic rights,

entitling him to be treated on this more favoured footing. He was one

of the common people, whose punishment was more summary and far harsher

than simple banishment to an island.

In the second place, even if he had been of sufficiently high standing

for that form of punishment, it is impossible to suppose that the crime

of Christianity could have been punished so leniently at that period.

If it was a crime at all, it belonged to a very serious class; and

milder treatment is unknown as a punishment for it. In its first

stages, before it was regarded as a crime, some Christians were

subjected to comparatively mild penalties, like scourging; but in such

cases they were punished, not for the crime of Christianity, not for

"the name," but for other offences, such as causing disorder in the

streets. But St. John was in Patmos for the word of God and the

testimony of Jesus, partaker with you in the tribulation and kingdom

and patience which are in Jesus. His punishment took place at a time

when the penalty for Christianity was already fixed as death in the

severer form (i.e. fire, crucifixion, or as a public spectacle at games

and festivals) for persons of humbler position and provincials, and

simple execution for Roman citizens. Nor is it possible to suppose that

St. John was banished at an early stage in the persecution, before the

procedure was fully comprehended and strictly carried out. The

tradition that connects his punishment with Domitian is too strong.

The conclusion seems inevitable: St. John was not punished with the

recognised Roman penalty of banishment to an island (deportatio in

insulam): the exile to Patmos must have been some kind of punishment of

a more serious character.

There was such a penalty. Banishment combined with hard labour for life

was one of the grave penalties. Many Christians were punished in that

way. It was a penalty for humbler criminals, provincials and slaves. It

was in its worst forms a terrible fate: like the death penalty it was

preceded by scourging, and it was marked by perpetual fetters, scanty

clothing, insufficient food, sleep on the bare ground in a dark prison,

and work under the lash of military overseers. It is an unavoidable

conclusion that this was St. John's punishment. Patmos is not elsewhere

mentioned as one of the places where convicts of this class were sent;

but we know very little about the details and places of this penalty;

and the case of St. John is sufficient proof that such criminals were

in some cases sent there. There were no mines in Patmos. Whether any

quarries were worked there might be determined by careful exploration

of the islet. Here, as everywhere in the New Testament, one is met by

the difficulty of insufficient knowledge. In many cases it is

impossible to speak confidently, where a little exploration by a

competent traveller would probably give certainty.

Undoubtedly, there were many forms of hard labour under the Roman rule,

and these varied in degree, some being worse than others. We might wish

to think that in his exile St. John had a mild type of punishment to

undergo, which permitted more leisure and more ease; but would any

milder penalty be suitable to the language of 1:9, your brother and

partaker with you in the tribulation? It is possible perhaps to explain

those words as used by an exile, though subjected only to the milder

penalty inflicted on persons of rank. But how much more meaning and

effect they carry, when the penalties of both parties are of the same

severe character. Now it is a safe rule to follow, that the language of

the New Testament is rarely, if ever, to be estimated on the lower

scale of effectiveness. The interpretation which gives most power and

meaning is the right one. St. John wrote to the Churches in those words

of 1:9, because he was suffering in the same degree as themselves.

Banished to Patmos, St. John was dead to the world; he could not learn

much about what was going on in the Empire and in the Province Asia. It

would be difficult for him to write his Vision in a book, and still

more difficult to send it to the Churches when it was written. He could

exercise no charge of his Churches. He could only think about them, and

see in the heavens the process of their fate. He stood on the sand of

the seashore, and saw the Beast rise from the sea and come to the land

of Asia: and he saw the battle waged and the victory won. Just as the

Roman supreme magistrate or general was competent to read in the sky

the signs of the Divine will regarding the city or the army entrusted

to his charge, so St. John could read in the heavens the intimation of

the fortunes and the history of his Churches.

In passing, a remark on the text must be made here. It is unfortunate

that the Revisers departed from the reading of the Authorised Version

in 13:1; and attached the first words to the preceding chapter,

understanding that the Dragon "stood upon the sand of the sea." Thus a

meaningless and unsuitable amplification--for where is the point in

saying that the Dragon waxed wroth with the Woman, and went away to war

with the rest of her seed; and he stood upon the sand of the sea? the

history breaks off properly with his going away to war against the

saints (the conclusion of that war being related in 19:19-21), whereas

it halts and comes to a feeble stop, when he is left standing on the

seashore--was substituted for the bold and effective personal detail, I

stood upon the sand of the shore of Patmos, and saw a Beast rise out of

the sea.

St. John could see all this; and through years of exile, with rare

opportunities of hearing what happened to his Churches, he could remain

calm, free from apprehension, confident in their steadfastness on the

whole and their inevitable victory over the enemy. In that lonely time

the thoughts and habits of his youth came back to him, while his

recently acquired Hellenist habits were weakened in the want of the

nourishment supplied by constant intercourse with Hellenes and

Hellenists. His Hellenic development ceased for the time. The head of

the Hellenic Churches of Asia was transformed into the Hebrew seer.

Nothing but the Oriental power of separating oneself from the world and

immersing oneself in the Divine could stand the strain of that long

vigil on the shore of Patmos. Nothing but a Vision was possible for

him; and the Vision, full of Hebraic imagery and the traces of late

Hebrew literature which all can see, yet also often penetrated with a

Hellenist and Hellenic spirit so subtle and delicate that few can

appreciate it, was slowly written down, and took form as the Revelation

of St. John.

Most men succumb to such surroundings, and either die or lose all human

nature and sink to the level of the beasts. A few can live through it,

sustained by the hope of escape and return to the world. But St. John

rose above that life of toil and hopeless misery, because he lived in

the Divine nature and had lost all thought of the facts of earth. In

that living death he found his true life, like many another martyr of

Christ. Who shall tell how far a man may rise above earth, when he can

rise superior to an environment like that? Who will set bounds to the

growth of the human soul, when it is separated from all worldly

relations and trammels, feeding on its own thoughts and the Divine

nature, and yet is filled not with anxiety about its poor self, but

with care, love and sympathy for those who have been constituted its

charge?

When he was thus separated from communication with his Churches, St.

John was already dead in some sense to the world. The Apocalypse was to

be, as it were, his last testament, transmitted to the Asian Churches

from his seclusion when opportunity served, like a voice coming to them

from the other world.

Those who can with sure and easy hand mark out the limits beyond which

the soul of man can never go, will be able to determine to their own

satisfaction how far St. John was mistaken, when he thought he heard

the Divine voice and listened to a message transmitted through him to

the Churches and to the Church as a whole. But those who have not

gauged so accurately and narrowly the range of the human soul will not

attempt the task. They will recognise that there is in these letters a

tone and a power above the mere human level, and will confess that the

ordinary man is unable to keep pace with the movement of this writer.

It is admitted that the letters reveal to us the character and the

experiences of the writer, and that they spring out of his own nature.

But what was his nature? How far can man rise above the human level?

How far can man understand the will and judgment of God? We lesser men

who have not the omniscient confidence of the critical pedant, do not

presume to fix the limits beyond which St. John could not go.

But we know that from the Apocalypse we have this gain, at least.

Through the study of it we are able in a vague and dim way to

understand how that long drawn-out living death in Patmos was the

necessary training through which he must pass who should write the

Fourth Gospel. In no other way could man rise to that superhuman level,

on which the Fourth Gospel is pitched, and be able to gaze with steady

unwavering eyes on the eternal and the Divine and to remain so

unconscious of the ephemeral world. And they who strive really to

understand the education of Patmos will be able to understand the

strangest and most apparently incredible fact about the New Testament,

how the John who is set before us in the Synoptic Gospels could ever

write the Fourth Gospel.

The Revelation, which was composed in the circumstances above

described, must have been slow in taking form. It was not the vision of

a day; it embodied the contemplation and the insight of years. But its

point of view is the moment when the Apostle was snatched from the

world and sent into banishment. After that he knew nothing; his living

entombment began then; and if the Revelation is quoted as an historical

authority about the Province, its evidence applies only to the period

which he knew.

At last there came the assassination of the tyrant, the annulling of

all his acts, and the strong reaction against his whole policy. The

Christians profited by this. The persecution, though not first

instituted by him, was closely connected with his name and his ideas,

and was discredited and made unpopular by the association. For a time

it was in abeyance.

In particular, the exile pronounced against St. John was apparently an

act of the Emperor, and ceased to be valid when his acts were declared

invalid. The Apostle was now free to return to Asia. He may have

brought the Apocalypse with him. More probably an opportunity had been

found of sending it already. But it reached the Churches, and began to

be effective among them, in the latter part of Domitian's reign; and

hence Irenaeus says it was written at that time. But while his account

is to be regarded as literally true, yet the composition was long and

slow, and the point of view is placed at the beginning of the exile.

There grew up later the belief that his exile had only been short; and

that he was banished about two years before the end of Domitian's

reign. But this seems to rest on no early or good evidence: all that

can be reckoned as reasonably certain (so far as certainty can be

predicated of a time so remote and so obscure) is that St. John was

banished to Patmos and returned at the death of Domitian.

Antoninus Pius (138-161), indeed, laid down the rule that criminals

might be released from this penalty after ten years on account of

ill-health or old age, if relatives took charge of them. But this

amelioration cannot be supposed to have been allowed in the Flavian

time for an obscure Christian. No other end for the punishment of St.

John seems possible except the fall of Domitian; and in that case he

must have been exiled by Domitian, for if he had been condemned by

another Emperor, his fate would not have been affected by the annulment

of Domitian's acts.

There arose also in that later time a misconception as to the character

of the Flavian persecution. It was regarded as an act of Domitian

alone, and was supposed to be, like all the other persecutions except

the last, a brief but intense outburst of cruelty: this misconception

took form before the last persecution, and was determined by the

analogy of all the others.

But the Flavian persecution was not a temporary flaming forth of

cruelty: it was a steady, uniform application of a deliberately chosen

and unvarying policy, a policy arrived at after careful consideration,

and settled for the permanent future conduct of the entire

administration. It was to be independent of circumstances and the

inclination of individuals. The Christians were to be annihilated, as

the Druids had been; and both those instances of intolerance were due

to the same cause, not religious but political, viz., the belief that

each of them endangered the unity of the Empire and the safety of the

Imperial rule. Domitian was not a mere capricious tyrant. He was an

able, but gloomy and suspicious, ruler. He applied with ruthless logic

the principle which had apparently been laid down by his father

Vespasian, and which was confirmed a few years later by Trajan. But the

more genial character of Vespasian interfered in practice with the

thorough execution of the principle which he had laid down; and the

clear insight of Trajan recognised that in carrying it out methods were

required which would be inconsistent with the humaner spirit of his

age, and he forbade those excesses, while he approved the principle.

But the intellect of Domitian perceived that the proscription of the

Christians was simply the application of the essential principles of

Roman Imperialism, and no geniality or humanity prevented him from

putting it logically and thoroughly into execution. His ability, his

power to grasp general principles, and his narrow intensity of nature

in putting his principles into action, may be gathered from his

portrait, Fig. 5, taken from one of his coins.

Figure 5

Figure 5: Domitian the persecutor
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Chapter 9: The Flavian Persecution in the Province of Asia as Depicted in the

Apocalypse

The shadow of the Roman Empire broods over the whole of the Apocalypse.

Not merely are the Empire and the Emperors and the Imperial city

introduced explicitly and by more or less clear descriptions among the

figures that bulk most largely in the Visions: an even more important,

though less apparent, feature of the book is that many incidental

expressions would be taken by the Asian readers as referring to the

Empire. Their minds were filled with the greatness, the majesty, the

all-powerful and irresistible character of the Roman rule; and, with

this thought in their minds, they inevitably interpreted every allusion

to worldly dignity and might as referring to Rome, unless it were at

the outset indicated by some marked feature as not Roman. One such

exception is the Horseman of 6:1, who rides forth accompanied by

Bloodshed, Scarcity and Death: he is marked by the bow that he carries

as the Parthian terror (chapter 6, Figs. 1, 3), which always loomed on

the eastern horizon as a possible source of invasion with its

concomitant trials.

Those incidental allusions can be brought out only by a detailed study

and scrutiny of the Apocalypse, sentence by sentence. But it will

facilitate the understanding of the Seven Letters to notice here

briefly the chief figures under which the power of Rome appears in the

Apocalypse. Some of these are quite correctly explained by most modern

commentators; but one at least is still rather obscure. Almost every

interpreter rightly explains the Dragon of 12:3ff, the Beast of 13:1ff,

and the Woman of 17:3ff; but the monster in 13:18ff is not quite

properly explained, and this is the one that most intimately concerns

the purpose of the present work.

The Dragon of 12:1, the supreme power of evil, acts through the force

of the Empire, when he waited to devour the child of the Woman and

persecuted the Woman and proceeded to make war on the rest of her seed;

and his heads and his horns are the Imperial instruments by whom he

carries on war and persecution. The Beast of 13:1, with his ten

diademed horns and the blasphemous names on his seven heads, is the

Imperial government with its diademed Emperors and its temples

dedicated to human beings blasphemously styled by Divine names.

The Woman of 17:1, sitting on a scarlet-coloured beast with seven heads

and ten horns and names of blasphemy, decked in splendour and lapped in

luxury and drunk with the blood of the saints and the blood of the

martyrs, is the Imperial city, which attracted to her allurements and

her pomp the kings of the nations, the rich and distinguished men from

all parts of the civilised world. The term "kings" was commonly used in

the social speech of that period to indicate the wealthy and luxurious.

The kings of the client-states in Asia Minor and Syria, also, visited

Rome from time to time. Epiphanes of Cilicia Tracheia was there in A.D.

69, and took part in the Civil War on the side of Otho.

To Rome go the saints and the martyrs to be tormented, that the woman

and her guests may be amused on festivals and State occasions. She sits

upon the Imperial monster, the beast with its heads and its horns and

its blasphemous names and its purple or scarlet hue (for the ancient

names of colours pass into one another with little distinction),

because Rome had been raised higher than ever before by the Imperial

government. Yet the same Beast and the ten horns, by which she is

exalted so high, shall hate her, and shall make her desolate and naked,

and shall eat her flesh, and shall burn her utterly with fire: for the

Emperors were no true friends to Rome, they feared it, and therefore

hated it, curtailed its liberties, deprived it of all its power,

murdered its citizens and all its leading men, wished (like Caligula)

that the whole Roman People had one single neck, and (like Nero) burned

the city to the ground.

In a more veiled, and yet a clearly marked way the Province Asia

appears as a figure in the Vision. It must be understood, however, what

"the Province" was in the Roman system and the popular conception. The

Province was not a tract of land subjected to Rome: as a definite tract

of the earth "Asia" originally had no existence except in the sense of

the whole vast continent, which is still known under that name. A

"Province" to the Roman mind meant literally "a sphere of duty," and

was an administrative, not a geographical, fact: the Province of a

magistrate might be the stating of law in Rome, or the superintendence

of a great road, or the administration of a region or district of the

world; but it was not and could not be (except in a loose and

derivative way) a tract of country. From the Asian point of view the

Province was the aspect in which Rome manifested itself to the people

of Asia. Conversely, the Province was the form under which the people

of Asia constituted a part of the Empire.

Rome appeared to the Asians in a double aspect, and so the Province had

a double character, i.e. two horns.

In the first place the Province of Asia was the entire circle of

administrative duties connected with that division of the Empire, which

stood before the minds of the people of Asia (and among them of the

writer of the Apocalypse) as the whole body of officials, who conducted

the administration, especially the Senate in Rome acting through its

chosen agent on the spot, the individual Senator whom the rest of the

Senate delegated to represent it and to administer its power in Asia

for the period of a year, residing in official state as Proconsul in

the capital or making his official progress through the principal

cities.

In the second place the Province was the whole circle of religious

duties and rites, which constituted the ideal bond of unity holding the

people of Asia together as a part of the Imperial realm; and this

ritual was expressed to the Asian mind by the representative priests,

constituting the Commune (or, as it might almost be called, the

Parliament) of Asia: the one representative body that spoke for the

"Nation," i.e. the Province, Asia.

Again, the Province meant the status which a certain body of persons

and cities occupied in the Roman Empire. They possessed certain

privileges in the Empire, in virtue of being provincials, and their

rights and duties were determined by "the Law of the Province," which

was drawn up to regulate the admission of the Province in the Empire.

Thus, e.g., a Phrygian occupied a place in the Empire, not as a

Phrygian, but as an Asian or a Galatian (according as he belonged to

the Asian or the Galatian part of Phrygia). A Phrygian was a member of

a foreign conquered race. An Asian or a Galatian was a unit in the

Empire, with less privileges indeed than a Roman Citizen, but still

honoured with certain rights and duties. These rights and duties were

partly civil and partly religious: as an Asian, he must both act and

feel as part of the Empire--he must do certain duties and feel certain

emotions of loyalty and patriotism--loyalty and patriotism were

expressed through the Provincial religion, i.e. the State cult of the

majesty of Rome and of the Emperor, regulated by the Commune.

The Province of Asia in its double aspect of civil and religious

administration, the Proconsul and the Commune, is symbolised by the

monster described 13:11ff. This monster had two horns corresponding to

this double aspect; and it was like unto a lamb, for Asia was a

peaceful country, where no army was needed. Yet it spake as a dragon,

for the power of Rome expressed itself quite as sternly and haughtily,

when it was unsupported by troops, as it did when it spoke through the

mouth of a general at the head of an army.

The monster exerciseth all the authority of the first Beast in his

sight; for the provincial administration exercised the full authority

of the Roman Empire, delegated to the Proconsul for his year of office.

It maketh the earth and all that dwell therein to worship the first

Beast, for the provincial administration organised the State religion

of the Emperors. The Imperial regulation that all loyal subjects must

conform to the State religion and take part in the Imperial ritual, was

carried out according to the regulations framed by the Commune, which

arranged the ritual, superintended and directed its performance,

ordered the building of temples, and the erection of statues, fixed the

holidays and festivals, and so on--saying to them that dwell on the

earth that they should make an image to the Beast.

At this point occurs a remarkable series of statements, constituting

the one contemporary account of the Flavian persecution of the

Christians in Asia. They are to the effect that the Commune attempted

to prove the truth and power of the Imperial religion by means of

miracles and wonders: the monster "doeth great signs, that he should

even make fire to come down out of heaven upon the earth in the sight

of men; and he deceiveth them that dwell on the earth by reason of the

signs which it was given him to do in the sight of the Beast; saying to

them that dwell on the earth that they should make an image to the

Beast. And it was given him to give breath to the statue of the Beast,

that the statue of the Beast should both speak and cause that as many

as should not worship the statue of the Beast should be killed." The

last statement is familiar to us; it is not directly attested for the

Flavian period by pagan authorities, but it is proved by numerous

Christian authorities, and corroborated by known historical facts, and

by the interpretation which Trajan stated about twenty-five years later

of the principles of Imperial procedure in this department. It is

simply that straightforward enunciation of the rule as to the kind of

trial that should be given to those who were accused of Christianity.

The accused were required to prove their loyalty by performing an act

of religious worship of the statue of the Emperor, which (as Pliny

mentioned to Trajan) was brought into court in readiness for the test:

if they performed the ritual, they were acquitted and dismissed: if

they refused to perform it, they were condemned to death. No other

proof was sought; no investigation was made; no accusation of any

specific crime or misdeed was made, as had been the case in the

persecution of Nero, which is described by Tacitus. That short and

simple procedure was legal, prescribed by Imperial instructions, and

complete.

No scholar now doubts that the account given in these words of the

Apocalypse represents quite accurately the procedure in the Flavian

persecution. Criticism for a time attempted to discredit the unanimous

Christian testimony, because it was unsupported by direct pagan

testimony; and signally failed. The attempt is abandoned now.

Quite correct also is the statement that "the Province" ordered the

inhabitants of Asia to make a statue in honour of the Beast. The

Commune ordered the construction of statues of the Imperial gods, and

especially the statue of the Divine Augustus in the temple at Pergamum.

But the other statements in this remarkable passage are entirely

uncorroborated: not even indirect evidence supports them. It is nowhere

said or hinted, except in this passage, that the State cultus in Asia,

the most civilised and educated part of the Empire, recommended itself

by tricks and pseudo-miracles, such as bringing down fire from heaven

or making the Imperial image speak. With regard to these statements we

are reduced to mere general presumptions and estimate of probabilities.

Are we then to discredit them as inventions, or as mere repetitions of

traditional apocalyptic ideas and images, not really applicable to this

case? By no means. This is the one contemporary account that has been

preserved of the Flavian procedure: the one solitary account of the

methods practised then by the Commune in recommending and establishing

the State religion. It is thoroughly uncritical to accept from it two

details, which are known from other sources to be true, and to dismiss

the rest as untrue, because they are neither corroborated nor

contradicted by other authorities. This account stands alone: there is

no other authority: it is corroborated indirectly in the main facts.

The accessory details, therefore, are probably true: they are not

entirely unlikely, though it is rather a shock to us to find that such

conduct is attributed to the Commune in that highly civilised

age--highly civilised in many respects, but in some both decadent and

barbarous.

It must, also, be remembered that the people of the Province Asia were

not all equally educated and civilised: many of them had no Greek

education, but were sunk in ignorance and the grossest Oriental

superstition. There is no good reason apparent why this contemporary

account should be disbelieved; and we must accept it.

The attempt was made under the authority of the Commune, by one or more

of its delegates in charge of the various temples and the ritual

practised at them, to impress the populace with the might of the

Imperial divinity by showing signs and miracles, by causing fire to

burst forth without apparent cause, and declaring that it came down

from heaven, and by causing speech to seem to issue from the statue in

the temple. The writer accepts those signs as having really occurred:

the monster was permitted by God to perform those marvels, and to

delude men for a time. None of the details which this contemporary

account mentions is incredible or even improbable. A Roman Proconsul in

Cyprus had a Magian as his friend and teacher in science: the Magian

probably showed him the sign of spontaneous fire bursting forth at his

orders. In a Roman Colony at Philippi a ventriloquist, a slave girl,

earned large sums for her owners by fortune-telling (Acts 16:16). Why

should we refuse to believe that ventriloquism was employed in an Asian

temple at this time of excited feeling among both persecutors and

persecuted?

It is not necessary to suppose that the Commune of Asia encouraged and

practised everywhere such methods. It would be sufficient justification

for the statements in this passage, if the methods were practised by

any of its official representatives in any of the Asian temples of the

Imperial religion, without condemnation from the Commune. There is no

reason to think that the shrine of the Sibyl at Thyatira was alien to

such impostures, or that the people in Ephesus, who were impressed by

the magical powers of the sons of Sceva (Acts 19:13f) and duped by

other fraudulent exhibitors, were unlikely to be taken in by such arts,

when practised with official sanction.

That these marvels and signs were connected more particularly with one

individual, and not so much with the Commune as a body, is suggested by

the only other reference to them, vis. 19:20, when the Beast and the

kings of the earth and their armies gathered together to make ar

against Him that sat upon the horse and against His army; and the Beast

was taken, and with him the false prophet that wrought the signs in his

sight, wherewith he deceived them that had received the mark of the

Beast and them that worshipped his image. We must understand that these

words refer to some definite person, who exercised great influence in

some part of Asia and was the leading spirit in performing the marvels

and signs. He is as real as the prophetess of Thyatira, 2:20. He had

been prominent in deceiving the people for the benefit of the Imperial

government, and is associated with its approaching destruction. This

association in ruin would be all the more telling, if the prophet had

visited Rome and been received by some of the Flavian Emperors.

A personage like Apollonius of Tyana would suit well the allusions in

the Apocalypse. He lived and exercised great influence in Asia,

especially at Ephesus, where after his death he enjoyed a special cult

as "the averter of evil" (Alexikakos), because he had taught the city

how to free itself from a pestilence by detecting the human being under

whose form the disease was stalking about in their midst, and putting

to death the wretched old man on whom (like an African wizard smelling

out the criminal) he fixed the guilt.

Apollonius enjoyed widely the reputation of a magician. He had been

well received in Rome, and was the friend of Vespasian, Titus and

Nerva. His biographer Philostratus defends him from the charge of

magic, but represents him as a worker of signs and wonders; and it must

be remembered that St. John does not regard the prophet as an impostor,

but as one to whom it was given to perform marvels. Philostratus, it is

true, does not represent him as an upholder of the Imperial cultus, and

rather emphasises his opposition to Domitian; but the aim of the

biographer is not to give an exact history of Apollonius as he was, but

to place an ideal picture before the eyes of the world. There is every

reason to think that a man like Apollonius would use all his influence

in favour of Vespasian and Titus, and no reason to think that he would

discountenance or be unwilling to promote the Imperial cultus. While he

was opposed to Domitian, it does not appear that the mutual dislike had

come to a head early in the reign of that Emperor, when according to

our view the Apocalypse was written, though Philostratus represents

Apollonius as for seeing everything and knowing intuitively the

character of every man.

It seems, then, quite possible that Apollonius may actually be meant by

this prophet associated with the Beast; but, even if that be not

correct, yet it is certain that there were other magicians and workers

of wonders in the Asian cities; and it is in no way improbable that one

of them may have been employed as an agent, even as a high-priest, of

the Imperial religion. The over-stimulated, cultured yet morbid society

of the great cities of Asia Minor furnished a fertile soil for the

development of such soothsayers, fortune-tellers and dealers in magic:

Lucian's account of Alexander of Abonoteichos in Paphlagonia may be

taken as a good example in the second century. The existence of many

such impostors in the Province Asia during the first century is

attested, not merely by the passages already quoted from the Acts, but

also by an incident recorded by Philostratus in the biography of

Apollonius. The Asian cities by the Hellespont, dreading the recurrence

of earthquakes, contributed ten talents to certain Egyptians and

Chaldeans for a great sacrifice to avert the danger. Apollonius

encountered and drove away the impostors--the circumstances of the

contest are not recorded--discovered the reason why Earth and Sea were

angry, offered the proper expiatory sacrifices, averted the danger at a

small expense, and the earth stood fast.

The monster, who stands for the Province, is described s coming up out

of the earth. He is contrasted with the Beast which came up out of the

sea. They are thus described as native and as foreign: the one belongs

to the same land as the readers of the Apocalypse, the other comes from

across the sea, and seems to rise out of the sea as it comes. This form

of expression was usual, both in language and in art. Foreign products

and manufactures were described as "of the sea": we use "sea-borne" in

the same sense: the goddess who came in with the Phoenicians, as

patroness and protectress of the Sidonian ships, was represented as

"rising from the sea." Beings native to the country, or closely

connected with the earth, were represented in art as reclining on the

ground (e.g., river- or mountain-gods, as chapter 19, Figure 20), or

emerging with only half their figure out of the ground (as the goddess

of the earth in Figure 6).

Figure 6

Figure 6: The Earth Goddess giving the child Erysichthon to Athena

Thus the Beast was marked clearly to the readers having a home beyond

the sea, while the monster was closely connected with their own soil,

and had its home in their own country.

The monster causeth all, the small and the great, and the rich and the

poor, and the free and the bond, that there be given them a mark on

their right hand or upon their forehead; and that no man should be able

to buy or to sell, save he that hath the mark, the name of the Beast or

the number of his name.

This refers to some unknown, but (as will be shown) not in itself

improbable attempt, either through official regulation or informal

"boycott," to injure the Asian Christians by preventing dealings with

traders and shopkeepers who had not proved their loyalty to the

Emperor. That such an attempt may have been made in the Flavian

persecution seems quite possible. It is not described here as an

Imperial, but only as a provincial regulation; now it is absolutely

irreconcilable with the principles of Roman administration that the

Proconsul should have issued any order of the kind except with Imperial

authorisation; therefore we must regard this as a recommendation

originating from the Commune of Asia. The Commune would have no

authority to issue a command or law; but it might signalise its

devotion to the Emperor by recommending that the disloyal should be

discountenanced by the loyal, and that all loyal subjects should try to

restrict their custom to those who were of proved loyalty. Such a

recommendation might be made by a devoted and courtly body like the

Commune; and it was legal to do this, because all who refused to engage

in the public worship of the Emperors were proscribed by Imperial act

as traitors and outlaws, possessing no rights.

Only some enactment of this kind seems adequate to explain this

remarkable statement of 13:16f. In a very interesting section of his

Biblical Studies, p. 241f, Dr. Deissmann describes the official stamp

impressed on legal deeds recording and registering the sale of

property; and maintains that this whole passage takes its origin from

the custom of marking with the Imperial stamp all records of sale. This

seems an inadequate explanation. The mark of the Beast was a

preliminary condition, and none who wanted it were admitted to business

transactions. But the official stamp was merely the concomitant

guarantee of legality; it was devoid of religious character; and there

was no reason why it should not be used by Christians as freely as by

pagans.

That the mark of the Beast must be impressed in the right hand or the

forehead is a detail which remains obscure: we know too little to

explain it with certainty. If it had been called simply the mark on the

forehead, it might be regarded as the public proof of loyalty by

performance of the ritual: this overt, public proof might be

symbolically called "a mark on the forehead." But the mention of an

alternative place for the mark shows that a wider explanation is

needed. The proof of loyalty might be made in two ways; both were

patent and public; they are symbolically described as the mark on the

right hand or on the forehead; without one or the other no one was to

be dealt with by the loyal provincials.

That something like a "boycott" might be attempted in the fervour of

loyal hatred for the disloyal Christians seems not impossible. That

"strikes" occurred in the Asian cities seems established by an

inscription of Magnesia; and where "strikes" occur, an attempted

"boycott" seems also possible. But the character attributed to this

mark of the Beast extends far beyond the operation of a mere

restriction on trading transactions. It must be remembered that the age

was the extremest and worst period of "delation," i.e. of prosecution

by volunteer accusers on charges of treason. The most trifling or the

most serious actions were alike liable to be twisted into acts of

personal disrespect to the Emperor, and thus to expose the doer of them

to the extremest penalty of the law; a falsehood told, a theft

committed, a wrong word spoken, in the presence of any image or

representation of the Emperor, might be construed as disrespect to his

sacred majesty: even his bust on a coin constituted the locality an

abode of the Imperial god, and made it necessary for those who were

there to behave as in the Divine presence. Domitian carried the theory

of Imperial Divinity and the encouragement of "delation" to the most

extravagant point; and thereby caused a strong reaction in the

subsequent Imperial policy. Precisely in that time of extravagance

occurs this extravagant exaggeration of the Imperial theory: that in

one way or another every Asian must stamp himself overtly and visibly

as loyal, or be forthwith disqualified from participation in ordinary

social life and trading. How much of grim sarcasm, how much of literal

truth, how much of exaggeration, there lies in those words,--that no

man should be able to buy or sell, save he that hath the mark of the

Beast on his right hand or upon his forehead,--it is impossible for us

now to decide. It is probably safe to say that there lies in them a

good deal of sarcasm, combined with so much resemblance to the real

facts as should ensure the immediate comprehension of the readers. But

that there is an ideal truth in them, that thy give a picture of the

state of anxiety and apprehension, of fussy and over-zealous profession

of loyalty which the policy of Domitian was producing in the Roman

world, is certain.

This is the description given by St. John of the Flavian persecution.

It shows that persecution to have been an organised attempt to combine

many influences so as to exterminate the Christians, and not a mere

sporadic though stern repression such as occurred repeatedly during the

second century. But it is already certain that the Flavian persecution

was of that character. Trajan, while admitting the same principle of

State, that the Christians must be regarded as outlaws and treated like

brigands, deprived persecution of its worst characteristics by

forbidding the active search after Christians and requiring a formal

accusation by a definite accuser. Under the Flavian Emperors we see an

extremely cruel and bitter public movement against the Christians, an

attempt to enlist religious feeling on the side of the Empire, and a

zealous participation of the Asian provincial bodies, beginning from

the Commune, in the persecution as a proof of their loyalty.

A recent writer on this subject expresses doubt as to "the degree to

which the worship of the Emperor had become the normal test applied to

one accused of being a Christian." How any doubt can remain in face of

this passage, even were it alone, it is hard to see. It is difficult to

devise a more effective and conclusive declaration that the religion of

Christ and the religion of the Emperor were now explicitly and

professedly ranged against one another, and that the alternative

presented to every individual Christian was to "worship the image of

the Beast" or death.

It furnishes no argument against this view of the character of the

Flavian persecution that, during the persecutions of the second

century, no attempt seems to have been made actively to stimulate

religious feeling among the populace as an ally against the new

religion. The attempt was made in the last great persecution, during

the times of Diocletian and his successors. Then again the Imperial

government attempted to seek out and exterminate the Christians. It

"took advantage of and probably stimulated a philosophical religious

revival, characterised by strong anti-Christian feeling; and employed

for its own ends the power of a fervid emotion acting on men who were

often of high and strongly religious motives. Christianity had to deal

with a reinvigorated and desperate religion, educated and spiritualised

in the conflict with the Christians. The Acta of St. Theodotus of

Ancyra furnishes an instance of the way in which the devoted fanaticism

of such men made them convenient tools for carrying out the purposes of

the government; the approach of the new governor of Galatia and the

announcement of his intentions struck terror into the hearts of the

Christians; his name was Theotecnus, the child of God,' a by-name

assumed by a philosophic pagan reactionary in competition with the

confidence of the Christians in their Divine mission and the religious

names which their converts assumed at baptism." This description gives

some idea of the state of things in the Province Asia which prompted

the words of St. John. We need not doubt that Theotecnus and others

like him also made use of signs and marvels for their purposes.

Theotecnus seems to have been the author of the Acts of Pilate, an

attack on the Christian belief. A remarkable inscription found near

Acmonia in Phrygia is the epitaph of one of those pagan philosophic

zealots, not an official of the Empire, but a leading citizen and

priest in the Province. He is described in his epitaph as having

received the gift of prophecy from the gods. His very name Athanatos

Epitynchanos, son of Pius, Immortal Fortunate, son of Religious, quite

in the style of the Pilgrim's Progress, marks his character and part in

the drama of the time. His pretensions to prophetic gift were

supported, we may be sure, by signs and marvels.

Less is known about the second last persecution, 249-51 A.D., in which

Decius attempted in a similar way to seek out and exterminate the

Christians. But another inscription of Acmonia is the epitaph of a

relative, perhaps the grandfather or uncle of Athanatos Epitynchanos.

His name was Telesphoros, Consummator, and he was hierophant of a

religious association in Acmonia; and his wife and his sons

Epitynchanos and Epinikos (Victorious) made his grave in company with

the whole association. This document is a proof that a similar

religious pagan revival accompanied the persecution of Decius in

Acmonia; and Acmonia may be taken as a fair example of the provincial

spirit in the persecutions. It is evident that, in those great

persecutions, a strong public feeling against the Christians stimulated

the Emperors to action, and that the Emperors, in turn, tried to urge

on the religious feeling of the public into fanaticism, as an aid in

the extermination of the sectaries.

In the two last persecutions official certificates of loyalty were

issued to those who had complied with the law and taken part in the

ritual of the Imperial religion. These certificates form an apt

parallel to the "mark of the Beast," and prove that that phrase refers

to some real feature of the Flavian persecution in Asia.

Those three persecutions stand apart from all the rest in a class by

themselves. The intermediate Emperors shrank from thoroughly and

logically putting in practice the principle which they all recognised

in theory--that a Christian was necessarily disloyal and outlawed in

virtue of the name and confession. All three are characterised by the

same features and methods, which stand clearly revealed in the

Apocalypse for the first of them and in many documents for the last.

The analogy of the official certificates in the time of Diocletian

suggests that in the Flavian period the mark of the Beast on the right

hand may have been a similar official certificate of loyalty. A

provincial who was exposed to suspicion must carry in his hand such a

certificate, while one who was notoriously and conspicuously loyal

might be said to carry the mark on his forehead. In the figurative or

symbolic language of the Apocalypse hardly anything is called by its

ordinary and direct name, but things are indirectly alluded to under

some other name, and words have to be understood as implying something

else than their ordinary connotation; and therefore it seems a fair

inference that the mark on the forehead is the apocalyptic description

of a universal reputation for conspicuous devotion to the cult of the

Emperor.

The shadow of the Imperial religion lies deep over the whole book. But

the remarkable feature of the book--the feature which gave it its place

in the New Testament in spite of some undeniable defects, which for a

time made its place uncertain, and which still constitute a serious

difficulty in reading it as an authoritative expression of the

Christian spirit--is that the writer is never for a moment affected by

the shadow. He was himself a sufferer, not to death, but to what he

would feel as a worse fate: he was debarred from helping and advising

his Churches in the hour of trial. But there is no shadow of sorrow or

discouragement or anxiety as to the issue. The Apocalypse is a vision

of victory. The great Empire is already vanquished. It has done its

worst; and it has already failed. Not all the Christians have been

victors; but those who have deserted their ranks and dropped out of the

fight have done so from inner incapacity, and not because the

persecuting Emperor is stronger than they. Every battle fought to the

end is a defeat for the Empire and a Christian victory. Every effort

that the Emperor makes is only another opportunity for failing more

completely. The victory is not to gain: it already is. The Church is

the only reality in its city: the rest of the city is mere pretence and

sham. The Church is the city, heir to all its history and its glories,

heir too to its weaknesses and its difficulties and sometimes

succumbing to them.

The most dangerous kind of error that can be made about the Apocalypse

is to regard it as a literal statement and prediction of events. Thus,

for example 18:1-19:21 is not to be taken as a prophecy of the manner

in which, or the time at which, the downfall of the great Empire and of

the great City was to be accomplished; it is not to be understood as

foreshadowing the Papacy, according to the foolish imaginings,

"philosophy and vain deceit" as St. Paul would have called them (Col

2:8) of one modern school; it is not to be tortured by extremists on

any side into conformity with their pet hatreds. Those are all idle

fancies, which do harm to no one except those who waste their intellect

on them. But it becomes a serious evil when the magnificent confidence

and certainty of St. John as to the speedy accomplishment of all these

things is distorted into a declaration of the immediate Coming of the

Lord and the end of the world. Time was not an element in his

anticipation. He was gazing on the eternal, in which time has no

existence. Had any Asian reader asked him at what time these things

should be accomplished, he would assuredly have answered in the spirit

of Browning's Grammarian:--

What's time? Leave "now" to dogs and apes;

Man has forever.

Moreover, it is declared in the plainest language which the Apocalypse

admits that the series of the Emperors is to continue yet for a season.

The Beast himself is the eighth king (i.e. Emperor, according to the

strict technical usage of the Greek word): he is the incarnation and

climax of the whole seven that precede: he is Domitian himself as the

visible present embodiment of the Imperial system. But the beast has

also ten horns: these are ten Emperors, which have not been invested

with Imperial power as yet; but they receive authority as Emperors with

the Beast (i.e. as units in the Imperial system) for one hour: these

shall war against the Lamb, and the Lamb shall overcome them: 17:12,

14.

The number ten is here to be interpreted as in 2:10, where the Church

of Smyrna is to be exposed to persecution for ten days. It merely

denotes a finite number as contrasted with infinity: the series of

Emperors is limited and comes to an end in due season. Rome shall

perish. In one sense Rome is perishing now in every failure that it

makes, in the victory of every martyr. The Beast was and is not. In

another sense the end is not yet. But there is an end. The power of

every Emperor is for one hour: he shall live his little span of pomp

and pride, of power and failure, and he shall go down to the abyss,

like his predecessors.

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

Chapter 10: The Province of Asia and the Imperial Religion

The Roman Province of Asia included most of the western half of Asia

Minor, with the countries or regions of Caria, Lydia, Phrygia, Mysia,

and the coast-lands of the Troad, Aeolis and Ionia. It was the earliest

Roman possession on the continent of Asia. Conquered by the Romans in

the war against Antiochus the Great, it was given by them to their ally

Eumenes, King of Pergamum, at the peace which was concluded in 189

B.C.; and in 133 B.C. it was bequeathed by his nephew and adopted son

Attalus III to the great conquering people. The real existence of this

will, formerly suspected to be a mere invention of the Romans, is now

established by definite testimony. The King knew that the illegitimate

Aristonicus would claim the Kingdom, and that there was no way of

barring him out except through the strength of Rome.

Thus Asia had been a Roman Province for more than two hundred years

when the Seven Letters were written. Its history under Roman rule had

been chequered. It was the wealthiest region of the whole Roman Empire,

and was therefore peculiarly tempting to the greed of the average Roman

official. Amid the misgovernment and rapacity that attended the last

years of the Republic, Asia suffered terribly. The Asiatics possessed

money; and the ordinary Roman, whose characteristic faults were greed

and cruelty, shrank from no crime in order to enrich himself quickly

during his short tenure of office in the richest region of the world.

Hence the Province welcomed with the enthusiasm of people brought back

from death to life the advent of the Empire, which inaugurated an era

of comparative peace, order, and respect for property. In no part of

the world, probably, was there such fervent and sincere loyalty to the

Emperors as in Asia. Augustus had been a saviour to the Asian peoples,

and they deified him as the Saviour of mankind, and worshipped him with

the most whole-hearted devotion as the God incarnate in human form, the

"present deity." He alone stood between them and death or a life of

misery and torture. They hailed the birthday of Augustus as the

beginning of a new year, and worshipped the incarnate God in public and

in private.

In order to understand rightly the position of Christianity in Asia and

the spirit of the Seven Asian Letters, it is necessary to conceive

clearly the means whereby the Imperial policy sought to unify and

consolidate the Province. There can be little doubt that several of the

features of Christianity were determined in Asia. Roman Provincial

unity, founded in a common religion, was the strongest idea in Asia,

and it must inevitably influence, whether directly or through the

recoil from and opposition to it, the growth of such an organisation as

the Church in Asia, for the Christian Church from the beginning

recognised the political facts of the time and accommodated itself to

them.

Meetings of representatives of the Asian cities were held at least as

early as 95 B.C., and probably date from the time of the Pergamenian

kings. Doubtless the kings tried to make their kingdom a real unity,

with a common feeling and patriotism, and not merely an agglomeration

of parts tied together under compulsion and external authority; and, if

so, they could attain this end only by instituting a common worship. In

the case of the Asian Commune a Pergamenian origin seems proved by the

name of the representatives in the official formula "it seemed good to

the Hellenes in Asia." It appears improbable that an assembly which had

been formed by the Romans for diffusing Roman ideas would have borne

officially the name of "the Hellenes in Asia." But the Pergamenian

kings counted themselves the champions of Hellenism against Asiatic

barbarism; and their partisans in the cities were "the Hellenes."

Such common cults had always the same origin, viz., in an agreement

among the persons or cities concerned to unite for certain purposes,

and to make certain deities witnesses and patrons of their union. Thus

every treaty between two cities had its religious side, and involved

the common performance of rites by representatives of both sides: these

rites might be performed either to the patron gods of the two cities

(which was usual), or to some god or gods chosen by common consent. The

same process was applied when a larger body of cities agreed (of course

first of all by negotiations and treaty) to form a union. Every such

union of cities had its religious side and its religious sanction in

rites performed by representatives of all the cities. These

representatives, as being chosen to perform a religious duty, were

priests of the common worship.

It is an easy step, though not a necessary one, to institute also city

temples of the same worship, so that the city may itself carry on the

same ritual on its own behalf. All that is necessary for the common

worship is one sacred place where the meetings can be held.

In the Pergamenian time the common cult was probably the worship of the

typically Pergamenian deities (whose worship also spread to some of the

Asia cities, as is pointed out later). The policy of Rome allowed free

play to this religion, as it always did to any social institution which

was not disloyal and dangerous. But the Asian assembly soon began to

imitate the example set by Smyrna in 195 B.C. of worshipping the power

of Rome; and from 95 B.C. onwards there occur cases of Asian cults of

beneficent Roman officers (Scaevola, Q. Cicero, etc.), as well as of

similar municipal cults. Such an Asian cult could be instituted only by

an assembly of representatives of the Asian cities, and the old

Pergamenian institution thus served a Roman purpose. The name Commune

occurs first in a letter sent by M. Antony in 33 B.C. to "the Commune

of the Hellenes of Asia"; the older references give various names,

implying always an assembly of Asian representatives. It was Augustus

who constituted the Commune finally, using its loyalty to Rome and

himself for an Imperial end.

In that agglomeration of various countries and nations, differing in

race and in speech, the one deep-seated unifying feeling arose from the

common relation in which all stood to the Emperor and to Rome. There

was nothing else to hold the Province together in a unity except the

enthusiastic loyalty which all felt to the Roman Imperial government.

There was not then in any of the races that inhabited the Province a

strong national feeling to run counter to the Roman loyalty. It does

not appear that Lydian or Phrygian patriotism and national feeling had

much power during the first two centuries of the Province.

Circumstances had long been such that national patriotic feeling could

hardly be called into existence. There was plenty of strong feeling and

true loyalty among the inhabitants of each city towards their own city.

But Greek life and the Greek spirit, while favourable to the growth of

that municipal feeling, did not encourage a wider loyalty. It remained

for the Roman organisation and unifying power to widen the range of

loyalty; and the first important stage in this process came through

that intense personal devotion to Augustus as the Saviour of the

civilised world and bearer of the Majesty of Rome.

In the condition of human thought and religious conceptions that then

prevailed, such an intense feeling must take a religious form. Whatever

deeply affected the minds of a body of men, few or many, inevitably

assumed a religious character. No union or association of any kind was

then possible except in a common religion, whose ritual expressed the

common feelings and purpose. Thus the growth of an Asian Provincial

religion of Rome and the Emperor was natural.

The Imperial policy took advantage of this natural growth, guided it,

and regulated it, but did not call it into existence. Augustus at first

rather discouraged it--doubtless because he dreaded lest its

anti-republican character might offend Roman sentiment. But it was too

strong for him; and after a time he perceived the advantages that it

offered, and proceeded to utilise it as a political device, binding

together the whole Province in a common religious ceremonial, and a

common strong feeling. The one and only Asian unity was the Imperial

cult. It was directed and elaborated by the Commune or Common Council

of Asia, a body which seems to have had more of the "representative"

character than any other institution of ancient times, and thus was the

prototype of a Parliament. Asia was divided into districts, apparently,

and a certain number of cities had the title of metropolis; but the

details regarding the representation of the districts or the metropoles

in the Commune are unknown.

The relation of the Christian organisation in Asia to the Commune, or

rather to the tendency towards consolidation which took an Imperial

form in the Commune, is brought out in striking relief by several

facts. The Commune was the common assembly of the Hellenes of Asia. The

tendency towards consolidation was a fact of Hellenism, not of the

native Anatolian spirit. Now it has been elsewhere shown that

Christianity was at first far more strenuously opposed to the native

spirit than to the Hellenic. The one reference to the Commune in the

New Testament outside of the Apocalypse is in Acts 19:31, where certain

members of that body, "chief officers of Asia," are mentioned as

friends of St. Paul, and took his side against the mob of worshippers

of Ephesian Artemis, a typically Anatolian goddess.

Again Christianity in Asia expressed itself in Greek, not in any of the

native languages. Although the majority, probably, of the people of

Phrygia spoke the Phrygian language and a large number of them were

entirely ignorant of Greek in the first century, yet there is no

evidence and no probability that Christianity ever addressed itself to

them in Phrygian. St. Paul avoided Phrygia, with the exception of the

two cities in the Phrygian Region of the Roman Province Galatia, viz.,

Antioch and Iconium (Acts 16:6). The Church in Asia was Greek-speaking,

and had become, by the fourth century, the most powerful agent in

making a knowledge of Greek almost universal, even in the rural parts

of the Province. The Greek character of the entire Church in its

earlier stages--for even the Church in Rome was mainly Greek in

language until the middle of the second century--was chiefly determined

by the character of the Province Asia. The relation of the Province to

the Greek language therefore needs and deserves attention.

The Province of Asia included the most civilised and educated regions

of the Asiatic continent, ancient and famous Greek cities like Cyme,

Colophon and Miletus, the realms of former lines of monarchs like the

Lydian kings at Sardis, the Attalid kings at Pergamum, and the Carian

kings at Halicarnassus. It was the most thoroughly Hellenised part of

all Anatolia or Asia Minor. The native languages had died out in its

western parts, and been replaced by Greek; Lydian had ceased to be

spoken or known in Lydia, when Strabo wrote about A.D. 20; Carian was

then probably unknown in the western parts of Caria, though the central

and eastern districts were not so far advanced. Mysia, the northwestern

region of the Province, was probably in a similar condition to Caria,

the west and the coasts entirely Greek-speaking, the inner parts less

advanced. Most thoroughly Anatolian in character, and least affected by

Greek civilisation, was Phrygia. West Phrygia and especially the parts

adjoining Lydia were most affected by Hellenism; whereas in the centre

and east the Greek language seems to have been hardly known outside the

great cities until the late second or the third century after Christ.

Even in the western parts, it is proved that in the rustic and rough

region of Motella, not far from the Lydian frontier, Greek was strange

to many of the country people at least as late as the second century.

In the extreme southwest of Phrygia, in the district of Cibyra, Strabo

mentions that four languages were spoken in the first century, viz.,

Greek, Pisidian, Solymian and Lydian. The last had died out in Lydia,

but survived in the speech of a body of Lydian colonists in Cibyra,

just as Gaelic is more widely preserved and more exclusively spoken in

parts of Canada today than it is in the Highlands of Scotland.

But the great cities of the Province Asia (as distinguished from the

rural parts), except a few of the most backward Phrygian towns, were

pretty thoroughly Greek in the first century after Christ; and

everywhere throughout the Province all education was Greek, and there

was probably no writing except in Greek. It seems to have been only in

the second century that the native Anatolian feeling revived, and

writing began to be practised in the native tongues; at least all

inscriptions in the Phrygian language (except those of the ancient

kingdom, before the Persian conquest) seem to be later than about A.D.

150.

Religion, too, was in outward appearance Hellenised in the cities; and

the Anatolian deities were there commonly called by Greek names. But

this was only a superficial appearance; the ritual and the character of

the religion continued Anatolian even in the cities, while in the rural

districts there was not even an outward show of Hellenisation.

Thus, in the Province Asia, there was a great mixture of language,

manners and religion. Apart form the Roman unity, the various nations

were as far from being really uniform in character and customs and

thought, as they were from being one in blood. The Imperial Government

did not attempt to compel the various peoples to use Latin or any

common language: it did not try to force Roman law or habits and ways

on the Province, still less to uproot the Greek civilisation. It was

content to leave the half-Greek or Graeco-Asiatic law and civilisation

of Asia undisturbed. But it discouraged the national distinctions and

languages; it recognised Greek, but not Phrygian or Pisidian or Carian;

it tried to make a unified Graeco-Roman Asia Provincia out of that

agglomeration of countries. The attempt failed ultimately; but it was

made; it was the ruling feature of administration in the first century;

and the whole trend of Roman feeling and loyalty in all the provinces

of Asia Minor during the first century was in favour of the Provincial

idea and against the old national divisions. The term which Strabo uses

to represent in Greek the Latin Asia Provincia expressed the true Roman

point of view. He speaks of the Province as "the nation of Asia": i.e.,

the Roman Province took the place of any national divisions: loyalty

considered that there was only one nation in Asia, that the Province

was the nation.

As time went on and the past pre-Imperial miseries were forgotten, the

fervour of loyalty, which had for a time given some real strength to

the Imperial religion, began to cool down; and there was no longer

strength in it to hold the Province together, while there was a growth

in the strength of national feeling. Polemon the Sophist of the time of

Hadrian and Pius was called "the Phrygian," because he was born of a

Laodicean family; and when Ionians were using such a nickname,

Phrygians naturally began to retort by assuming it as a mark of pride.

It was Hadrian probably who saw that the Roman ideal was not strong

enough in itself without support from local and old national feeling;

and from his time onwards the Imperial policy ceased to be so hostile

to the old national distinctions. He did not try to break up the vast

Roman Provinces; but there are traces of an attempt to recognise

national divisions: e.g., the new Province of the Tres Eparchiae was

left in fact and name a loose aggregate of three countries, Cilicia,

Isauria, Lycaonia, which kept their national names and had probably

three distinct Communes or Councils. The union of Asia was already old;

but he tried to strengthen it in a way characteristic of ancient

feeling, viz., by giving it a support in Anatolian religion as well as

in the Imperial religion.

During the first century the State religion was simply the worship of

the Emperor or of Rome and the Emperor. But that was only a sham

religion, a matter of outward show and magnificent ceremonial. It was

almost devoid of power over the heart and will of man, when the first

strong sense of relief from misery had grown weak, because it was

utterly unable to satisfy the religious needs and cravings of human

nature. From a very early time there seems to have existed in the

Eastern Provinces a tendency to give more reality to this Imperial

religion by identifying the Divine Emperor with the local god, whatever

form the latter had: thus the religious feelings and habits of the

people in each district were associated to some extent with the

Imperial divinity and the State religion. Perhaps it was Domitian who

first saw clearly that the Imperial religion required to be reinforced

by enlisting in its service the deep-seated reverence of men for their

local god. In the second century the custom of associating the Emperor

with the local deity in a common religious ritual seems to have spread

much more widely, and the old tendency to make certain local gods into

gods of the Province became more marked. Under Hadrian a silver coinage

for the whole of Asia was struck with the types, not merely of the

Pergamenian temple of Augustus, but also of the Ephesian Diana, the two

Smyrnaean goddesses Nemesis, the Sardian Persephone, etc., thus giving

those deities a sort of Provincial standing. This class of coins was

struck under the authority of the Commune. But it was in the Flavian

persecution that this approximation between the native religions and

the Imperial worship began first to be important. This approximation

put an end to the hope, which St. Paul had cherished, that the conquest

of the Empire by the new faith might be accomplished peacefully. It now

became apparent that war was inevitable, and its first stage was the

Flavian persecution.

Figure 7

Figure 7: The Temple of Augustus at Pergamum. Coin of the Commune of

Asia

In Asia the Ephesian religion of Artemis was the only native cultus

which had by its own natural strength spread widely through the

Province. Before the Roman period the royal character of Pergamum had

given strength to its deities, especially Asklepios the Saviour and

Dionysos the Guide (Kathegemon). The latter was the royal god, and the

royal family was regarded as sprung from him, and the reigning king was

his representative and incarnation. Asklepios, on the other hand, was

the god of the city Pergamum. Hence in several cities even in distant

Phrygia the worship of those two deities was introduced; and after the

Roman period had begun, the respect felt for the capital of Asia was

expressed by paying honour to its god. This is very characteristic of

ancient feeling. The patron god is the representative of his city, just

as the angel in the Seven Letters stands for his Church. Municipal

patriotism was expressed by worshipping the god of the city; and other

parts of Asia recognised the superior rank of Pergamum by worshipping

Asklepios the Saviour.

Figure 8

Figure 8: Ephesus and Sardis represented by their goddesses

In Roman time, also, the natural advantages of Ephesus had full play.

Ephesus was brought into trading relations with many cities; many

strangers experienced the protection and prayed for the favour of the

Ephesian goddess. Thus, for example, she is recognised alongside of the

native god Zeus and the Pergamenian Asklepios in the last will and

testament of a citizen of Akmonia, dated A.D. 94. Many cities of Asia

made agreements with each other for mutual recognition of their cults

and festivals and common rights of all citizens of both cities at the

festivals; and such agreements were usually commemorated by striking

what are called "alliance-coins," on which the patron deities of the

two cities are represented side by side. The custom shows a certain

tendency in Asia towards an amalgamation and fusing of local religions;

and Ephesus concluded more "alliances" of this kind than any other city

of Asia. Hence in A.D. 56 the uneducated devotees of Artemis of Ephesus

spoke of their goddess, "whom all Asia and the civilised world

worshippeth."

The machinery of Roman government in the Province--the Proconsul (who

resided mostly in the official capital, though he landed and embarked

at Ephesus and often made a progress through the important cities of

the Province) and other officers--does not directly affect the Seven

Letters, and need not detain us.

More important is the Provincial religious organisation, directed by

the Commune. The one original temple of the Asian cultus at Pergamum

was soon found insufficient to satisfy the demonstrative loyalty of the

Asians. Moreover, the jealous rivalry of other great cities made them

seek for similar distinctions. Asian temples were built in Smyrna

(Tiberius), Ephesus, Sardis, etc. Each temple was a meeting-place of

the Commune; and where the Commune met, games "common to Asia" were

celebrated (such as those at which Polycarp suffered in Smyrna). The

Commune was essentially a body charged with religious duties, but

religion was closely interwoven with civil affairs, and the Commune had

other work: it had control of certain revenues, and must therefore have

had an annual budget, it struck coins, etc.

The most interesting side of Imperial history is the growth of ideas,

which have been more fully developed later. Universal citizenship,

universal religion, a universal Church, were ideas which the Empire was

slowly, sometimes quite unconsciously, working out or preparing for.

The Commune contained the germ on one side of a Parliament of

representatives, on another side of a religious hierarchy.

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

Chapter 11: The Cities of Asia as Meeting-Places of the Greek and the Asiatic

Spirit

The marked and peculiar character of the society and population of the

great Asian cities, amid which the local Churches were built up, is

present in the writer's mind throughout the Seven Letters; and it is

necessary to form some conception of this subject. Disregarding

differences, we shall try to describe briefly the chief forces which

had been at work in those cities during the last three centuries, and

the prominent features that were common to them all about A.D. 90. Some

of them were ancient Greek colonies, like Smyrna and Ephesus, some were

old Anatolian cities, like Pergamum and Sardis; but all these had

recently experienced great changes, and many new cities, like Laodicea,

Philadelphia, Thyatira, had been founded by the kings.

The successors of Alexander the Great were Greek kings, ruling Oriental

lands and peoples. To maintain their hold on their dominions it was

necessary to build up a suitable organisation in the countries over

which they ruled. Their method everywhere was similar: it was to make

cities that should be at once garrisons to dominate the country and

centres of Graeco-Asiatic manners and education, which the kings were

desirous of spreading among their Oriental subjects. The rather

pedantic adjective Graeco-Asiatic is used to describe the form which

Greek civilisation was forced to assume, as it attempted to establish

itself in Oriental lands: it did not merely change the cities, it was

itself much altered in the attempt. Sometimes those kings founded new

cities, where previously there seem to have been only villages.

Sometimes they introduced an accession of population and change of

constitution in already existing cities, a process which may be

described as re-founding. In both cases alike a new name, connected

with the dynasty, was almost invariably substituted for the previous

name of the village or city, though in many cases the old name soon

revived, e.g., in Ephesus and in Tarsus. Commonest among them were the

Seleucid names Antioch and Laodicea, and the Macedonian Alexandria.

The new population consisted generally of colonists brought from

foreign countries, who were considered intruders and naturally not much

liked by the older population. The colonists were granted property and

privileges in their new cities; and they knew that the continuance of

their fortunes and rights depended on the permanence of the royal

government which had introduced them. Thus those strangers constituted

a loyal garrison in every city where they had been planted. With them

were associated in loyalty the whole party that favoured the royal

policy, or hoped to profit by it. It would appear that these

constituted a powerful combination in the cities. They were in general

the active, energetic, and dominating party.

How important in the New Testament writings those Asian foundations of

the Greek kings were, is brought out very clearly by a glance over the

list of cities. Laodicea and Thyatira were founded or refounded by

Seleucid kings: the Ionian Greek cities in general were profoundly

modified by them. Ephesus, Smyrna, Troas, Pergamum and Philadelphia

were refounded by other Greek kings in the same period and under

similar circumstances.

Two classes of settlers were specially required and encouraged in the

Seleucid colonies. In the first place, of course, soldiers were needed.

These were found chiefly among the mercenaries of many nations--but

mostly of northern race, Macedonians, Thracians, etc.--who made up the

strength of the Seleucid armies. The harsh, illiterate, selfish,

domineering tone of those soldier-citizens was often satirised by the

Greek writers of the third and second centuries before Christ, who

delighted to paint them as braggarts, cowards at heart, boasting of

false exploits; and the boastful soldier, the creation of Greek wit and

malice, has been perpetuated since that time on the Roman and the

Elizabethan stage in traits essentially the same.

But the Greek kings knew well that soldiers alone were not enough to

establish their cities on a permanent basis. Other colonists were

needed, able to manage, to lead, to train the rude Oriental peasantry

in the arts on which civilised life must rest, to organise and utilise

their labour and create a commercial system. The experience of the

present day in the cities of the east Mediterranean lands shows where

such colonists could best be found. They were Greeks and Jews. Nowadays

Armenians also would be available; but at that time Armenia had hardly

come within reach of even the most elementary civilisation. Only among

the Greeks and the Jews was there that familiarity with ideals, that

power and habit of thinking for themselves and of working for a future

and remote end, which the kings needed in their colonists. Modern

students do not as a rule conceive the Jews as an educated race, and

some can hardly find language strong enough to describe their

narrowness and deadness of intellect. But when compared with the races

that surrounded them, the Greeks excepted, the Jews stood on a far

higher intellectual platform: they knew one book (or, rather, one

collection of books) well, and it was a liberal education to them.

One might hardly expect to find that the Greeks were loyal subjects of

Seleucid kings. They were apt to be democratic and unruly; but it is as

true of ancient as it is of modern times that the Greeks are "better

and more prosperous under almost any other government than they are

under their own." They accommodated themselves with their usual

dexterity and pliancy to their position; and circumstances, as we have

seen, made them dependent on the kings. The stagnant and unprogressive

Oriental party looked askance at and disliked the Greek element; and

the latter must regard the kings as their champions, even though the

Seleucid kings were far too autocratic and too strongly tinged with the

Oriental fashions for the Greek colonists to feel in thorough sympathy

with them. But settlers and kings alike had the common interest that

they must dominate the uneducated mass of the ancient population. Thus

the constitution of the new cities was a compromise, a sort of limited

monarchy, where democratic freedom and autocratic rule tempered and

restrained each other; and the result was distinctly favourable to the

development and prosperity of the cities.

It may seem even stranger that the Jews should be found by Seleucid

kings their best and most loyal subjects outside of Palestine, for

those kings were considered by the Jews of Palestine to be the most

deadly enemies of their race and religion. But the Jew outside of

Palestine was a different person and differently situated from the Jew

in his own land. Abroad he was resigned to accept the government of the

land in which he lived, and to make the best of it; and he found that

loyalty was by far the best policy. He could be useful to the

government; and the government was eager to profit by and ready to

reward his loyalty. Thus their interest were identical. Moreover, the

Jewish colonies planted by the Seleucid kings in Asia Minor and Cilicia

were all older than the Maccabean rising, when the Jewish hatred for

the Seleucid kings came to a head.

Their moral scruples divided the Jews from their neighbours in the

cities, and thereby made them all the more sensible of the fact that it

was the royal favour which maintained them safe and privileged in the

places where they lived as citizens. In Palestine their ritual kept the

Jews aloof from and hostile to the Seleucid kings, and fed their

national aspirations. But in the Graeco-Asiatic cities their ritual

actually bound them more closely to the king's service.

Through similar causes, at a later time, the Jews in Palestine hated

the Roman government and regarded it as the abominable thing, and they

were subdued only after many rebellions and the most stubborn

resistance. And yet, through that troubled period, the Jews outside

Palestine were loyal subjects of the Empire, distinguished by their

special attachment to the side of the Emperors against the old Roman

republican party.

Moreover, the Jews, an essentially Oriental race, found the strong

Oriental tinge in the policy of the Seleucid kings far more congenial

to them than the Greek colonists could do. The "grave Hebrew trader,"

if one may imitate the words of Matthew Arnold, was by nature

essentially opposed to "the young, light-hearted master of the wave."

Hence the Jewish settlers formed a counterpoise against the Greek

colonists in the Seleucid cities, and, wherever the Greek element

seemed too strong, the natural policy of the kings was to plant Jews in

the same city.

That remarkable shifting and mixing of races was, of course, not

produced simply by arbitrary acts of the Greek kings, violently

transporting population hither and thither at their caprice. The royal

policy was successful, because it was in accordance with the tendencies

of the time as described in chapter 1. The Graeco-Asiatic cities

between 300 and 100 B.C. were in process of natural growth through the

settling in them of strangers; and the strangers came for purposes of

trade, eager to make money. The kings interfered only to regulate and

to direct to their own advantage a process which they had not

originated and could not have prevented. What they did for those

strangers was to give them the fullest rights in the cities where they

settled. The strangers and their descendants would have always remained

aliens; but the kings made them citizens, gave them a voice in the

government and a position in the city as firm and influential as that

of the best, increased their numbers by assisting immigrants, and

presented them with lands.

Even the Jews, though introduced specially by the Seleucid kings, and

always most numerous in the Seleucid colonies, were spread throughout

the great cities of the Greek world, and especially in the chief

centres of trade and finance (as might be expected).

The result of that free mixture of races in the Graeco-Asiatic cities

was to stimulate a rapid and precocious development. There was great

ease of intercourse and freedom of trade, a settled and sound coinage

and monetary system, much commerce on a considerable scale, much

eagerness and opportunity to make money by large financial operations.

There was also a notable development on the intellectual side.

Curiosity was stimulated in the meeting of such diverse races. The

Oriental came into relations with the European spirit: each tried to

understand and to outwit the other.

Thus an amalgamation of Oriental and European races and intellect,

manners and law, was being worked out practically in the collision and

competition of such diverse elements. It was an experiment in a

direction that is often theorised about and discussed at the present

day. Can the east take on the western character? Can the Asiatic be

made like a European? In one sense that is impossible: in another sense

it was done in the Graeco-Asiatic cities, and can be done again. It was

done in them, not by Europeanising the Asiatic, but by profoundly

modifying both; each learned from the other; and that is the only

treatment of the problem that can ever be successful.

This great experiment in human development was conducted on a small

scale and in a thin soil, but as all the more precocious on that

account, and also the more short-lived. It was a hot-house growth,

produced in circumstances which were evanescent; and it was unnatural

and unhealthy.

The smallness of scale on which all Greek history was conducted is one

of its most remarkable features. In Greece proper, as contrasted with

the big countries and the large masses of modern nations, the scale was

quite minute. In the Graeco-Asiatic States the scale seemed much

greater; but development was really confined to a number of spots here

and there, showing only as dots on a map, small islets in the great sea

of stagnant, unruffled, immovable Orientalism. The Greek political and

social system demanded a small city as its scene, and broke down when

the attempt was made to apply it on a larger scale. But no more

stimulating environment to the intellect could be found than was

offered in the Graeco-Asiatic cities, and the scanty glimpses which we

get into the life of those cities reveal to us a very quick, restless,

intelligent society, keenly interested in a rather empty and shallow

kind of philosophic speculation, and almost utterly destitute of any

vivifying and invigorating ideal.

The interest and importance to us of this moment in society lies in the

fact that Pauline Christianity arose in it and worked upon it. In every

page of Paul's writings that restless, self-conceited, morbid,

unhealthy society stands out in strong relief before the reader. He

knew it so well, because he was born and brought up in its midst. He

conceived that his mission was to regenerate it, and the plan which he

saw to be the only possible one was to save the Jew from sinking down

to the pagan level by elevating the pagan to the true Jewish level. The

writer of the Seven Letters also, though a Jew from Palestine, had

learned to know the Asian cities by long residence.

The noblest feature of Greek city life was its zeal and provision for

education. The minute carefulness with which those Asian-Greek cities

legislated and provided for education--watching over the young, keeping

them from evil, graduating their physical and mental training to suit

their age, moving them on from stage to stage--rouses the deepest

admiration in the scholar who laboriously spells out and completes the

records on the broken stones on which they are written, and at the same

time convinces him how vain is mere law to produce any healthy

education. It is pathetic to think how poor was the result of all those

wise and beautiful provisions.

The literature of the age has almost utterly perished; but the

extremely scanty remains, along with the Roman imitations of it, do not

suggest that there was anything really great in it, though much

cleverness, brilliance, and sentimentality. Perhaps Theocritus, who

comes at the beginning of the age, might rank higher; but the great

master of bucolic poetry, the least natural form of poetic art, can

hardly escape the charge of artificiality and sentimentality. In the

realm of creative literature, the spirit of the age is to be compared

with that of the Restoration in England, and partakes of the same

deep-seated immorality.

The age was devoted to learning: it investigated antiquities, studied

the works of older Greek writers, commented on texts; and the character

of the time, in its poorness of fibre and shallowness of method, is

most clearly revealed in this department. It is hardly possible to find

any trace of insight or true knowledge in the fragments of this branch

of literature that have come down to us. Athenodorus of Tarsus was in

many respects a man of ability, courage, education, high ideas and

practical sense; but take a specimen of his history of his own city:

"Anchiale, daughter of Japetos, founded Anchiale (a city near Tarsus):

her son was Cydnus, who gave his name to the river at Tarsus: the son

of Cydnus was Parthenius, from whom the city was called Parthenia:

afterwards the name was changed to Tarsus." This habit of substituting

irrational "fables and endless genealogies" (1 Tim 1:4) for the attempt

really to understand nature and history was engrained in the spirit of

the time, and shows how superficial and unintelligent its learning was.

Out of it could come no real advance in knowledge, but only frivolous

argumentation and "questionings" (1 Tim 1:4).

Only in the department of moral philosophy did the age sometimes reach

a lofty level. A touch of Oriental sympathy with the Divine nature

enabled Athenodorus and others to express themselves with singular

dignity and beauty on the duty of man and his relation to God. But the

"endless genealogies" frequently obtruded themselves in their finest

speculations.

The Christian letters need to be constantly illustrated from the life

of those cities, and to be always read in the light of a careful study

of the society in them. It was, above all, the philosophical

speculation in which they excelled and delighted that Paul detested. He

saw serious danger in it. Not only was it useless and resultless in

itself, mere "empty deceit" (Col 2:8), but, far worse, it led directly

to superstition. Vain speculation, unable to support itself in its

lofty flight, unable to comprehend the real unity of the world in God,

invented for itself silly genealogies (1 Tim 1:4), in which nature and

creation were explained under the empty fiction of sonship, and a chain

of divine beings in successive generations was made and worshipped; and

human nature was humbly made subservient to these fictitious beings,

who were described as "angels" (Col 2:18ff).

This philosophical speculation cannot be properly conceived in its

historical development without bearing in mind the mixed population and

the collision of Jewish and Greek thought which belonged to those great

Graeco-Asiatic cities. It united Greek and Jewish elements in arbitrary

eclectic systems. The mixture of Greek and Jewish thought is far more

conspicuous in Asia Minor than in Europe. Hence there is not much trace

of it in the Corinthian letters (though some writers try to discover

it, and lay exaggerated stress on it): the Corinthian philosophers were

of a different kind. But in the cities of Asia, Phrygia, South Galatia,

and Cilicia--all along the great roads leading east and west across

Asia Minor--the minds of men were filled with crude attempts at

harmonising and mingling Oriental (especially Jewish) and Greek ideas.

Their attempts took many shapes, from mere vulgar magical formulae and

arts to the serious and lofty morality of Athenodorus the Tarsian in

his highest moments of philosophy.

When we think of the intellectual skill, the philosophic interest, and

the extreme cleverness of the age, we feel the inadequacy of those

arguments--or rather those unargued assertions--according to which the

Epistle to the Colossians reveals a stage of philosophic speculation,

as applied to Christian doctrines, so advanced that it could not have

been reached earlier than the second century. How long would it take

those clever and subtle philosophic inquirers in those cities to

achieve the slight feat of intellectual gymnastics presupposed in the

Epistle?

Such then was the motley population of the numerous Seleucid colonies

which were planted in Lydia, Phrygia, Pisidia, and Lycaonia during the

third century, and in Cilicia during the second century B.C. The

language of the settlers was Greek, the language of trade and

education; and it was through these cities that a veneer of Greek

civilisation was spread over the Asiatic coasts.

Figure 9

Figure 9: Sardis--First Metropolis of Asia, of Lydia, and of Hellenism

The jealousies and rivalries of those great cities are a quaint feature

of their history in the Roman period. The old Greek pride in their

patris, their father-land--which to them was simply their city--had no

longer the opportunity of expressing itself in the field of politics.

No city could have a foreign policy. Even in municipal matters, while

the Empire nominally allowed home rule, yet in practice it discouraged

it: the management of city business was more and more taken out of the

hands of the cities: the Emperor was there to think for all and provide

for all better than they could for themselves. Municipal pride

expressed itself in outward show, partly in the healthier direction of

improving and beautifying the cities, partly in the vainglorious

invention of names and titles. In every Province and district there was

keen competition for the title first of the Province or the district.

Every city which could pretend to the first place in respect of any

qualification called itself "first," and roused the jealousy of other

cities which counted themselves equally good. Smyrna was "first of Asia

in size and beauty," Ephesus first of Asia as the landing-place of

every Roman official, Pergamum first as the official capital, and

Sardis boldly styled itself "first metropolis of Asia, of Lydia, of

Hellenism" on the arrogant coin represented in Figure 9. Similarly in

the Province Bithynia Nicomedia and Nicaea competed for the primacy. So

again in Cilicia Tarsus and Anazarba, in one district of Macedonia

Philippi and Amphipolis (see chapter 14), disputed with one another

about those empty titles. A temporary agreement between the three chief

cities of Asia, implying a lull in their rivalry, is attested by the

coin shown in Figure 10, chapter 14.

The prosperity, both material and intellectual, of the cities was very

great under the kings. As the dynasties decayed, the Romans took over

their power, and during the disintegration of the Roman Republic and

the long Civil Wars the cities suffered severely from misgovernment and

extortion. But prosperity was restored by the triumph of the new

Empire, which was welcomed with the utmost enthusiasm by the

Graeco-Asiatic cities. The Roman Empire did not, as a rule, need to

found cities and introduce new population in order to maintain its hold

on Asia Minor. It stood firmly supported by the loyalty of the city

population. Only on the South-Galatian frontier was a line of

Coloniae--Antioch, Lystra, etc.--needed to protect the loyal cities

from the unsubdued tribes of Mount Taurus. The two Roman Coloniae in

Asia, Troas and Parium, were founded for sentimental and economic

reasons, not to hold a doubtful land.

But the history of those cities, and the letters of the New Testament,

show that a very high degree of order, peace and prosperity may result

in a thoroughly unhealthy life and a steady moral deterioration, unless

the condition of the public mind is kept sound by some salutary idea.

The salutary idea which was needed to keep the Empire sound and the

cities healthy was what Paul preached; and that idea was the raising of

the Gentiles to equality with the Jews in religion and morality.

An amalgamation of Oriental and Hellenic religious ideas had been

sought by many philosophers, and was practised in debased forms by

impostors who traded on the superstitions of the vulgar. It was left

for Christianity to place it before the world accomplished and

perfected.

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

Chapter 12: The Jews in the Asian Cities

In chapter 11 we recognised how important an element the Jewish

colonists were in the cities which the Seleucid kings founded or

re-founded as strongholds of their power, and as centres of the

Graeco-Asiatic civilisation amid the dreary ocean of Oriental monotony;

and we also saw what were the reasons which made them trusty supporters

of the Seleucid regime and specially useful to counterbalance the Greek

element in those cities, all the more trusty and useful because they

were unpopular, and even hated by their fellow-citizens.

Considering how important a part the Jewish Christians must have played

in the Asian Churches (Acts 18:20, 19:1-8, 20:21), it is necessary to

examine their position in the cities more closely. The point of view

taken in the Apocalypse is that the Christians were the true Jews (just

as they constitute the real element in the city where they dwell), and

the national Jews who clung to the old Hebrew ideas were not the true

Jews but merely the synagogue of Satan. The Palestinian Jew who could

express such a view had travelled far along the Pauline path of

development.

The Jews were too clever for their fellow-townsmen. They regarded with

supreme contempt the gross obscene ritual and the vulgar superstitions

of their neighbours; but many of them were ready to turn those

superstitions to their own profit; and a species of magic and

soothsaying, a sort of syncretism of Hebrew and pagan religious ideas,

afforded a popular and lucrative occupation to the sons of Sceva in

Ephesus and to many another Jew throughout the Asiatic Greek cities. It

was probably an art of this kind that was practised in the Chaldean's

holy precinct at Thyatira, which is mentioned in an inscription of the

Roman period (see chapter 23).

There were among those Jews, of course, persons of every moral class,

from the destined prophet, Saul of Tarsus, whose eyes were fixed on the

spiritual future of his people, down to the lowest Jew who traded on

the superstitions and vices of those pagan dogs whom he despised and

abhorred, while he ministered to the excesses from which in his own

person he held aloof. But among them all there was, in contrast to the

pagan population around them, a certain unity of feeling and aspiration

bred in them by their religion, their holy books, the Sabbath meetings

and the weekly lessons and exhortations, the home training and the

annual family meal of the Passover. These made an environment which

exercised a strong influence even on the most unworthy.

Of their numbers we can form no estimate, but they were very great. In

preparing for the final struggle in western Asia Minor about 210 B.C.,

Antiochus III moved 2,000 Jewish families from Babylonia into Lydia and

Phrygia, and that was a single act of one king, whose predecessors and

successors carried out the same policy on a similar scale. The

statistics which Cicero gives, when he describes how a Roman Governor

in 66 B.C. arrested the half-shekel tribute which the Jews sent to

Jerusalem, show a very large Jewish population in Phrygia and a large

Jewish population in Lydia.

Except in a few such references history is silent about that great

Jewish population of Asia Minor. But inscriptions are now slowly

revealing, by here a trace and there a trace, that nobles and officers

under the Roman Empire who have all the outward appearance of ordinary

Roman provincial citizens were really part of the Phrygian Jewish

population. The original Jews of Asia Minor seem to have perished

entirely, for the Turkish Jews of the present day are Spanish-speaking

Jews, whose ancestors were expelled from Spain by the most famous of

Spanish sovereigns and sheltered in Turkey by Mohammedan Sultans. In

the dearth of evidence one can only speculate as to their fate. Reasons

have elsewhere been stated showing that a considerable part of that

original Jewish population adopted Christianity, and thus lost their

isolation and cohesion, and became merged in the Christian Empire of

the fourth and following centuries after Christ.

As to those Jews, very many in number, who clung unfalteringly to their

own faith, what was likely to be their fate in the Christian Empire?

The Eastern Empire was largely Greek in language and in spirit alike;

and any one who has become familiar with the intensity and bitterness

of the hatred that separates the Greek from the Jew, will recognise

that in general the alternative of extermination or expulsion was

presented to them. There was no place and no mercy for the Jew in the

Greek Christian Empire. The barbarous lands of Europe and the steppes

and villages of Russia were a gentler home to them than the most

civilised of lands.

When one thinks of the character of the Hellenic cities, one must ask

how and on what conditions the Jews were able to live in them.

When the Jews were present in such a city merely as resident aliens,

their position is easier to understand. It was quite usual for

strangers to reside in a Greek city for purposes of trade, and even to

become permanent inhabitants with their families. But, as has been

already pointed out, there was no ordinary way by which such

inhabitants could attain the citizenship. They and their descendants

continued to rank only as resident aliens. It was easy for them to

retain and practise their own religious rites. Strangers naturally

brought their religion with them; and their regular custom was to form

an association among themselves for the common practice of their own

rites. Such religious associations were numerous and recognised by law

and custom; and Jewish residents could carry their religion with them

under this legal form.

It was in this way as a rule that foreign religions spread in the Greek

cities. The foreign Asiatic rites, by their more impressive and

enthusiastic character, attracted devotees, especially among the

humbler and less educated Greeks. Thus Oriental cults spread in such

cities as Corinth, Athens, and other trading centres, in spite of the

fact that those pagan cults were essentially non-proselytising, and

preferred to keep their bounds narrow and to restrict the advantages of

their religion to a small number.

Similarly the Jewish association, with its synagogue or place of prayer

by sea-shore or river bank, attracted attention and proselytes, though

it repelled and roused the hatred of the majority, because it was "so

strange and mysterious and incomprehensible to the ordinary pagan, with

its proud isolation, its lofty morality, its superiority to pagan ideas

of life, its unhesitating confidence in its superiority." Thus the Jews

became a power even where they ranked only as aliens.

It is much more difficult to understand the position of the Jews in

those Hellenic cities where they possessed the rights of citizenship.

Now, as a rule, in the cities founded by the Seleucid kings, the Jews

were actually citizens. But it was to the ancient mind an outrage and

an almost inconceivable thing, that people could be fellow-citizens

without engaging in the worship of the same city gods. The bond of

patriotism was really a religious bond. The citizen was encompassed by

religious duties from his cradle to his grave. It was practically

impossible for the Jew to be a citizen of a Greek city in the ordinary

way. Some special provision was needed.

That special provision was made by the Seleucid kings in founding their

cities. It was a noteworthy achievement, and a real step in the history

of human civilisation and institutions, when they succeeded in so

widening the essential theory of the Greek city as to enable the Jew to

live in it as an integral part of it. The way in which this result was

attained must be clearly understood, as it throws much light on the

position of the Jews in the Graeco-Asiatic cities.

The Greek city was never simply an aggregation of citizens. The

individual citizens were always grouped in bodies, usually called

"Tribes," and the "Tribes" made up the city. This was a fundamental

principle of Greek city organisation, and must form the starting-point

of all reasoning on the subject. The city was an association of groups,

not of individuals. It is generally admitted that the groups were older

than the institution of cities, being a survival of a more primitive

social system. As Mr. Greenidge says, Roman Public Life, p. 66: "Simple

membership of a State, which was not based on membership of some lower

unit, was inconceivable to the Graeco-Roman world." In the Seleucid

City-States that "lower unit" was generally called the "Tribe."

The "Tribe" was united by a religious bond (as was every union or

association of human beings in the Graeco-Roman world): the members met

in the worship of a common deity (or deities), and their unity lay in

their participation in the same religion. It was, therefore, as utterly

impossible for a Jew to belong to an ordinary Tribe, as it was for him

to belong to an ordinary Hellenic city.

But, just as it was possible for a group of Jewish aliens to reside in

a Greek city and practise their own religious rites in a private

association, so it was possible to enroll a body of Jewish citizens in

a special "Tribe" (or equivalent aggregation), which was united without

any bond of pagan religion. That this must have been the method

followed by the Seleucid kings is practically certain (so far as

certainty can exist in that period of history), though the fact cannot

everywhere be demonstrated in the absence of records. Josephus mentions

that in Alexandria the "Tribe" of the Jews was called "Macedonians,"

i.e. all Jews who possessed the Alexandrian citizenship were enrolled

in "the Tribe Macedones": this "Tribe" consisted of Jews only, as

Josephus' words imply, and as was obviously necessary (for what Greek

would or could belong to a Tribe which consisted mainly of the

multitude of Jews with whom the rest of the Alexandrian population was

almost constantly at war?).

The example of Alexandria may be taken as a proof that, by a sort of

legal fiction, an appearance of Hellenism was given to the Jewish

citizens in a Greek City-State. It was of the essence of both Ptolemaic

and Seleucid cities that they should be centres of Hellenic

civilisation and education. In the period of which we are treating the

term "Hellenes" did not imply Greek blood and race, but only language

and education and social manners. The Jews could never be, in the

strict sense, Hellenes, for their manners and ways of thinking were too

diverse from the Greek; but by enrolling them in a "Tribe," and giving

this "Tribe" a Greek name and outward appearance, the Seleucid and

Ptolemaic kings made them members of a city of Hellenes.

But the other difficulty remained. There was a religious bond uniting

the whole city. The entire body of citizens was knit together by their

common religion; and the Jews stood apart from this city cultus,

abhorring and despising it.

The Seleucid practice trampled under foot this religious difficulty by

creating an exception to the general principle. The Jews were simply

declared by the founder of the dynasty, Seleucus, and his successors to

be citizens, and yet free to disregard the common city cultus. They

were absolved from the ordinary laws and regulations of the city, if

these conflicted with the Jewish religion: especially, they could not

be required to appear in court, or take any part in public life, on the

Sabbath. Certain regulations were modified to suit Jewish scruples.

When allowances of oil were given to the citizens, the royal law

ordered that an equivalent in money should be given to the Jewish

citizens, whose principles forbade them to use oil that a Gentile had

handled or made. Their Hellenic fellow-citizens were never reconciled

to this. It seemed to them an outrage that members of the city should

despise and reject the gods of the city. This rankled in their minds, a

wound that could not be healed. Time after time, wherever a favourable

opportunity seemed to offer itself, they besought their masters--Greek

king or Roman emperor--to deprive the Jews of their citizenship: for

example, their argument to Agrippa in 15 B.C. was that fellow-citizens

ought to reverence the same gods.

Therein lay the sting of the case to the Greeks or Hellenes. The Jews

never merged themselves in the Hellenic unity. They always remained

outside of it, a really alien body. In a time when patriotism was

identified with community of religion, it was not possible to attain

true unity in those mixed States. A religious revolution was needed,

and to be effective it must take the direction of elevating thought.

Then one great man, with the true prophet's insight, saw that unity

could be introduced only by raising the Gentiles to a higher level

through their adoption of the Jewish morality and religion; and to that

man's mind this was expressed as the coming of the Messiah, an idea

which was very differently conceived by different minds. Elsewhere we

have attempted to show the effect upon St. Paul of this idea as it was

forced on him in his position at Tarsus, which was pre-eminently the

meeting-place of East and West.

It follows inevitably from the conditions, that there can never have

been a case of a single and solitary Jewish citizen in a Hellenic city.

It was impossible for a Jew to face the religious difficulty in an

ordinary Greek city. He could not become a member of an ordinary

"Tribe": he could become a member of a Hellenic city only where the act

of some superior power had altered the regular Greek constitution in

favour of the Jews as a whole. It may be set aside as impossible, as

opposed to all evidence and reasonable inference, either that an

ordinary Hellenic city would voluntarily set aside its own fundamental

principles in order to welcome its most hated enemies and most

dangerous commercial rivals, or that the superior power would or could

violate the constitution of the city in favour of a single individual.

Where Jews are proved or believed to have been citizens of a Hellenic

city, the origin of their right must lie in a general principle laid

down by a superior power, accompanied by the introduction of a body of

Jewish citizens sufficiently strong to support one another and maintain

their own unity and religion.

But might not a Jew occasionally desire the Hellenic citizenship for

the practical advantages it might offer in trade? He might desire those

advantages in some or many cases; but they could not be got without

formal admission to a "Tribe," and if he were admitted to an ordinary

Hellenic Tribe through a special decree, he must either participate in

its religion or sacrifice the advantages which he aimed at. In fact, it

may be doubted whether any person who avoided the meetings and

ceremonies of the tribesmen could have retained the membership. The Jew

must either abandon his nation and his birthright absolutely, or he

must stand outside of the Hellenic citizenship, except in those cities

whose constitution had been widened by the creation of a special

"Tribe" or similar body for Jews.

The case may be set aside as almost inconceivable that any Jew in the

pre-Roman period, except in the rarest cases, absolutely disowned his

birthright and was willing to merge himself in the ordinary ranks of

Hellenic citizenship. Professor E. Schurer has emphasised the

thoroughly Hebraic character even of the most Hellenised Jews who had

settled outside Palestine; and there can be no doubt that he is right.

They were a people of higher education and nobler views than the

Gentiles; and they could not descend entirely to the Gentile level.

Even the lowest Jew who made his living out of Gentile superstitions or

vices usually felt, as we may be sure, that he was of a higher stock,

and was not willing to become a Gentile entirely.

Moreover, the race hatred was too strong. The Greeks would not have

permitted it, even if a Jew had desired it. The Greeks had no desire to

assimilate the Jews to themselves; they only desired to be rid of them.

The position of the Jews in the Ionian cities is illustrated by an

incident that occurred in 15 B.C. There was a body of Jews in Ephesus;

and the other citizens, i.e. the Hellenes, tried to induce Agrippa to

expel these on the ground that they would not take part in the religion

of the city. Their argument is instructive. They appealed to the

settlement of the Ephesian constitution by Antiochus II, 261-246 B.C.,

as authoritative; and this proves that there had been no serious change

in the principles of the Ephesian constitution since that time.

That body of Jews in Ephesus did not consist simply of non-citizens,

resident (perhaps for many generations) in the city for purposes of

trade. That there were Ephesian citizens among them is clearly implied

in the pleading of their fellow-citizens: the Hellenes of Ephesus made

no charge against Jewish strangers: in the forefront of their case they

put their claim that the Hellenes alone had any right to the

citizenship, which was the gift of Antiochus II. These words are

useless and unnecessary, unless there was a body of Jews claiming to be

citizens of Ephesus, whom the Greeks desired to eject from the

citizenship. They came to Agrippa asking permission, not to expel

Jewish strangers from the town, but to deprive the Jews of their

participation in the State.

Moreover, the next words quoted from the argument of the Hellenes are

even stronger: they put the case that the Jews are kinsmen and members

of the same race with themselves, "If the Jews are kinsmen to us, they

ought to worship our gods." The only conceivable kinship between Jews

and Greeks was that which they acquired through common citizenship. The

idea that common citizenship implies and produces kingship is very

characteristic of ancient feeling and language. We note in passing that

this idea occurs in St. Paul, Romans 16:7, 11, where the word "kinsmen"

will be understood as denoting Tarsian Jews by those who approach the

Epistles from the side of ordinary contemporary Greek thought. It can

hardly mean Jews simply (as "kinsmen according to the flesh" does in

Romans 9:3); for many other persons in the same list are not so called,

though they are Jews. Andronicus and a few others are characterised as

members of the same city and "Tribe" as Paul.

The Jewish rights, therefore, must have originated from Antiochus II.

Now, throughout his reign, that king was struggling with Ptolemy King

of Egypt for predominance in the Ionian cities; and the constitution

which he introduced in Ephesus must have been intended to attach the

city to his side, partly by confirming its rights and freedom, partly

by introducing a new body of colonists whose loyalty he could depend

upon; and among those colonists were a number of Jews.

This conclusion seems inevitable; and Professor E. Schurer has rightly

held it. But the common view has been hitherto that Antiochus II merely

gave freedom to the Ionian cities, including Ephesus; and even so

competent an authority as Professor Wilcken adopts the prevalent view.

What Antiochus gave was not mere freedom in our vague sense, but a

definite constitution. The ancients knew well that freedom among a

large body of men is impossible without a constitution and written

laws.

It is not likely to be suggested by any scholar that some Jews might

have been made Ephesian citizens, when the resident aliens who had

helped in the war against Mithridates were granted citizenship by the

Ephesian State. No new Tribes were then instituted; the constitution

remained undisturbed; and those aliens would have to accept enrollment

in one of the pagan groups or "Tribes," out of which the city was

constituted; and this we have seen that Jews could not accept. If there

was a body of Jewish citizens in Ephesus (as seems certain), they must

have been placed there by some external authority; and, as we have

seen, the constitution was permanently settled by Antiochus II, so that

no new Tribes had been instituted and no modification by external

authority had been made.

It is pointed out in chapter 17 that a new Tribe, whose name is unknown

(because it was changed afterwards to Sebaste), was instituted at this

time for the new settlers whom Antiochus introduced. He doubtless

brought colonists of several nationalities, and avoided any pagan

religious bond of Tribal unity. The Jews constituted a special division

(Chiliastys) in this Tribe.

Antiochus acted similarly in several of the Ionian cities, possibly

even in them all. His changes are recorded to have been made in the

Ionian cities, and not to have been confined to Ephesus. The case of

Ephesus may be taken as typical of many other Asian cities; yet there

are few cities in which it can be proved conclusively that there was a

body of Jewish citizens. As a rule, the individual Jews escape our

notice: only general facts and large numbers have been recorded.

A little more is known about the Jews of the Lycus Valley through the

extremely important inscriptions preserved at Hierapolis. Laodicea and

Hierapolis, lying so near one another, in full view across the valley,

must be taken as a closely connected pair, and all that is recorded

about the Jews of Hierapolis may be taken as applying to those of

Laodicea (apart from certain differences in the constitution of the two

cities). The subject will therefore find a more suitable place in

chapter 29.

In each city where a body of Jewish citizens was formed, it was

necessary to frame a set of rules safeguarding their peculiar position

and rights; for no rights could exist in a Greek city without formal

enactment in a written law. This body of law is called in an

inscription of Apameia in Phrygia "the Law of the Jews"; and the

character of the reference shows beyond question that municipal

regulations, and not the Mosaic Law, are meant under that name.

Apameia, therefore must have contained a class of Jewish citizens; and

its character and history have been investigated elsewhere. A similar

law and name must have existed in the other cities where there was a

body of Jewish citizens.

The Jews had come, or been brought, into Asia Minor during the time

when Palestine was growing Hellenised in the warmth of Seleucid favour.

In their new homes they were even more kindly treated, and all the

conditions of their life were calculated to strengthen their good

feeling to the kings, and foster the Hellenising tendency among them,

at least in externals. They necessarily used the Greek language; they

became accustomed to Greek surroundings; they learned to appreciate

Greek science and education; and doubtless they did not think gymnastic

exercises and sports such an abomination as the authors of First and

Second Maccabees did.

But, as Professor E. Schurer and others have rightly observed, there is

not the slightest reason to think that the Jews of Asia Minor ceased to

be true to their religion and their nation in their own way: they

really commanded a wider outlook over the world and a more sane and

balanced judgment on truth and right than their brethren in Palestine.

They looked to Jerusalem as their centre and the home of their

religion. They contributed to maintain the Temple with unfailing

regularity. They went on pilgrimage in great numbers, and the pilgrim

ships sailed regularly every spring from the Aegean harbours for

Caesaria. They were in patriotism as truly Jews as the straitest

Pharisee in Jerusalem. Doubtless Paul was far from being the only Jew

of Asia Minor who could boast that he was "a Pharisee sprung from

Pharisees." Yet they were looked at with disfavour by their more

strait-laced Palestinian brethren, and regarded as little better than

backsliders and Sadducees. They had often, we may be sure, to assert

their true Pharisaism and spirituality, like Paul, in answer to the

reproach of being mere Sadducees with their Greek speech and Greek

ways.

In truth, there was great danger lest they should forget the essence of

their Hebrew faith. Many of them undoubtedly did so, though they still

remained Jews in name and profession, and in contempt for the Gentiles,

even while they learned from them and cheated them and made money by

pandering to their superstitions. Many such Jews were, in very truth,

only "a Synagogue of Satan" (as at Smyrna and Philadelphia), but still

they continued to be "a Synagogue." The national feeling was sound,

though the religious feeling was blunted and degraded.

In such surroundings was Saul of Tarsus brought up, a member of a

family which moved both in the narrow and exclusive circle of rich

Tarsian citizenship and in the still more proud and aristocratic circle

of Roman citizenship. In his writings we see how familiar he was with

the Graeco-Asiatic city life, and how readily illustrations from Greek

games and Roman soldiers and triumphs suggest themselves to him. In him

are brought to a focus all the experiences of the Jews of Asia Minor.

He saw clearly from childhood that the Maccabean reaction had not saved

Palestine, that the Pharisaic policy of excluding Gentile civilisation

and manners had failed, and that the only possible salvation for his

nation was to include the Gentiles by raising them to the Jewish level

in morality and religion. Judaism, he saw, must either lose its vigour

amid the sunshine of prosperity in Asia Minor, and gradually die, or it

must conquer the Gentiles by assimilating them. The issue was, however,

certain. The promise of God had been given and could not fail. This new

prophet saw that the time of the Messiah and His conquest of the

Gentiles had come.

And amid such surroundings the Jew that wrote the Apocalypse had lived

for years. He had come much in contact both with the Hellenist Jews of

the Diaspora and with the Christianised pagans in the Asian cities. He

had been all the more influenced by those surroundings, because his

whole outlook on the world had long ago been modified by the ardent

spirit of St. Paul. He was still bound to Jewish models and literary

forms in composing the Apocalypse; but sometimes the spirit and the

thought which he expresses in those forms are essentially non-Judaic

though their wider character is concealed from most of the commentators

under the outward show of Judaism. His growing mind was on the point of

bursting the last Jewish fetters that still contained it, the reverence

for traditional Jewish literary forms; it had not yet done so, but in

the composition of this book it was working towards full freedom.

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

Chapter 13: The Pagan Converts in the Early Church

In one respect Ignatius is peculiarly instructive for the study of the

early Asian Churches, in which the converts direct from Paganism must

have been a numerous and important body. This peculiar position and

spirit of Pagan converts (coming direct from Paganism), as

distinguished from Jews or those Pagans who had come into the Church

through the door of the Jewish synagogue, must engage our attention

frequently during the study of the Seven Letters; and Ignatius will

prove the best introduction.

The Pagan converts had not the preliminary education in Jewish thoughts

and religious ideas which a previous acquaintance with the service of

the synagogue had given those Gentiles who had been among "the

God-fearing" before they came over to Christianity. The direct passage

from Paganism to Christianity must have left a different mark on their

nature. Doubtless, some or even many of them came from a state of

religious indifference or of vicious and degraded life. But others, and

probably the majority of them, must have previously had religious

sensibility and religious aspirations. Now what became of those early

religious ideas during their later career as Christians? If they had

previously entertained any religious aspirations and thoughts, these

must have sought expression, and occasionally met with stimulus and

found partial satisfaction in some forms of Pagan worship or

speculation. Did these men, when they as Christians looked back on

their Pagan life, regard those moments of religious experience as being

merely evil and devilish; or did they see that such actions had been

the groping and effort of nature towards God, giving increased strength

and vitality to their longing after God, and that those moments had

been really steps in their progress, incomplete but not entirely wrong?

To this inevitable question Ignatius helps us to find an answer,

applicable to some cases, though not, of course, to all. That he had

been a convert from Paganism is inferred with evident justification by

Lightfoot from his letter to the Romans. He was born into the Church

out of due time, imperfect in nature, by an irregular and violent

birth, converted late, after a career which was to him a lasting cause

of shame and humiliation in his new life. That feeling might be

considered as partly a cause of the profound humility which he

afterwards felt towards the long-established Ephesian Church. Hence he

writes to the Romans: "I do not give orders to you as Peter and Paul

did: they were Apostles, I am a convict; they were free, but I am a

slave to this very hour." In the last expression we may see a

reference, not to his having been literally a slave (as many do), but

to his having been formerly enslaved to the passions and desires of

Paganism; from this slavery he can hope to be set free completely only

through death; death will give him liberty, and already even in the

journey to Rome and the preparation to meet death, "I am learning to

put away every desire."

The remarkable passage in Eph. sect. 9 must arrest every reader's

attention: "Ye are all companions in the way, God-bearers,

shrine-bearers, Christ-bearers, and bearers of your holy things,

arrayed from head to foot in the commandments of Jesus Christ; and I,

too, taking part in the festival, am permitted by letter to bear you

company." The life of the Ephesian Christians is pictured after the

analogy of a religious procession on the occasion of a festival; life

for them is one long religious festival and procession. Now at this

time it is impossible to suppose that public processions could have

formed part of their worship. Imperial law and custom, popular feeling,

and the settled rule of conduct in the Church, all alike forbade such

public and provocative display of Christian worship. Moreover it is

highly improbable that the Church had as yet come to the stage when

such ceremonial was admitted as part of the established ritual: the

ceremonies of the Church were still of a very simple and purely private

character. It was only when the ceremonial could be performed in public

that it grew in magnificence and outward show.

Yet the passage sets before the readers in the most vivid way the

picture of such a festal scene, with a troop of rejoicing devotees clad

in the appropriate garments, bearing their religious symbols and holy

things in procession through the streets. That is exactly the scene

which was presented to the eyes of all Ephesians several times every

year at the great festivals of the goddess; and Ignatius had often seen

such processions in his own city of Antioch. He cannot but have known

what image his words would call up in the minds of his readers, and he

cannot but have intended to call up that image, point by point, and

detail after detail. The heathen devotees were dressed for the

occasion, mostly in white garments, with garlands of the sacred foliage

(whatever tree or plant the deity preferred), while many of the

principal personages wore special dress of a still more sacred

character, which marked them as playing for the time the part of the

god and of his attendant divine beings, and some were adorned with the

golden crown either of their deity or of the Imperial religion. But the

Ephesian Christians wear the orders of Christ. The heathen devotees

carried images of their gods, both the principal deities and many

associated beings. The Christian Ephesians in their life carry God and

carry Christ always with them, for, as Ignatius has said in the

previous sentence, their conduct in the ordinary affairs of life

spiritualised those affairs, inasmuch as they did everything in Christ.

Many of the heathen devotees carried in their processions small shrines

containing representations of their gods; but the body of every true

right-living Christian is the temple and shrine of his God. The heathen

carried in the procession many sacred objects, sometimes openly

displayed, sometimes concealed in boxes (like the sacred mystic things

which were brought from Eleusis to Athens by one procession in order

that a few days later they might be carried back by the great mystic

procession to Eleusis for the celebration of the Mysteries); and at

Ephesus an inscription of the period contains a long enumeration of

various objects and ornaments which were to be carried in one of the

great annual processions. But the Christians carry holiness itself with

them, wherever they go and whatever they do.

How utterly different is the spirit of this passage from the Jewish

attitude towards the heathen world! Every analogy that Ignatius here

draws would have been to the Jews an abomination, the forbidden and

hateful thing. It would have been loathsome to them to compare the

things of God with the things of idols or devils. Ignatius evidently

had never passed through the phase of Judaism; he had passed straight

from Paganism to Christianity. He very rarely quotes from the Old

Testament, and when he does his quotations are almost exclusively from

Psalms and Isaiah, the books which would be most frequently used by

Christians.

Hence he places his new religion directly in relation with Paganism.

Christianity spiritualises and enlarges and ennobles the ceremonial of

the heathen; but that ceremonial was not simply rejected by him as

abominable and vile, for it was a step in the way of religion.

The point of view is noble and true, and yet it proved to be the first

step in the path that led on by insensible degrees, during the loss of

education in the Church, to the paganising of religion and the

transformation of the Pagan deities into saints of the Church, Demeter

into St. Demetrius, Achilles Pontarches into St. Phocas of Sinope,

Poseidon into St. Nicolas of Myra, and so on. From these words of

Ignatius it is easy to draw the moral, which assuredly Ignatius did not

dream of, that the Church should express religious feeling in similar

processions; and, as thought and feeling deteriorated, the step was

taken.

The same true and idealised spirit is perceptible in other parts of

Ignatius' letters. In Eph. sect. 10 he says: "Pray continually for the

rest of mankind (i.e. those who are not Christians, and specially the

Pagans), for there is in them a hope of repentance. Give them the

opportunity of learning from your actions, if they will not hear you."

The influence of St. Paul's teaching is here conspicuous: by nature the

Gentiles do the things of the Law, if they only give their real nature

free play, and do not degrade it (Rom 2:16).

Ignatius felt strongly the duty he owed to his former co-religionists,

as Paul felt himself "a debtor both to Greeks and to Barbarians"; and

just as the term "debtor" implies that Paul had received and felt

himself bound to repay, such indubitably must have been the thought in

the mind of Igantius. Ignatius learned the lesson from Paul, because he

was prepared to learn it. Many have read him and have not learned it.

In this view new light is thrown on a series of passages in the letters

of Ignatius, some of which are obscure, and one at least has been so

little understood that the true reading is by many editors rejected,

though Lightfoot's sympathetic feeling for Ignatius keeps him right, as

it usually does; and Zahn independently has decided in favour of the

same text.

One of the most characteristic and significant features in the writings

of Ignatius is the emphasis that he lays on silence, as something

peculiarly sacred and Divine. He recurs to this thought repeatedly.

Silence is characteristic of God, speech of mankind. The more the

bishop is silent, the more he is to be feared (Eph. sect. 6). The acts

which Christ has done in silence are worthy of the Father; and he that

truly possesses the Word of Christ is able even to hear His silence, so

as to be perfect, so that through what he says he may be doing, and

through his silence he may be understood (Eph. sect. 15). And so again

he is astonished at the moderation of the Philadelphian bishop, whose

silence is more effective than the speech of others.

So far the passages quoted, though noteworthy, do not imply anything

more than a vivid appreciation of the value of reserve, so that speech

should convey the impression of a latent and still unused store of

strength. But the following passages do more; they show that a certain

mystic and Divine nature and value were attributed by Ignatius to

Silence; and in the light of those two passages, the words quoted above

from Eph. sect. 15 are seen to have also a mystic value.

In Eph. sect. 19 he speaks of the three great Christian mysteries--the

virginity of Mary, the birth of her Son, and the death of the Lord,

"three mysteries shouting aloud (in the world of men), which were

wrought in the Silence of God." In Magn. sect. 8 he speaks of God as

having manifested Himself through His Son, who is His Word that

proceeded from Silence.

Now, we must ask what was the origin of this mystic power that Ignatius

assigns to Silence. Personally, I cannot doubt that his mind and

thought were influenced by his recollection of the deep impression that

certain Pagan Mysteries had formerly made on him.

It is mentioned in the Philosophumena, lib. v., that "the great and

wonderful and most perfect mystery, placed before those who were [at

Eleusis] initiated into the second and higher order, was a shoot of

corn harvested in silence." In this brief description a striking scene

is set before us: the hushed expectation of the initiated, the contrast

with the louder and more crowded and dramatic scenes of the previous

Mystic acts, as in absolute silence the Divine life works itself out to

an end in the growing ear of corn, which is reaped before them. There

can be no doubt, amid all the obscurity which envelopes the Eleusinian

ceremonial, that great part of the effect which they produced on the

educated and thoughtful, the intellectual and philosophic minds, lay in

the skilful, dramatically presented contrast between the earlier

naturalistic life, set before them in scenes of violence and repulsive

horror, and the later reconciliation of the jarring elements in the

peaceful Divine life, as revealed for the benefit of men by the Divine

power, and shown on the mystic stage as perfected in profound silence.

Think of the hierophant, a little before, shouting aloud, "a holy son

Brimos the Lady Brimo has borne," as the culmination of a series of

outrages and barbarities: then imagine the dead stillness, and the

Divine life symbolised to the imagination of the sympathetic and

responsive mystai in the growing and garnered ear of the Divinely

revealed corn which dies only to live again, which is destroyed only to

be useful.

The scene which we have described is mentioned only as forming part of

the Eleusinian Mysteries; and it may be regarded as quite probable that

Ignatius had been initiated at Eleusis. Initiation at Eleusis (which

had in earlier times been confined to the Athenian people) was widened

in later times so that all "Hellenes," i.e. all persons whose language

and education and spirit were Greek, were admitted. Thus, for example,

Apollonius of Tyana, who had been rejected in A.D. 51 on the ground,

not that he was a foreigner, but that he was suspected of magic, was

admitted to initiation in A.D. 55. But it is also true that (as is

pointed out in Dr. Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible, v., p. 126) "the

Mysteries celebrated at different religious centres competed with one

another in attractiveness," and they all borrowed from one another and

"adapted to their own purposes elements which seemed to be attractive

in others." Hence it may be that Ignatius had witnessed that same

scene, or a similar one, in other Mysteries.

That the highest and most truly Divine nature is silent must have been

the lesson of the Eleusinian Mysteries, just as surely as they

taught--not by any formal dogmatic teaching (for the words uttered in

the representation of the Divine drama before the initiated were

concerned only with the dramatic action), but through the impression

produced on those who comprehended the meaning of the drama, and (as

the ancients say) it required a philosophic spirit and a reverent

religious frame of mind to comprehend--that the life of man is

immortal. Both those lessons were to Ignatius stages in the development

of his religious consciousness; and the way in which, and the

surroundings amid which, he had learned them affected his conception

and declaration of the principles, the Mysteries of Christianity.

Marcellus of Ancyra, about the middle of the fourth century, was

influenced probably in the same way, when he declared that God was

along with quietness and that, as early heretics had taught, in the

beginning there was God and Silence.

The importance of Silence in the mystic ritual is fully appreciated by

Dr. Dieterich in his valuable and fascinating book, Eine

Mithrasliturgie (Leipzig, 1903) p. 42. Among the preparatory

instructions given to the Mystes was this: "Lay thy right finger on thy

mouth and say, Silence! Silence! Silence! symbol of the living

imperishable God!" Silence is even addressed in prayer, "Guard me,

Silence." Dr. Dieterich remarks that the capital S is needed in such an

invocation.

Lightfoot considers (see his note on Trall. sect. 2) that when Ignatius

speaks of the mysteries of Christianity, he has no more in his mind

than "the wide sense in which the word is used by St. Paul, revealed

truths." But we cannot agree in this too narrow estimate. To Ignatius

there lies in the term a certain element of power. To him the

"mysteries" of the Faith would have been very insufficiently described

by such a coldly scientific definition as "revealed truths": such

abstract lifeless terms were to him, as in Colossians 2:8, mere

"philosophy and vain deceit." The "mysteries" were living, powerful

realities, things of life that could move the heart and will of men and

remake their nature. He uses the term, I venture to think, in a similar

yet slightly different sense from Paul, who employs it very frequently.

Paul, too, attaches to it something of the same idea of power; for "the

mystery of iniquity" (2 Thess 2:7) is to him a real and strong enemy.

But Ignatius seems to attach to the "mysteries" even more reality and

objectivity than Paul does.

Surely Ignatius derived his idea of the "mysteries" partly at least

from the experiences of his Pagan days. He had felt the strong

influence of the grater Mysteries, to which some of the greatest

thinkers among the Greeks bear testimony; and the Christian principles

completed and perfected the ideas which had begun in his Pagan days.

This idea, that the religious conceptions of Paganism served as a

preparatory stage leading up to Christianity, was held by many, as well

as by Ignatius. Justin Martyr gave clear expression to it, and Eusebius

works it out in his Praeparatio Evangelica. Those who were conscious

that a real development of the religious sense had begun in their own

mind during their Pagan days and experiences, and had been completed in

their Christian life, must inevitably have held it; and there were many

Pagans of a deeply religious nature, some of whom became Christians.

The change of spirit involved in this development through Paganism to

Christianity is well expressed by a modern poet:--

Girt in the panther-fells,

Violets in my hair,

Down I ran through the woody dells,

Through the morning wild and fair,--

To sit by the road till the sun was high,

That I might see some god pass by.

&gt;Fluting amid the thyme

I dreamed through the golden day,

Calling through melody and rhyme:

"Iacchus! Come this way,--

From harrowing Hades like a king,

Vine leaves and glories scattering."

Twilight was all rose-red,

When, crowned with vine and thorn,

Came a stranger god from out the dead;

And his hands and feet were torn.

I knew him not, for he came alone:

I knew him not, whom I fain had known.

He said: "For love, for love,

I wear the vine and thorn."

He said: "For love, for love,

My hands and feet were torn:

For love, the winepress Death I trod."

And I cried in pain: "O Lord my God."

Mrs. Rachel Annand Taylor, Poems, 1904

That the same view should be strongly held in the Asian Churches was

inevitable. That often it should be pressed to an extreme was equally

inevitable; and one of its extreme forms was the Nicolaitan heresy,

which the writer of the Seven Letters seems to have regarded as the

most pressing and immediate danger to those Churches. That writer was a

Jew, who was absolutely devoid of sympathy for that whole side of

thought, alike in its moderate and its extreme forms. The moderate

forms seemed to him lukewarm; the extreme forms were a simple

abomination.

Such was the view of one school or class in the Christian Church. The

opposite view, that the Pagan Mysteries were a mere abomination, is

represented much more strongly in the Christian literature. There is

not necessarily any contradiction between them. Ignatius felt, as we

have said, that his Pagan life was a cause of lasting humiliation and

shame to him, even though he was fully conscious that his religious

sensibility had been developing through it. We need not doubt that he

would have endorsed and approved every word of the charges which the

Christian apologists made against the Mysteries. Both views are true,

but both are partial: neither gives a complete statement of the case.

The mystic meaning that lay in even the grossest ceremonies of the

Eleusinian and other Mysteries has been rightly insisted upon by Miss

J. E. Harrison in her Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion

(especially chapter 8), a work well worthy of being studied. Miss

Harrison has the philosophic insight which the ancients declare to be

necessary in order to understand and learn from the Mysteries. Their

evil side is to her non-existent, and the old Christian writers who

inveighed against the gross and hideous rites enacted in the Mysteries

are repeatedly denounced by her in scathing terms as full of unclean

imaginings--though she fully admits, of course, the truth of the facts

which they allude to or describe in detail. The authoress, standing on

the lofty place of philosophic idealism, can see only the mystic

meaning, while she is too far removed above the ugliness to be

cognisant of it. But to shut one's eyes to the evil does not annihilate

it for the world, though it may annihilate it for the few who shut

their eyes. Plato in the Second Book of the Republic is as emphatic as

Firmicus or Clemens in recognising the harm that those ugly tales and

acts of the gods did to the mass of the people. This must all be borne

in mind while studying her brilliant work.

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

Chapter 14: The Seven Churches of Asia

What thou seest, write in a book, and send to the Seven Churches;

unto Ephesus, and unto Smyrna, and unto Pergamum, and unto Thyatira,

and unto Sardis, and unto Philadelphia, and unto Laodicea.

Some manuscripts read in this passage "the Seven Churches which are in

Asia"; but the added words are certainly an interpolation from the

introduction, verse 4, "John to the Seven Churches which are in Asia."

The addition states correctly the limits of the area from which the

Seven Churches were selected; but it loses the emphasis implied in the

simple phrase "The Seven Churches." From the context it is clear that

they all belonged to Asia, i.e., to the Roman province called by that

name; but here, in the very beginning of John's vision, the Seven are

mentioned as a recognised number, already to the hearer and the

readers.

This remarkable expression, "The Seven Churches," must arrest the

attention of every reader. At the first glance one might gather that

only those Seven Churches existed in the Province Asia, and that the

Revelation had been composed at an early date when there were no more

Churches than the Seven. But that is impossible. There never was a time

when those Seven Churches existed, and no others. Their situation shows

that they could not well be the first seven to be founded: several

other unnamed Churches certainly must have been formed before Thyatira

and Philadelphia. Moreover, references in the New Testament prove

beyond question the existence of various other Churches in the Province

before the earliest date at which the composition of the Apocalypse of

John has ever been placed. A survey of the chief facts regarding those

other Churches will prove instructive for the present investigation.

(1.) Already during the residence of St. Paul in Ephesus, A.D. 54 to

56, "all they which dwelt in Asia heard the word" (Acts 19:10). That

would never have been recorded, except as an explanation of the rapid

spread of the new religion and the growth of numerous Churches.

(2.) Already in A.D. 61 the Church of Colossae was the recipient of a

letter from St. Paul; he asks the Colossians to cause that his letter

be read in the Church of the Laodiceans, and that "ye also read the

letter from Laodicea" (Col 4:16); and he mentions a body of Christians,

who must have constituted a Church, at Hierapolis (Col 4:13). In this

case it is evident that the three Churches of the Lycus Valley were

considered by every one to stand in close relation to one another. They

are very near, Hierapolis being about six miles north, and Colossae

eleven miles east, from Laodicea, and they are grouped together as

standing equal in the affection and zeal of the Colossian Epaphras. Any

letter addressed to one of them was regarded apparently by St. Paul as

common to the other two. This did not require to be formally stated

about Laodicea and Hierapolis, which are in full view of one another on

opposite sides of the glen; but Colossae lay in the higher glen of the

Lycus. It has been suggested that Hierapolis and Colossae perhaps

ceased to be Churches, because those cities may have been destroyed by

an earthquake between A.D. 61 and 90. Such a supposition cannot be

entertained. There is not the slightest reason to think that those

cities were annihilated about that time. On the contrary Hierapolis

continued to grow steadily in wealth and importance after this

hypothetical destruction; and, if Colossae rather dwindled than

increased, the reason lay in its being more and more overshadowed by

Laodicea. The earthquakes of Asia Minor have not been of such a serious

nature, and seem rarely if ever to have caused more than a passing loss

and inconvenience. There was nothing in such an event likely either to

kill or to frighten away the Christians of those two Churches.

(3.) Troas was the seat of a Church in A.D. 56 (2 Cor 2:12) and A.D. 57

(Acts 20:7ff). It was then considered by St. Paul to be "a door,"

through which access was opened to a wide region that lay behind in the

inner country: its situation in respect of roads and communication made

it a specially suitable and tempting point of departure for

evangelisation; it was a link in the great chain of Imperial postal

communication across the Empire; and its importance lay in its relation

to the other cities with which it was connected by a series of

converging roads. The ordinary "overland" route from Rome to the East

by the Appian and the Egnatian Way crossed the Aegean from Neapolis,

the harbour of Philippi, to Troas, Pergamum, etc.; and there must have

been continual communication, summer and winter alike, between Neapolis

and Troas. Places in such a situation, where a change was made from

land-travel to sea-faring, offered a peculiarly favourable opportunity

for intercourse and the spread of a new system of thought and life.

Troas, therefore, undoubtedly played a very important part in the

development of the Asian Church; yet it is not mentioned among the

Seven.

Figure 10

Figure 10: Ephesus, Smyrna, Pergamum--"First of Asia"

(4.) It may also be regarded as practically certain that the great

cities which lay on the important roads connecting those Seven leading

Cities with one another had all "heard the word," and that most of them

were the seats of Churches, when the Seven Letters were written. We

remember that, not long afterwards, Magnesia and Tralleis, the two

important, wealthy and populous cities on the road between Ephesus and

Laodicea, possessed Churches of their own and bishops; that they both

sent deputations to salute, console and congratulate the Syrian martyr

Ignatius, when he was conducted like a condemned criminal to face death

in Rome; and that they both received letters from him. With these facts

in our mind we need feel no doubt that those two Churches, and many

others like them, took their origin from the preaching of St. Paul's

coadjutors and subordinates during his residence in Ephesus, A.D.

54-56. Magnesia inscribed on its coins the title "Seventh (city) of

Asia," referring doubtless to the order of precedence among the cities

as observed in the Common Council of the Province, technically styled

Commune Asiae. This seems to prove that there was some special

importance attached in general estimation to a group of seven

representative cities in Asia, which would be an interesting

coincidence with the Seven Churches. Of the seven cities implied in the

Magnesian title five may be enumerated with practical certainty, viz.,

the three rivals "First of Asia," Smyrna, Ephesus and Pergamum, along

with Sardis and Cyzicus. The remaining two seats were doubtless keenly

contested between Magnesia, Tralleis (one of the richest and greatest

in Asia), Alabanda (chief perhaps in Caria), Apamea (ranked by Strabo

next to Ephesus as a commercial centre of the Province) and Laodicea;

but apparently at some time under the Empire a decision by the Emperor,

or by a governor of the Province, or by the Council of Asia, settled

the precedence to some extent and placed Magnesia seventh. Neither

Thyatira nor Philadelphia, however, can have had any reasonable claim

to a place among those seven leading cities of the Province.

(5.) Another city which can hardly have failed to possess an important

Church when the Seven Letters were written is Cyzicus. Not merely was

it one of the greatest cities of the Province (as has been mentioned in

the preceding paragraph): it also lay on one of the great routes by

which Christianity spread. It has been pointed out elsewhere that the

early Christianisation of Bithynia and Pontus was not due (as has been

commonly assumed) to missionaries travelling by land from Syria across

Asia Minor to the Black Sea coasts. Those cross-country routes from

south to north were little used at that period; and it was only during

the last quarter of the first century that Cappadocia, which they

traversed, began to be properly organised as a Province; for before

A.D. 74 Cappadocia was merely a procuratorial district, i.e., it was

governed in the interest of the Emperor as successor of the old native

kings by his procurator, who administered it on the old native lines.

Moreover, it is stated that inner Pontus was hardly affected by

Christianity until the Third century, while Pontus on the coast was

Christianised in the first century and the pagan ritual had almost

fallen into disuse there by A.D. 112, as Pliny reported to Trajan.

Those maritime regions therefore must have been Christianised by sea,

in other words by passengers on ships coming from "the parts of Asia"

or from Rome itself. On the route of such ships lay Cyzicus, one of the

greatest commercial cities of Asia Minor, which must have attracted a

certain proportion of the merchants and passengers on those ships. It

was along the great routes of international communication that

Christianity spread first; and Cyzicus can hardly have been missed as

the new thought swept along this main current of intercourse. But

Cyzicus has no place among the Seven Churches, though it was the

leading city and capital of a great district in the north of the

Province.

It is therefore evident that those Seven must have been selected out of

a much larger number of Churches, some of them very important centres

of thought and influence, for some reason which needs investigation.

Now it is inconceivable that St. John should simply write to Seven

Churches taken at random out of the Province which had been so long

under his charge, and ignore the rest. One can understand why St. Paul

wrote (so far as his letters have been preserved) to some of his

Churches and not to others: apart from the fact that he doubtless sent

more letters than have been preserved, he wrote sporadically, under the

spur of urgent need, as a crisis occurred now in one of his Churches,

now in another. But St. John is here writing a series of letters on a

uniform plan, under the spur of one single impulse; and it is clearly

intended that the Seven Churches should be understood as in a way

summing up the whole Province. That could only be the case if each was

in some way representative of a small group of Churches, so that the

whole Seven taken together represented and summed up the entire

Province. Similarly, it is clear that the Church of Asia taken as a

whole is in its turn representative of the entire Catholic Church.

Thus we can trace the outline of a complicated and elaborate system of

symbolism, which is very characteristic of this book. There are seven

groups of Churches in Asia: each group is represented by one

outstanding and conspicuous member: these representatives are the Seven

Churches. These Seven representative Churches stand for the Church of

the Province; and the Church of the Province, in its turn, stands for

the entire Church of Christ. Corresponding to this sevenfold division

in the Church, the outward appearance and envisagement of the Divine

Author of the Seven Letters is divided into seven groups of attributes;

and one group of attributes is assumed by Him in addressing each of the

Seven Churches, so that the openings of the Seven Letters, put

together, make up his whole outward and visible character.

But how was this selection of the Seven Churches accomplished? There

are only two alternatives; either the selection was made on this

occasion for the first time, or it had in some way or other come into

existence previously, so that there were already Seven recognised and

outstanding Churches of Asia. The first alternative seems generally to

have been accepted, but apparently without any serious consideration.

It seems to have been thought that the sacred number, Seven, had a

fascination for one who was so much under the dominion of symbolism as

the writer of the Apocalypse evidently was. On this view, being

presumably fascinated by the charm of that number, he chose those Seven

from the whole body of the Asian Churches, and treated them as

representative in the first place of the Province and ultimately of the

entire Catholic church. But it is impossible to acquiesce contentedly

in this supposition. There is no way of escaping the obvious

implication in 1:4 and 1:11, that those Seven were already known to the

world and established in popular estimation as "the Seven Asian

Churches," before the Vision came to St. John.

It is therefore necessary to adopt the second alternative. As the

Church of the great Province Asia gradually consolidated and completed

its organisation, there came into existence seven groups, and at the

head or the centre of each stood one of the Seven Churches. This

process had been completed up to this point before St. John wrote, and

affected the imagery of his vision.

The genesis of one of those groups can be traced at the very beginning

of the Christian history of the Province. Already in A.D. 61 the letter

to Laodicea and the letter to Colossae were, as has been indicated

above, treated as common to a group of three Churches in the Lycus

Valley. But, although the Colossian letter was intended to be

circulated, it was written to the Church of Colossae immediately and

directly. In writing that letter St. Paul had not in mind the group of

Churches: there stood before his imagination the Church of Colossae,

and to it he addressed himself. In the primary intention it is a letter

to Colossae; in a secondary intention it was made common to the whole

group. The same may be presumed to have been the character of the

unknown Laodicean letter.

The opinion has been advocated by some scholars that the Laodicean

letter was the one which is commonly known as the Epistle to the

Ephesians, and that it ought to be regarded as a circular letter,

copies of which were sent to all the Asian Churches; though in that

cast it might be expected that the Colossians would receive a copy

direct. But Professor Rendel Harris has thrown serious doubt on the

view that Ephesians was a circular letter, by his very ingenious

argument that it must have been written as an answer to a question (see

Expositor, 1898, Dec., p. 401ff): in that case it would be addressed to

the Church which had proposed the question to St. Paul.

In the facts just stated it seems to be implied that the chief Churches

of the Lycus Valley were already in A.D. 61 regarded as practically

common recipients of a letter addressed to one. Their interests and

needs were known to one another, and were presumed to be very similar;

they were in constant intercourse with one another, and especially

Laodicea and Hierapolis were not far removed from being really a single

city; and evidently it was the aim and policy of St. Paul to encourage

them to bear vividly in mind their common character and sisterhood.

Now, starting from this situation in A.D. 61, and taking into

consideration the creative and constructive capacity which the

Christian Church showed from the beginning, we must infer that the

consolidation of the three Churches into a recognised group had been

completed before the Seven Letters were written. In a vigorous and

rapidly growing body like the Church of the Province Asia, a fact was

not likely to lie for a long time inactive, and then at last begin

actively to affect the growth of the whole organism. Rather we must

conceive the stages in the Christian history of the Lycus Valley as

being three: first, the natural union and frequent intercommunication

of three separately founded, independent and equal Churches, as appears

in A.D. 61; secondly, the equally natural growing pre-eminence before

the eyes of the world of the leading city, Laodicea, so that letters

which were addressed to one city were still intended equally for all,

but Laodicea was the one that was almost inevitably selected as the

representative and outstanding Church; thirdly, the predominance and

presidency of Laodicea as the administrative head and centre amid a

group of subordinate Churches.

How far this development had proceeded when the Seven Letters were

written it is hardly possible to say with certainty. We can, however,

feel very confident that the third stage had not yet been completely

attained. The Seven Letters afford no evidence on this point, except

that, by their silence about any other Churches, they suggest that

Laodicea was already felt to stand for and therefore to be in a way

pre-eminent in its group; while, on the other hand, the spirit of the

early Church seems to be inconsistent with the view that Laodicea had

as yet acquired anything like headship or superiority. But the whole

question as to the growth of a fixed hierarchy and order of dignity

among the Churches is obscure, and needs systematic investigation.

The case of the Lycus Valley Churches must be regarded as typical. It

was the result of circumstances common to the entire Province. Hence,

the inference must be drawn that a series of similar groups was formed

throughout Asia; that the Seven Churches stood forth as in a certain

degree pre-eminent, though certainly not predominant, in their

respective groups; and that thus each in the estimation of the Asian

world carried with it the thought of the whole group of which it formed

a centre.

The subject, however, is not yet complete. The character of that first

group in the Lycus Valley would suggest that the groups were

territorial, marked off by geographical limits. But a glance at the

rest of the Seven shows that this is not the case: there is here

evidently nothing like a division of Asia into geographical groups: the

Seven Churches are a circle of cities round the west-central district

of the Province, while south, east, and north are entirely

unrepresented.

Again, the classification is not made according to rank or dignity or

importance in the Province. It is true that the first three, Ephesus,

Smyrna and Pergamum, are the greatest and outstanding cities of the

Province, which vied with one another for the title, which all claimed

and used and boasted about, "First of Asia": there were three cities

"First of Asia," just as there were two First of Cilicia and two First

of Bithynia; and Acts 16:11 shows that Philippi claimed to be "First of

that division of Macedonia," refusing to acknowledge Amphipolis, the

official capital, as superior to itself. This might suggest that they,

as the three greatest and most important cities of the Province, were

selected as centres of three groups of Churches. Also it is true that

among the remaining four, two, viz., Sardis and Laodicea, were, like

the first three, the heads of conventus (i.e., governmental districts

for legal purposes). But this principle breaks down completely in the

case of Thyatira and Philadelphia, which were secondary and second-rate

cities, the latter in the conventus of Sardis, the former in that of

Pergamum. The Seven Churches, therefore, were not selected because they

were planted in the most important and influential cities--had that

been the case, Cyzicus, Alabanda, and Apameia could hardly have been

omitted--nor is the order of enumeration, beginning with Ephesus,

Smyrna, and Pergamum, due to the fact that those were the three most

important cities of Asia.

In order to complete this investigation, we must try to reach some

clearer conception of the almost wholly unknown process by which the

Church of the Province Asia gradually worked out its internal

organisation during the first century. At the beginning of that process

all those Churches of Asia, apparently, stood side by side, equal in

standing, fully equipped with self-governing authority, except in so

far as they looked up to St. Paul as their founder (either immediately

or through his subordinate ministers) and parent, director and

counsellor: their relation to one another was in some degree analogous

to a voluntary union of States in a federal republic. Before the end of

the century, the Province was divided into districts with

representative cities, and Asia was advancing along a path that led to

the institution of a regularly organised hierarchy with one supreme

head of the Province.

Now let us try to imagine the situation in which this process occurred.

The purpose which was being worked out in the process was--unity. The

Christian Church was bent on consolidating itself in its struggle for

the spiritual lordship of the Empire. The means whereby it attained

that purpose, as has been shown in chapter 3, lay in constant

intercommunication, partly by travel, but still more by letter. The

result which was brought about could not fail to stand in close

relation to the means by which it had been worked out. And a glance at

the map shows that there was some relation here between the means and

the result. Travelling and communication, of course, are inextricably

involved in the road system: they are carried out, not along the

shortest lines between the various points, but according to the roads

that connect them. And all the Seven Cities stand on the great circular

road that bound together the most populous, wealthy, and influential

part of the Province, the west-central region.

It is only fair to observe that that great scholar, the late Dr. Hort,

pointed the way to the true principle of selection in an excursus to

his fragmentary, posthumously published edition of First Peter. In that

excursus, which is a model of scientific method in investigation, he

points out that the reason for the peculiar order in which the

Provinces are enumerated at the beginning of the Epistle lies in the

route along which the messenger was to travel, as he conveyed the

letter (perhaps in so many distinct copies) to the central cities of

the various Provinces. We now find ourselves led to a similar

conclusion in the case of Asia: the gradual selection of Seven

representative Churches in the Province was in some way connected with

the principal road-circuit of the Province.

So far the result which we have reached is unavoidable and undeniable:

it merely states the evident fact. But, if we seek to penetrate

farther, and to trace the process of development and consolidation more

minutely, it is necessary to enter upon a process of imaginative

reconstruction. We have given to us as the factors in this problem, the

state of the Asian Church about A.D. 60, and again its state about A.D.

90: we know that the process whereby the one was transformed into the

other within those thirty years took place along that road circuit, and

was connected with correspondence and intercourse. The details have to

be restored; and as this necessarily involves an element of hypothesis,

it ought to be treated in a special chapter.

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

Chapter 15: Origin of the Seven Representative Cities

The analogous case, quoted from Dr. Hort in the conclusion of the

preceding chapter, must not be pressed too closely or it might prove

misleading. The fact from which we have to start is that the First

Epistle of Peter enumerates the Provinces in the order in which a

messenger sent from Rome would traverse them, and that, similarly, the

Seven Churches are enumerated in the order in which a messenger sent

from Patmos would reach them.

In the former case the letter was written in Rome, and the messenger

would, in accordance with the regular customs of communication over the

Empire, sail to the Black Sea, and land at one of the harbours on the

north coast of Asia Minor. He might either disembark in the nearest

Province, and make his way by land round the whole circuit, ending in

the most distant; or he might choose a vessel bound for the most

distant Province and make the circuit in the reverse order. There are

some apparent advantages in the latter method, which he adopted. He

landed at one of the Pontic harbours, Amastris or Sinope or Amisos,

traversed in succession Pontus, Cappadocia, Galatia and Asia, and ended

in Bithynia, at one of whose great harbours he would find frequent

opportunity of sailing to Rome, or, if he were detained till navigation

had ceased during the winter season, the overland Post Road, through

Thrace and Macedonia, would be conveniently open to him. Such a

messenger would visit in succession one or more of the leading cities

of each Province, because the great Imperial routes of communication

ran direct between the great cities. He would not concern himself with

distributing the letter to the individual Christians in each Province;

that task would be left to the local Church, which would use its own

organisation to bring the knowledge of the message home to every small

Church and every individual. His work would be supplemented by

secondary messengers on smaller circuits in each Province and again in

each city. In no other way was effective and general distribution

possible.

In the latter case the letter enclosing the Apocalypse with the Seven

Letters was written in Patmos, and the messenger would naturally land

at Ephesus, and make his round through the Seven representative

Churches as they are enumerated by the writer. The route was clearly

marked out, and the messenger could hardly avoid it. He would go north

along the great road through Smyrna to Pergamum (the earliest Roman

road built in the Province about 133-130 B.C., as soon as Asia was

organised). Thence he would follow the imperial Post Road to Thyatira,

Sardis, Philadelphia and Laodicea, and so back to Ephesus, or on to the

East, as duty called him, using in either case the great Central Route

of the Empire. At each point, like the other messenger, he would trust

to the local organisation to complete the work of divulgation.

In those two circuits--the general Anatolian circuit of First Peter,

and the special Asian circuit of the Apocalypse--it is obvious that the

messengers were not merely ordered to take the letter (whether in one

or in several copies) and deliver it, using the freedom of their own

will as to the way and order of delivery. The route was marked out for

them beforehand, and was already known to the writers when composing

the letters. The question then arises whether the route in those two

cases was chosen expressly for the special occasion and enjoined by the

writer on the messenger, or was already a recognised circuit which

messengers were expected to follow in every similar case. Without going

into minute detail, it may be admitted that the route indicated in

First Peter might possibly have been expressly selected for that

special journey by the writer, who knew or asked what was the best

route; and thus it came to be stated by him in the letter. Equally

possibly it might be known to the writer as the already recognised

route for the Christian messengers.

But the former supposition could not be applied in the case of the

Apocalypse; it is utterly inconsistent with the results established in

chapter 6, since it would leave unexplained the fundamental fact in the

case, viz., that the writer uses the expression "the Seven Churches" in

1:4, 11, as recognised and familiar, established in common usage, and

generally understood as summing up the whole Christian Province.

Moreover, the messenger in First Peter was starting on a journey to

deliver a real letter; but in the Apocalypse the letter-form is assumed

merely as a literary device, and the book as a whole, and the Seven

Letters as part of it, are literary compositions not really intended to

be despatched like true letters to the Churches to which they are

addressed. The list of the Seven Churches is taken over, like the rest

of the machinery of epistolary communication, as part of the

circumstances to which this literary imitation has to accommodate

itself.

Moreover those who properly weigh the indisputable facts stated in

chapter 6 about the growth of the Laodicean district, as an example of

the steady, rapid development of early Christian organisation, must

come to the conclusion that the writer of the Letters cannot have been

the first to make Laodicea the representative of a group of Churches,

but found it already so regarded by general consent. Now what is true

of Laodicea must be applied to the rest of the Seven Churches.

In short, if there were not such a general agreement as to the

representative character of the Seven Churches, it is difficult to see

how the writer could so entirely ignore the other Churches, and write

to the Seven without a word of explanation that the letters were to be

considered as referring also to the others. St. Paul, who wrote before

that general agreement had been effected, carefully explained that his

letter to Colossae was intended to be read also at Laodicea, and vice

versa; but St. John assumes that no such explanation is needed.

Another important point to observe is that the Seven Cities were not

selected simply because they were situated on the circular route above

described, nor yet because they were the most important cities on that

route. The messenger must necessarily pass through Hierapolis, Tralleis

and Magnesia on his circular journey; all those cities were indubitably

the seats of Churches at that time; yet none of the three found a place

among the representative cities, although Tralleis and Magnesia were

more important and wealthy than Philadelphia or Thyatira. What then was

the principle of selection?

In chapter 3 we saw that the Christian Church owed its growth and its

consolidation under the early Empire to its carefulness in maintaining

frequent correspondence between the scattered congregations, thus

preventing isolation, making uniformity of character and aims possible,

and providing (so to say) the channels through which coursed the

life-blood of the whole organism; and the conclusion was reached that,

since no postal service was maintained by the State for the use of

private individuals or trading companies, "we find ourselves obliged to

admit the existence of a large organisation" for the transmission of

the letters by safe, Christian hands. Just as all the great trading

companies maintained each its own corps of letter-carriers

(tabellarii), so the Christians must necessarily provide means for

carrying their own letters, if they wanted to write; and this necessity

must inevitably result, owing to the constructive spirit of that

rapidly growing body, in the formation of a letter-carrying system. The

routes of the letter-carriers were fixed according to the most

convenient circuits, and the provincial messengers did not visit all

the cities, but only certain centres, from whence a subordinate service

distributed the letters or news over the several connected circuits or

groups.

Thus there emerges from the obscurity of the first century, and stands

out clear before our view about A.D. 80, some kind of organisation for

connecting and consolidating the numerous Churches of the Province

Asia. The Province had already by that date been long and deeply

affected by the new religion; and it must be presumed that there

existed a congregation and a local Church in almost every great city,

at least in the parts most readily accessible from the west coast.

Such is the bare outline of a kind of private messenger-service for the

Province, similar in many ways, doubtless, to the private postal

systems which must have been maintained by every great trading

corporation whose operations extended over the same parts (the

wealthiest and most educated and "Hellenised" parts) of the Province.

The general character of this messenger service, in so far as it was

uniform over the whole Roman Empire, has been described in chapter 3. A

more detailed view of the special system of the Province Asia may now

be gained from a closer study of the character and origin of the Seven

Churches.

When letters or information were sent round the Churches of the

Province, either the same messenger must have gone round the whole

Province, and visited every Church, or several messengers must have

been employed simultaneously. The former method is obviously too

inconvenient and slow: the single messenger would require often to go

and return over part of the same road, and the difference of time in

the receiving of the news by the earlier and the later Churches would

have been so great, that the advantages of intercommunication would

have been to a great degree lost. Accordingly, it must be concluded

that several messengers were simultaneously employed to carry any news

intended for general information in the Province of Asia.

Again, either those several messengers must all have started from the

capital and centre of communication, viz., Ephesus, or else one must

have started from the capital, and others must have started on

secondary routes, receiving the message from the primary messenger at

various points on his route. The former of these alternatives is

evidently too cumbrous, as it would make several messengers travel

simultaneously along the same road bearing the same message. It is

therefore necessary to admit a distinction between primary and

secondary circuits, the former starting from Ephesus, the latter from

various points on the primary circuit.

Now, if we combine this conclusion with our previously established

results, the hypothesis inevitably suggests itself that the Seven

groups of Churches, into which the Province had been divided before the

Apocalypse was composed, were seven postal districts, each having as

its centre or point of origin one of the Seven Cities, which (as was

pointed out) lie on a route which forms a sort of inner circle round

the Province.

Closer examination of the facts will confirm this hypothesis so

strongly as to raise it to a very high level of probability: in fact,

the hypothesis is simply a brief statement of the obvious facts of

communication, and our closer examination will be merely a more minute

and elaborate statement of the facts.

The Seven Cities, as has been already stated, were situated on a very

important circular route, which starts from Ephesus, goes round what

may be called Asia par excellence, the most educated and wealthy and

historically pre-eminent part of the Province. They were the best

points on that circuit to serve as centres of communication with seven

districts: Pergamum for the north (Troas, doubtless Adramyttium, and

probably Cyzicus and other cities on the coast contained Churches);

Thyatira for an inland district on the northeast and east; Sardis for

the wide middle valley of the Hermus; Philadelphia for Upper Lydia, to

which it was the door (3:8); Laodicea for the Lycus Valley, and for

Central Phrygia, of which it was the Christian metropolis in later

time; Ephesus for the Cayster and Lower Meander Valleys and coasts;

Smyrna for the Lower Hermus Valley and the North Ionian coasts, perhaps

with Mitylene and Chios (if those islands had as yet been affected).

In this scheme of secondary districts it is evident that some are very

much larger than others. The whole of Western and Central Caria must be

included in the Ephesian district. The Northeastern part of Caria would

more naturally fall in the Laodicean district, to which also a vast

region of Phrygia should belong, leaving to the Philadelphian district

another large region, Northern and West-central Phrygia with a

considerable part of Eastern Lydia. But it is possible, and even

probable, that Ephesus was the centre from which more than one

secondary circuit went off: it is not necessary to suppose that only

one secondary messenger started from such a city. So also with Laodicea

and possibly with Philadelphia and Smyrna and others. An organisation

of this kind, while familiar to all in its results, would never be

described by any one in literature, just as no writer gives an account

of the Imperial Post-service; and hence no account is preserved of

either. While the existence of a primary circuit, and a number of

secondary circuits going off from the Seven Cities of the primary

circuit, seems certain, the number and arrangement of the secondary

circuits is conjectural and uncertain.

The whole of the arrangements would have to be made to suit the means

of communication that existed in the Province Asia, the roads and the

facilities for travel, on which chapter 3 may be consulted. It lies

apart from our purpose to work it out in detail; but the system which

seems most probable is indicated on the accompanying sketch-map, and

those who investigate it minutely will doubtless come to the conclusion

that some of the circuits indicated are fairly certain, but most can

only be regarded as, at the best, reasonably probable, and some will

probably be found to be wrong when a more thorough knowledge of the

Asian road-system (which is the only evidence accessible) has been

attained. It will, however, be useful to discuss some conspicuous

difficulties, which are likely to suggest themselves to every

investigator.

The first is about Troas. Considering its importance as the doorway of

Northwestern Asia, one might at first expect to find that it was one of

the Seven representative Churches. But a glance at the map will show

that it could not be worked into the primary circuit of the provincial

messenger, except by sacrificing the ease and immensely widening the

area and lengthening the time of his journey. On the other hand Troas

comes in naturally on that secondary circuit which has Pergamum as its

origin. The Pergamenian messenger followed the Imperial Post road

through Adramyttium, Assos and Troas, along the Hellespont to

Lampsacus. There the Post Road crossed into Europe, while the messenger

traversed the coast road to Cyzicus, and thence turned south through

Poimanenon to Pergamum. This circuit is perhaps the most obvious and

convincing of the whole series, as the account of the roads and towns

on it in the Historical Geography of Asia Minor will bring out clearly.

The second difficulty relates to Tralleis and Magnesia. As the primary

messenger had to pass through them, why are they relegated to the

secondary circuit of Ephesus? Obviously, the primary messenger would

reach them last of all; and long before he came to them the messenger

on a secondary Ephesian circuit would have reached them. Moreover, it

is probable that the primary circuit was not devised simply with a view

to the Province of Asia, but was intended to be often conjoined with a

further journey to Galatia and the East, so that the messenger would

not return from Laodicea to the coast, but would keep on up the Lycus

by Colossae eastwards.

Thirdly, Caria does not fit well in the secondary districts and

circuits. It is so great that it seems to require for itself one

special circuit; and if so Tralleis was the one almost inevitable point

of communication with the primary circuit. Yet Tralleis was not one of

the Seven Churches. But probably a distinction must be made. Western

Caria (Alabanda, Stratonicea and the coast cities) probably formed a

secondary circuit along with the Lower Meander Valley; and Ephesus was

the starting point for it. On the other hand the eastern and southern

part of Caria lay apart from any of the great lines of communication:

it was on the road to nowhere: any one who went south from the Meander

into the hilly country did so for the sake of visiting it, and not

because it was on his best way to a more distant goal. Now the new

religion spread with marvellous rapidity along the great routes; it

floated free on the great currents of communication that swept back and

forward across the Empire, but it was slower to make its way into the

back-waters, the nooks and corners of the land: it penetrated where

life was busy, though was active, and people were full of curiosity and

enterprise: it found only a tardy welcome among the quieter and less

educated rural districts. Hence that part of Caria was little disturbed

in the old ways, when most of the rest of Asia was strongly permeated

with Christianity.

Fourthly, an immense region of Northern and Eastern Phrygia seems to be

quite beyond any reasonably easy communication with the primary

circular route.

As to Northern Phrygia, it is extremely doubtful whether it had been

much affected by the new religion when the Seven Letters were written.

It was a rustic, scantily educated region, which offered no favourable

opportunity for Christianity. Some, indeed, would argue that, as

Bithynia was so strongly permeated with the new religion, before A.D.

111, Phrygia which lies farther south and nearer the original seats of

Christianity, must have been Christianised earlier. This argument,

however, ignores the way in which Christianity spread, viz., along the

main roads and lines of communication. The same cause, which made

Eastern Caria later in receiving the new faith (as shown above), also

acted in Northern Phrygia. A study of the interesting monuments of

early Christianity in that part of the country has shown that it was

Christianised from Bithynia (probably not earlier than the second

century), and it was therefore left out of the early Asian system, as

being still practically a pagan country. Southern Phrygia lay near the

main Central Route of the Empire, and its early Christian monuments

show a markedly different character from the North Phrygian monuments,

and prove that it was Christianised (as was plainly necessary) from the

line of the great Central Highway. This part of Phrygia lay entirely in

the Upper Meander Valley, and fell naturally within the Laodicean

circuit.

Eastern Phrygia, on the other hand, was Christianised from Iconium and

Pisidian Antioch, and was therefore not included in the early Asian

system which we have described. Doubtless, during the second century, a

complete provincial organisation came into existence; and all Christian

Asia was then united. But, as great part of Phrygia had for a long time

been outside of the Asian system of the Seven Churches, it was

sometimes even in the second century thought necessary for the sake of

clearness to mention Phrygia along with Asia in defining the Church of

the whole Province. Hence we have the phrase "the Churches (or

Brethren) of Asia and Phrygia" in Tertullian, adv. Prax 1, and in the

letter of the Gallic Christians.

In the case of Laodicea it seems natural and probable that two

secondary circuits must be admitted. One would include the Lycus and

the Upper Meander Valleys: the messenger would go along the great

Central Highway and trade route through Colossae to Apameia, and thence

through the Pentapolis and back by Eumeneia to Laodicea. Hierapolis,

being so close to Laodicea, would share in any Laodicean communication

without any special messenger. Another secondary circuit would follow

the important Pamphylian Road (to Perga and Attalia), as far as Cibyra,

and then perhaps keep along the frontier of the Province to Lake

Ascania; but this road was rather a rustic byway, and it is hardly

probable that the frontier region was Christianised so early as the

first century. The Cibyra district, on the Pamphylian Road, was more

likely to be penetrated early by the new thought; and the name Epaphras

in an inscription of this district may be a sign that the impulse came

from Colossae.

Thus we find that the Seven Letters are directed to a well-marked

district embracing the greater part of the Province Asia; and natural

features, along with indubitable epigraphic and monumental evidence,

make it probable that the district of the Seven Letters contained the

entire Asian Church as it was organised about the end of the first

century. The importance of the Seven Letters becomes evident even in

such a small though interesting matter as this.

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

Chapter 16: Plan and Order of Topics in the Seven Letters

Each of the Seven Letters opens, as letters in ancient time always did,

by stating who sends the message and to whom it is sent. But the

exordium does not take the form that it would have if the sender of the

message were the writer of the letter, viz., "the writer to the person

addressed." In the present case the letters are written by John, who

imagines himself to be only the channel through which they come from

the real Author; and the exordium is altered to suit this situation.

The writer does not name himself; but after naming the persons

addressed--To the angel of the Church in Ephesus--he gives a brief

description of the Author of the message. The seven descriptions all

differ from one another; and, taken together, they make up the complete

account given in Revelation 1 of One like unto a son of man. The Divine

Author presents Himself in a different aspect to each individual

Church; and the seven aspects make up His complete personal

description, as the different Churches make up the complete and

Universal Church. This expresses in another way what we have tried to

show in chapter 14: the Seven Churches make up the complete Church of

the Province Asia, because each of them stands in place of a group of

Churches, and the Church of the Province Asia in its turn stands in

place of the Universal Church of Christ.

This variation from the ordinary formula of ancient letters is

connected with the fact, which has already been pointed out, that these

are not true letters, but literary compositions, or rather parts of one

larger composition. Although for convenience we have called them the

Seven Letters, they were not to be sent separately to the Seven

Churches. The Apocalypse is a book which was never intended to be taken

except as a whole; and the Seven Letters are a mere part of this book,

and never had any existence except in the book. The Seven Churches had

established their representative position before the book was composed;

and that is assumed throughout by the author. They stand to him, in

their combination, for the entire Province, and the Province stands to

him for the entire Church of Christ; though, when he is writing to

Smyrna or Thyatira, he sees and thinks of Smyrna or Thyatira alone.

As to the brief description of the Divine Author, which is prefixed to

each of the Seven Letters, there is a special appropriateness in each

case to the character or circumstances of the Church which is

addressed. To a certain extent we can comprehend wherein this

appropriateness lies; but there is probably a good deal which escapes

us, because our knowledge of the character and history of the Seven

Churches is so incomplete. From this appropriateness it follows that

the complete description of the Divine Author, which is made up of

those seven parts, is logically later than the parts, though it comes

first in the book. This appears especially in the Thyatiran letter. In

the highly complex plan of the work, every detail was selected

separately in view of its suitability for one or other of the Seven

Churches, and was then worked into its place in the full description in

the first chapter. Yet the description is complete: the writer worked

up the parts into a whole before stating them separately for the Seven

churches.

After the formal heading or exordium, each of the Seven Letters begins

by a statement intimating that the writer possesses full knowledge of

the character and position of the Church which he is addressing. In

five out of the seven letters this intimation begins, I know thy works;

but in the cases of Smyrna and Pergamum, the opening is different: I

know thy tribulation, and I know where thou dwellest. The difference is

evidently due to their peculiar circumstances. He who wishes to prove

his full knowledge of the Church in Smyrna says that he knows its

sufferings; because these were the striking feature in its history. And

in Pergamum the most prominent and distinguishing characteristic lay in

its situation, "where the throne of Satan is": by that situation its

history had been strongly influenced. But in most cases what is

essential to know about a Church is what it has done; and so begin all

the other five.

As was stated in chapter 3, the letter to an individual church passes

easily into an "Epistle General" to the whole Church, for it embodies

general principles of nature, order, and government, which are

applicable to all. Similarly, to apply the comparison which was there

made, the Imperial Rescript addressed to a Province or to its governor

embodied general principles of administration, which were afterwards

regarded as applicable universally (except in so far as they were

adapted to an exceptional condition of the Province addressed). But in

every case, when an individual Church is addressed, as here, it is

addressed in and for it itself, and its own special individual

character and fortunes are clearly present before the writer's mind. He

does not think of the Smyrna group when he addresses Smyrna, nor is he

thinking of the Universal Church: he addresses Smyrna alone; he has it

clear before his mind, with all its special qualities and

individuality. Yet the group which had its centre in Smyrna, and the

whole Universal Church, alike found that the letter which was written

for Smyrna applied equally to them, for it was a statement of eternal

truths and universal principles.

There was undoubtedly a very considerable resemblance between the Seven

Cities: the surroundings in which the Seven Churches were placed were

similar; and accordingly the character of all was in a superficial view

similar. In every city there were doubtless Jews of the nationalist

party, bitterly opposed to the Jewish Christians and through them to

the Christians as a body, a source of danger and trouble to every one

of the Churches; but the Jews are mentioned only in the letters to

Smyrna and Philadelphia. There were Nicolaitans, beyond all question,

in every Asian congregation; but they are alluded to only in the

Thyatiran letters as the dominant party in that Church, in the letter

to Pergamum as a strong element there, and in the Ephesian letter as

disapproved and hated by the Church of Ephesus as a body. Every one of

the Seven Churches was a missionary centre; but Philadelphia alone is

depicted as the missionary Church.

Underneath the general similarity the writer and the Author saw the

differences which determined the character, the past history, and the

ultimate fate of all the Seven churches (as described in chapter 4).

But the differences should not be too much emphasised, or exclusively

attended to. There are two hostile powers everywhere present, one open

and declared, one secret and lurking within the camp; and the thought

of these is never far from the writer's mind, even though he does not

expressly mention them in every letter.

One is the Imperial power and the Imperial worship, which the writer

saw plainly to be the power of Satan engaged in a determined attempt to

annihilate the Church, but doomed beforehand to failure. The Church and

the Imperial worship are irreconcilable; one or the other must be

destroyed; and the issue is not doubtful. Since the Imperial power has

now actively allied itself with the Imperial cultus in this conflict

against truth and life, it has doomed itself to destruction.

The other enemy is the Nicolaitan principle. The opposition to the

Nicolaitans is the chief factor in determining the character and form

of the Seven Letters. But for them there would probably be no letters

to the Seven Churches. The rest of the Apocalypse is occupied with the

triumph over the Imperial Religion. But there was no need to warn the

Churches against it: it was a sham, doomed to destruction, and already

conquered in every martyrdom. The one pressing danger to the Churches

was within and not without: it lay in their weaknesses of nature, and

in that false teaching which was set forth with the show of authority

by some prophets and leaders in the Churches. Against the Nicolaitan

teachers the Seven Letters are directed in the way of warning and

reproof, with strenuous opposition and almost bigoted hatred. Those

teachers drew a somewhat contemptuous contrast between their highly

advanced teaching, with its deep thought and philosophic insight, and

the simple, uneducated, unphilosophic views which St. John championed.

They gave undue emphasis to the Greek aspect of Christianity; and in

its practical working out they made it their rule of life to maintain

the closest possible relations with the best customs of ordinary

society in the Asian cities. This attempt was in itself quite

justifiable; but in the judgment of St. John (and we may add of St.

Paul also) they went too far, and tried to retain in the Christian life

practices that were in diametrical opposition to the essential

principles of Christianity, and thus they had strayed into a syncretism

of Christian and anti-Christian elements which was fatal to the growth

and permanence of Christian thought.

But in his opposition to the Nicolaitans the writer does not make the

mistake of going to the opposite extreme, minimising the share that

Greek thought and custom might have in the Christian life, and

exaggerating the opposition between Greek education and true religion.

He holds the balance with a steady hand; he expresses himself in a form

that should be clear and sympathetic to the Greek Churches whom he was

addressing; he gives quiet emphasis to the best side of Greek education

in letters which are admirable efforts of literary power; but at a

certain point his sympathy stops dead; beyond that point it was fatal

to go.

He saw the whole of life, and not merely one side of it; and he was not

misled by indiscriminate opposition to the enemy, however strongly he

hated them. He would have weakened the Church permanently, if he had

made the mistake, too common in the history of religion, of condemning

everything that the other side championed. He took from it all that

could be taken safely, gave all that it could give to train the

religious feeling to the highest, and did everything better than his

enemy could.

In studying St. Paul we find ourselves forced to recognise the

essential agreement of his views on this question with St. John's; and

in studying St. John we find ourselves forced to the same judgment.

With superficial differences they both take the same calm, sane view of

the situation as a whole, and legislate for the young Church on the

same lines. Up to a certain point the converted pagan should develop

the imperfect, but not wholly false, religious ideas and gropings after

truth of his earlier years into a Christian character; but there was

much that was absolutely false and fundamentally perverted in those

ideas; the pagan religions had been degraded from an originally better

form by the willful sin and error of men, and all that part of them

must be inexorably eradicated and destroyed. The determining criterion

lay in the idolatrous element: where that was a necessary part of pagan

custom or opinion, there was no justification for clinging to it:

unsparing condemnation and rejection was the only course open to a true

Christian.

Hence arose the one striking contrast in outward appearance between the

views of the two Apostles. St. Paul clung to the hope and belief that

the Church might develop within the Empire, and find protection from

the Imperial government. St. John regarded the Imperial government as

Antichrist, the inevitable enemy of Christianity. But in the interval

between the two lay the precise formulation of the Imperial policy,

which imposed on the Christians as a test of loyalty the performance of

religious ritual in the worship of the Emperors. The Empire armed

itself with the harness of idolatry; and the principle that St. Paul

himself had laid down in the sharpest and clearest terms at once put an

end to any hope that he had entertained of reconciliation and amity

between the Church and the existing State.

Again, the Seven Letters repeatedly, in the most pointed way, express

and emphasis the continuity of history, in the city and the local

Church. The Church is not simply regarded as a separate fact, apart

from the city in which it has its temporary abode; such a point of view

was impossible and such a thought was inconceivable for the ordinary

ancient mind. We have so grown in the lapse of centuries and the

greater refinement of thought as to be able to hold apart in our minds

the two conceptions; but the ancients regarded the State or the city

and its religion as two aspects of one thing. So again, to the ancients

every association of human beings had its religious side, and could not

exist if that side were destroyed.

The literary form which beyond all others is loved by the writer of the

Seven Letters is comparison and contrast. Throughout them all he is

constantly striking a balance between the power which the Divine Author

wields, the gifts that he gives, the promises and prospects which he

holds forth to his own, and the achievements of all enemies, the

Empire, the pagan cities, the Jews, and the Nicolaitans. The modern

reader has almost everywhere to add one side of the comparison, for the

writer only expresses one side and leaves the other to the intuition of

his readers. He selects a characteristic by which the enemy prominent

in his mind was, or ought to be, distinguished, and describes it in

terms in which his readers could not fail to read a reference to that

enemy; but he attributes it to the Divine Author or the true Church or

the true Christian. Thus he describes the irresistible might that shall

be given to the Thyatiran victor in terms which could not fail to rouse

in every reader the thought of the great Empire and its tremendous

military strength.

Examples of this rhetorical form will be pointed out in every letter;

and yet it is probable that many more were apparent to the Asian

readers than we can now detect. The thought that is everywhere present

in the writer's mind is how much better the true Church does everything

than any of its foes, open or secret.

One example may be given. The simple promise made by the Author to the

Smyrnaeans, I will give you the crown of life, when compared with the

address which Apollonius made to them, is seen to contain implicit

allusion to a feature of the city, which was a cause of peculiar pride

to the citizens: "the crown of Smyrna" was the garland of splendid

buildings with the Street of Gold, which encircled the rounded hill

Pagos. Apollonius in a fully expressed comparison advised the citizens

to prefer a crown of men to a crown of buildings. This Author leaves

one member of the figure to be understood: if we expressed his thought

in full, it would be "instead of the crown of buildings which you boast

of, or the crown of men that your philosophers recommend, I will give

you the crown of life."

The peroration of each of the Seven Letters is modelled in the same

way: all contain a claim for attention and a promise. The former is

identical in all Seven Letters: he that hath an ear, let him hear what

the Spirit saith to the Churches. The latter is different in every

case, being adapted to the special character of each.

The claim for attention, which is made in the peroration of every

letter, is perhaps to be understood as in part applying to the whole

Apocalypse, but in a much greater degree it applies to the advice and

reproof and encouragement contained in the individual letter and in the

whole Seven Letters. There was less need to press for attention to the

vision of victory and triumph, while there was serious need to demand

attention to the letter, with its plain statement of the dangers to

which the Church was exposed. Hence, while the claim is identical in

all, it is specially needed in each letter.

The promise made to the victors at the end of every letter is to be

understood as addressed partly to the Christians of the city, but still

more to the true Christians of the entire Church. The idea that the

individual Church is part of the Universal Church, that it stands for

it after the usual symbolic fashion of the Apocalypse, is never far

from the writer's mind; and he passes rapidly between the two points of

view, the direct address to the local Church as an individual body with

special needs of its own, and the general application and apostrophe to

the entire Church as symbolised by the particular local Church.

There is a difference among the letters in regard to the arrangement of

the peroration: in the first three the claim for attention comes before

the promise, in the last four it comes after. It must remain doubtful

whether there is any special intention in this, beyond a certain

tendency in the writer towards employing variety as a literary device.

Almost every little variation and turn in these letters, however, is

carefully studied; and probably it is through deliberate intention that

they are divided by this variation into two classes; but what is the

reason for the division, and the principle involved in it, is hard to

say. The first three ranked also as the three greatest cities of the

Province, vying with one another for the title "First of Asia," which

all three claimed. In the general estimation of the world, and in their

own, they formed a group apart (compare Figure 10, chapter 14), while

the others were second-rate. Probably there was a set of seven leading

cities in public estimation, as we saw in chapter 14; and certainly

there was within that set a narrower and more famous group of three. It

may be that this difference almost unconsciously affected the writer's

expression and produced a corresponding variation in the form, though

the variation apparently conveys no difference in force or meaning, but

is purely literary and formal.

An attempt has been made to explain the variation on the ground that

the first three Churches are regarded as having on the whole been

faithful, though with faults and imperfections; whereas the last four

have been faithless for the most part, and only a "remnant" is

acknowledged in them as faithful. But, while that is true of three out

of the four, yet Philadelphia is praised very highly, with almost more

thoroughness than any even of the first three, except Smyrna; and it is

the only Church to which the Divine Author says "I have loved thee."

So far as grouping can be detected among the Seven Churches, it would

rather appear that they are placed in pairs. Ephesus and Sardis go

together; so again Smyrna and Philadelphia, Pergamum and Thyatira;

while the distant Laodicea stands by itself, far away in the land of

Phrygia. Ephesus and Sardis have both changed and deteriorated; but in

Ephesus the change amounts only to a loss of enthusiasm which is still

perhaps recoverable; in Sardis the deterioration has deepened into

death. Smyrna and Philadelphia are praised far more unreservedly than

the rest; both are poor and weak; both have suffered from the Jews; but

both are full of life and vigour, now and forever. Pergamum and

Thyatira have both been strongly affected by Nicolaitanism; both are

compared and contrasted with the Imperial power; and both are promised

victory over it. Laodicea stands alone, outcast and rejected, because

it cannot make up its mind whether to be one thing or another.

This common plan on which all the Seven Letters are framed would alone

furnish a sufficient proof that they are not true letters, but literary

compositions which are cast in the form of letters, because that form

had already established itself in usage. Now the writer certainly did

not select this form merely because it was recognised in the pagan

literature. He selected it because it had already become recognised as

the characteristic and the best form of expression for Christian

didactic literature. A philosophic exposition of truth was apt to

become abstract and unreal; the dialogue form, which the Greeks loved

and some of the Christian writers adopted, was apt to degenerate into

looseness and mere literary display; but the letter, as already

elaborated by great thinkers and artists who were his predecessors, was

determined for him as the best medium of expression. In this form (as

has been shown in chapter 3) literature, statesmanship, ethics, and

religion met, and placed the simple letter on the highest level of

practical power. Due regard to the practical needs of the congregation

which he addressed prevented the writer of a letter from losing hold on

the hard facts and serious realities of life. The spirit of the

lawgiver raised him above all danger of sinking into the commonplace

and the trivial. Great principles must be expressed in the Christian

letter. And finally it must have literary form as a permanent monument

of teaching and legislation.

It was a correct literary instinct that led St. John to express the

message to the Seven Churches in letters, even though he had to work

these letters into an apocalypse of the Hebraic style, a much less

fortunate choice on pure literary grounds, though (as we have seen in

chapter 8) it was practically inevitable in the position in which the

writer was placed. In each letter, though it was only a literary

Epistle addressed to a representative Church, the writer was obliged to

call up before his mind the actual Church as he knew it; and thus he

has given us seven varied and individualised pictures of different

congregations.

Probably the opposition and criticism which he was sure to experience

from the Nicolaitans stimulated the writer to reach the high standard

of literary quality which characterises the Seven Letters in spite of

the neglect of traditional rules of expression. He uses the language of

common life, not the stereotyped forms of the historian or the

philosophers. As Dante had the choice between the accepted language of

education, Latin, and the vulgar tongue, the popular Italian, so St.

John had to choose between a more artificial kind of Greek, as

perpetuated from past teaching, and the common vulgar speech, often

emancipated from strict grammatical rules, but nervous and vigorous, a

true living speech. He chose the latter.

While one must speak about and admire the literary power of the Seven

Letters, the writer did not aim at literary form. He stated his thought

in the simplest way; he had pondered over the letters during the only

years in Patmos, until they expressed themselves in the briefest and

most direct form that great thoughts can assume; but therein lies the

greatest power that the letter can attain. He reached the highest level

in point of epistolary quality, because he had no thought of form, but

only of effect on his reader's life.

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

Chapter 17: Ephesus: The City of Change

The subject of the present chapter is the early Roman city, the Ephesus

of St. John and St. Paul. But as soon as we begin to examine its

character and make even a superficial survey of its history, it stands

out as the place that had experienced more vicissitudes than any other

city of Asia. In most places the great features of nature and the

relations of sea and land remain permanent amid the mutations of human

institutions: but in Ephesus even nature has changed in a surprising

degree. To appreciate its character as the city of change, we must

observe its history more minutely than is needed in the other cities.

At the present day Ephesus has all the appearance of an inland city.

The traveller who wanders among its ruins may be at first unconscious

of the neighbourhood of the sea. He beholds only a plain stretching

east and west, closed in on the north and south by long lines of

mountain, Gallesion and Koressos. As he looks to the east he sees only

ranges of mountains rising one behind another. As he looks to the west

his view from most part of the city is bounded by a ridge which

projects northwards from the long ridge of Koressos into the plain.

This little ridge is crowned by a bold fort, called in the modern local

tradition, St. Paul's Prison: the fort stands on the hill of Astyages

(according to the ancient name), and the ridge contains also another

peak on the west, called the Hermaion. The ridge and fort constitute

the extreme western defences of the Greek city, which was built about

287 B.C. That old Greek tower, owing to its distance and isolation, has

escaped intentional destruction, and is one of the best preserved parts

of the old fortification. From its elevation of 450 feet it dominates

the view, the most striking and picturesque feature of the Greek

Ephesus.

The historian of Greece, Professor Ernst Curtius, was misled by the

appearance of the city, and has described the fortunes of Ephesus as a

city separated from the sea by the ridge of Astyages. This

misapprehension partially distorted his view of Ephesian history and

coloured his picture, which is otherwise marked by sympathetic insight

and charm of expression. It is the merit of Professor Benndorf to have

placed the subject in its true light, and to have shown that the

history of Ephesus was determined by its original situation on the

seashore and its eagerness to retain its character as a harbour in

spite of the changes of nature, which left it far from the sea. The

brief sketch, which follows, of the history of Ephesus is founded on

Benndorf's first topographical sketch, and on the map prepared for his

promised fuller study of the subject. The present writer is indebted to

his kindness for a copy of the map in proof not finally corrected, and

can only regret that this sketch has to be printed without access to

the historical study which is to accompany it.

The most impressive view of modern Ephesus is from the western side of

Mount Pion, either from the upper seats of the Great Theatre or from a

point a little higher. The eye ranges westwards over the streets and

buildings of the Greek and Roman city (recently uncovered by the

Austrian Archaeological Institute in excavations extending over many

years and conducted with admirable skill), and across the harbour to

the hill of Astyages: southwest the view is bounded by the long ridge

of Koressos, along the front crest of which runs the south wall of the

Greek city: northwest one looks across the level plain to the sea, full

six miles away, and to the rocky ridge that projects from Mount

Gallesion and narrows the sea-gates of the valley: northward lie the

level plain and the steep slopes of Gallesion. The mouth of the river

is hidden from sight behind the hill of Astyages.

Figure 11

Figure 11: Conjectural map of the gulf of Ephesus, to show changes in

the coastline. The line of the walls of the Hellenic (and Roman) city

is marked. The history of Ephesus takes place between the hill of St.

John (Ayasoluk) and the hill of St. Paul (Astyages). The sea in A.D.

100-200 probably came up to about the valley opening down from Ortygia.

But a large and important part of ancient Ephesus is excluded from that

view, and can be seen only by ascending to the top of the twin-peaked

Pion, which commands the view on all sides. The view from the upper

seats of the Theatre may be supplemented by looking east from the

northern edge of Pion, beside the Stadium, or still better from the

prominent rock (cut into an octagonal form, probably to serve a

religious purpose) which stands in the plain about fifty yards in front

of the northwest corner of Pion and of the Stadium. From either of

these points one looks northeast and east over the valley and the site

of the great Temple of Artemis to the Holy Hill of Ayassoluk, which

overhung the Temple, and to the piled-up ranges of mountains beyond.

The modern visitor to Ephesus rarely finds time or has inclination to

visit St. Paul's Prison: the name is traditional in the locality, but

though the tower was certainly in existence at the time of St. Paul's

residence in the city, there is no reason to think that he was ever

imprisoned in Ephesus. It is, however, quite probable that in the

Byzantine time the Apostle's name was attached to the hill and fort in

place of the older name Astyages. Not merely does this western hill

permit a survey over the city and valley almost equal in completeness

to the view from Pion: there is also a remarkable phenomenon observable

here and nowhere else in Ephesus. At the foot of the hill lies the

ancient harbour, now a marsh dense with reeds. When a wind blows across

the reeds, there rises to the hilltop a strange vast volume of sound of

a wonderfully impressive kind; the present writer has sat for several

hours alone on the summit, spellbound by that unearthly sound, until

the approach of sunset and the prospect of a three hours' ride home

compelled departure.

In ancient times by far the most impressive view of Ephesus was that

which unfolded itself before the eyes of the voyager from the west. But

the changes that time has wrought have robbed the modern traveller of

that view. The ancient traveller, official or scholar, trader or

tourist, coming across the Aegean Sea from the west, between Chios and

Samos, sailed into Ephesus. The modern shore is a harbourless line of

sandy beach, unapproachable by a ship.

The plain of Ephesus is distinctly broader near the city than it is at

the present seacoast. The narrowness of the entrance, what may be

called the sea-gate of the valley, has been an important factor in

determining its history. Some miles above the city the valley is again

narrowed by ridges projecting from the mountains of Gallesion and

Koressos. In this narrow gap are the bridges by which the railway and

the road from Smyrna cross the Cayster, whose banks here are now only

ten feet above sea level, though the direct distance to the sea is ten

kilometres and the river course is fully sixteen or twenty kilometres.

Between these upper or eastern narrows and the modern seacoast lies the

picturesque Ephesian plain, once the Gulf of Ephesus. The river Cayster

has gradually silted up the gulf to the outer coastline beyond the ends

of the mountains, and has made Ephesus seem like an inland city,

whereas Strabo in A.D. 20 describes it as a city of the coast.

But about 1100 B.C. the sea extended right up to the narrows above

Ephesus. Greek tradition in the valley, which can hardly have reached

back farther than 1200 B.C., remembered that state of things, when the

large rocky hill, two kilometres north of the Roman city, across the

Cayster, was an island named Syria, and the whole Ephesian valley was

an arm of the sea, dotted with rocky islets, and bordered by

picturesque mountains and wooded promontories. near the southeastern

end of the gulf, on the seashore, stood the shrine of the Great

Goddess, the Mother, protector, teacher, and mistress of a simple and

obedient people. There was no city at that time; but the people,

Lelegians and Carians, dwelt after the Anatolian fashion in villages,

and all looked for direction and government to the Goddess and to the

priests who declared her will. Ephesus even then had some maritime

interests, directed, like everything else, by the Goddess herself

through her priests. Hence, even when the Temple was far distant from

the receding seashore, a certain body of shipment was attached to its

service, through the conservatism of a religion which let no hieratic

institution die. The hill of Ayassoluk, between the Temple and the

railway station, was a defensive centre close at hand for the servants

of the Goddess. History shows that it was the Holy Hill, though that

title is never recorded in our scanty authorities.

The sense of the holiness of this hill, and of the low ground beneath

its western slope, was never wholly lost amid all the changes of

religion that occurred in ancient and medieval times. On the hill

Justinian's great Church of St. John Theologos was built; the medieval

town was called Agios Theologos or Ayo-Thologo, the Turkish Ayassoluk;

and the coins of a Seljuk principality, whose centre was at this town,

bear the legend in medieval Latin Moneta Que Fit In Theologo. Between

the church and the old temple of the goddess stands the splendid mosque

of Isa Bey. The modern traveller, standing on the southern edge of the

large hole, at the bottom of which Mr. Wood found the temple buried

thirty feet deep, looks over temple and mosque to the Holy Hill and

Church of Ayassoluk. All the sacred places of all the religions are

close together.

The site of the temple was only found after many years of search. Those

who know the spirit of Anatolian religion, and the marvellous

persistence with which it clings to definite localities, would have

looked for it beside the mosque, the hill and the church. But it was

sought everywhere except in the right place. Professor Kiepert marked

it conjecturally on his plan of Ephesus out in the open plain near the

Cayster, two kilometres west of Ayassoluk; and Mr. Wood spent several

years and great sums of money digging pits all over the plain.

Afterwards, he went to the city, searching the public buildings for

inscriptions which might by some chance allude to the temple, and at

last found in the Great Theatre a long inscription which mentioned a

procession going out from the Magnesian Gate to the temple. He went to

the gate, and followed up the road, which lay deep beneath the ground,

till he found the sacred precinct and finally the temple.

Yet this was not the earliest Ephesian sanctuary and home of the

goddess. In her oldest form she was a goddess of the free wild life of

nature, and her first home was in the southern mountains near Ortygia.

Thence she migrated to dwell near her people in their more civilised

homes on the plain, or rather she, as the Mother and the Queen-bee,

guided her swarming people to their new abodes, and taught them how to

adapt themselves to new conditions. But her love for her favourite wild

animals, who had lived round her old home among the hills, always

continued; and two stags often accompany her idol, standing one on each

side of it: see Figure 10 chapter 14, Figure 26 chapter 25, and Figure

17 in this chapter; also chapter 19.

But her old home among the mountains was always sacred. There were

there a number of temples, ancient and recent; an annual Panegyris was

held there, at which there was much competition among the young nobles

of Ephesus in splendour of equipment; and Mysteries and sacred banquets

were celebrated by an association or religious club of Kouretes. The

myth connected the birth of Artemis with this place; and in a sense it

was the birthplace of the goddess and her first Ephesian home.

In Christian times the holiness of this locality was maintained. The

Mother of God was still associated with it, though the birth of God

could no longer be placed there. The legend grew that she had come to

Ephesus and died there; and her home and grave were known. This legend

is at least as old as the Council held in Ephesus A.D. 431. After the

Greek Christians of Ephesus had fled to the eastern mountains and

settled in the village of Kirkindji they celebrated an annual

pilgrimage and festival at the shrine of the Mother of God, the Virgin

of the Gate, Panagia Kapulu. The Christian shrine was at a little

distance from Ortygia; both were under the peak of Solmissos

(Ala-Dagh), but Ortygia was on the west side, while the Panagia was on

the north side higher up the mountain; both peak and Panagia lie

outside our map, and even Ortygia is strictly outside the southern

limit, though the name has been squeezed in.

The home and grave of the Mother of God have been recently discovered

by the Roman Catholics of Smyrna, aided by visions, prayers and faith;

and the attempt has been made in the last ten years to restore the

Ephesian myth to its proper place in the veneration of the Catholic

Church. The story is interesting, but lies beyond our subject. What

concerns us is to observe the strong vitality of local religion in Asia

Minor amid all changes of outward form. The religious centre is moved a

little to and fro, but always clings to a comparatively narrow circle

of ground.

The date and even the order of the successive stages in the history of

the Ephesian valley cannot as yet be fully determined--though Professor

Benndorf's expected memoir will doubtless throw much light on them.

About 1100 B.C. the first Greek colonists, coming from Athens, expelled

most of the older population and founded a joint city of Greeks and the

native remnant beside the shrine of their own Athena, including in

their city also a tract along the skirts of Koressos. Its exact

situation has not been determined; but it was probably identical with a

district called Smyrna, which lay between Koressos and Pion, partly

inside, partly southeast from, the Hellenic Ephesus.

For four centuries this was the situation of Ephesus. There was an

Ionian city bearing that name on the slopes of Mount Koressos, and

above a mile north was the Temple of the Great Goddess Artemis. The

Greek colonists in their new land naturally worshipped the deity who

presided over the land. Gradually they came to pay more respect to her

than to their own patroness and guardian deity Athena, who had led them

across the sea from Athens. The holy village around the Hieron of

Artemis can hardly have existed in this period: Ephesus was moved to

the southern position and transformed into a Greek city. The population

of the city was at first divided into three Tribes, of which Epheseis

the first was evidently the Anatolian division, while Euonymoi,

containing the Athenian colonists, was only the second.

The sea gradually retreated towards the west during this period; and

the Temple of Artemis was now a sanctuary within a large sacred

precinct in the plain. But the goddess, though worshipped by the

Greeks, was not transformed into a Greek deity. She remained an

Anatolian deity in character and in ritual. The Divine nature does not

change.

A new era began after 560 B.C., when Ephesus was conquered by Croesus.

The city was now attached to the Temple of Artemis; and the population

was moved back from the higher ground and dwelt once more beside the

Temple. Smyrna, the deserted site of the Ionian Ephesus, was now behind

the city (as Hipponax says).

The change marked the entire triumph of the Asiatic or Anatolian

element over the Greek in the Ephesian population. The Anatolian

element had always been strong in the population of the Greek city; the

Ephesian Goddess was henceforth the national deity of the city, the

patroness of the family and municipal life. Thus, the change of

situation about 550 B.C. accompanied a change in spirit and character.

Ephesus was not, however, reduced entirely to the pure Anatolian

village system. It was not a mere union of villages with the Temple as

the only centre; it was a city with a certain organisation and a

certain form of municipal government. Power was apportioned to the

different sections of the population by the usual Greek device of a

division into Tribes: each Tribe had one vote, and a more numerous body

in one Tribe had no more power than a small number of citizens in

another. It had its own acropolis, probably the hill of Ayassoluk,

overhanging the Temple on the northeast. It struck its own coins in

silver and electrum (the sure proof of administrative independence as a

city); but they were entirely hieratic in character and types, and for

nearly three centuries after 560 it must be ranked rather as an

Anatolian town than as a Greek city.

Figure 12

Figure 12: A, B. Coin of the Anatolian Ephesus

It was, indeed, forced, after 479, to join the union of Greek States

which was called the Delian Confederacy; but it seceded at the earliest

opportunity; and the goddess was always inclined to side with the

Persians against the Greeks, and with oligarchic Sparta against

democratic Athens.

With the conquest of Asia by Alexander the Great, after 335, the Greek

spirit began to strengthen itself in Ephesus and in general throughout

the country. This is first perceptible in the coinage. The bee, the

sacred insect and the symbol of the Great Goddess, had hitherto always

been the principal type on Ephesian coins. Now about 295 B.C. a purely

Greek type, the head of the Greek Artemis, the Virgin "Queen and

Huntress chaste and fair," was substituted for the bee on the silver

coins, while the less honourable copper coinage retained the old

hieratic types.

Figure 13

Figure 13: A, B. Coin of the Hellenic Ephesus

The importance of this change of type arises from the character of the

Great Goddess. She is the expression of a religious belief, which

regarded the life of God as embodying and representing the life of

nature, and proceeding according to the analogy of the natural world,

so that in the drama of Divine life there is a God-Father, a

Goddess-Mother, and a Son or a Daughter (the Maiden Kora or other

various ideas), born again and again in the annual cycle (or sometimes

in longer cycles) of existence. The mutual relations of those beings

were often pictured in the Divine drama according to the analogy of

some kind of earthly life. In the Ephesian ceremonial the life of the

bee was the model: the Great Goddess was the queen-bee, the mother of

her people, and her image was in outline not unlike the bee, with a

grotesque mixture of the human form: her priestesses were called

Melissai (working-bees), and a body of priests attached to the Temple

was called Essenes (the drones). The shape of the idol is seen in

Figure 10 chapter 14; Figure 26 chapter 25. The life-history of the

bee, about which the Greek naturalists held erroneous views (taking the

queen-bee as male, and king of the hive), was correctly understood in

the primitive Ephesian cultus; and it is highly probable that the

employment for human use of the bee and of various domesticated animals

was either originated or carried to remarkable perfection in ancient

Asia Minor; while it is certain that the whole doctrine and rules of

tending those animals had a religious character and were in close

relation to the worship of the Divine power in its various and varying

local embodiments.

The reverse of the coins tells the same tale as the obverse. The

Anatolian coin shows the palm-tree under which the goddess was born

among the southern mountains at Ortygia, and her sacred animal, the

stag, cut in half in truly barbaric style. The Hellenic coin shows the

bow and quiver of the huntress-maiden, and acknowledges the Anatolian

goddess by the small figure of a bee: even in its most completely

Hellenised form Ephesus must still do homage to the native goddess.

On the other hand Greek religion was strongly anthropomorphic, and the

Hellenic spirit, as it developed and attained fuller consciousness of

its own nature, rejected more and more decisively the animal forms and

animal analogies in which the Anatolian religion delighted.

Where Greece adopted an Anatolian cult, it tried to free itself from

animal associations, and to transform the Divine impersonation after

the purely human beautiful Hellenic idea. Thus to substitute the head

of the huntress Virgin Artemis for the bee on the coins was to

transform an Anatolian conception into a Greek figure, and to blazon

the triumph of the Greek spirit over the Oriental.

There followed once more a change in the situation of Ephesus,

accompanying the change in spirit that was being wrought in the aims

and outlook of the city. Ephesus was moved away from the neighbourhood

of the Temple to a situation not far removed from that of the old Greek

city. The change, naturally, was strenuously resisted by the priests

and the large section of the people that was under their domination.

But the will of King Lysimachus, the master of the northwest regions of

Asia Minor, who carried on the Hellenising tradition of Alexander, was

too strong; and he cleverly overcame the unwillingness of the Anatolian

party in the town. The Ephesus of 560-287 BC was in a low-lying

situation, surrounded on three sides by higher ground, and in time of

rain a great amount of water poured down through the town. Lysimachus

took advantage of a heavy rain, and stopped the channels which carried

off the water into the gulf, or the river: the town was flooded, and

the people were glad to leave it.

The new situation was admirably strong and convenient; and the Hellenic

Ephesus of this new foundation lasted for more than a thousand years.

Its shape was like a bent bow, the two ends being Pion on the east and

the Hill of Astyages on the west; while the sea washed up into the

space between, forming an inner harbour, whose quays bordered by

stately colonnades and public buildings can still be traced amid the

ruins. The outer harbour was part of the land-locked gulf.

A great street ran from the inner harbour right up to the base of Pion.

The visitor to Ephesus, after landing at the harbour, would traverse

this long straight street, edged by porticoes, with a series of

magnificent buildings on either hand, until he reached the left front

of the Great Theatre and the beginning of the steep ascent of Pion. The

street, as it has been disclosed by the Austrian excavations, is the

result of a late reconstruction and bears the name of the Emperor

Arcadius, A.D. 395-408; but the reconstruction was only partial, and

there can be little doubt that the general plan of the city in this

quarter dates from the foundation about 287 B.C., and that this great

street is the one which is mentioned in the Bezan text of Acts 19:28. A

riot was roused by a speech of Demetrius, delivered probably in a

building belonging to a guild of some of the associated trades. After

the passions of the mob and their apprehension of financial disaster

were inflamed, they rushed forth "into the street," and ran along it

shouting and invoking the goddess, until at last they found themselves

in front of the Great Theatre. That vast empty building offered a

convenient place for a hasty assembly. Even this excited mob still

retained some idea of method in conducting business. It was quite in

the old Greek style that they should at once constitute themselves into

a meeting of the Ephesian People, and proceed to discuss business and

pass resolutions. Many a meeting convened in an equally irregular way,

simply through a strong common feeling without any formal notice had

been held in the great Greek cities, and passed important resolutions.

But this meeting was not conducted by persons used to business and

possessing authority with the crowd. It was a mere pandemonium, in

which for more than an hour the mob howled like Dervishes, shouting

their prayers and invocations. Then the Secretary addressed the

assembly, and pointed out that such an irregular meeting was not

permitted by the Imperial government, which would regard this as a mere

riot and punish it with the severity which it always showed to illegal

assumption of power.

The death of Lysimachus in 281 B.C. interrupted and impeded for a

moment the development of the new city, which he had planned on a great

scale. But the position was favourable; and it soon became one of the

greatest cities of Asia. Miletus had once been the great seaport of the

west coast of Asia Minor; and the main route for the trade between the

interior and the countries of the West came down the Meander Valley to

Miletus, at the southern entrance to a great gulf extending fully

twenty miles into the land. But Miletus had suffered greatly when the

Ionian revolt was crushed by the Persians about 500 B.C.; and Ephesus

then gained an advantage through Persian favour. Moreover, Ephesus was

really a nearer harbour than Miletus even for trade coming down the

Meander Valley. Finally, the river Meander was rapidly silting up its

gulf, and the harbour of Miletus was probably requiring attention to

keep the entrance open; both the gulf of Miletus, then so large, and

the harbour have in modern times entirely disappeared, owing to the

action of the Meander. Thus Ephesus was heir to much of the trade and

prosperity which had belonged to Miletus; though it was destined in its

turn, from a similar cause, to see its harbour ruined, and its trade

and importance inherited by its rival Smyrna.

Lysimachus had called the new city Arsinoe after his wife, thus

breaking definitely with the old tradition as to name and the old

Ephesian religious connection; and he indicated the break by making the

bust of Arsinoe the principal type on the city coins. The tradition,

however, was too strong; and another change of name soon occurred,

probably at his death in 281 B.C. The coins of the city began once more

to bear the old name of Ephesus. But the Greek huntress virgin still

had the place of honour on the silver coins, while the bee was the

principal type on the copper coins. The spirit prevalent in the city

expresses itself always on the coins.

Figure 14

Figure 14: A, B. Coin of Ephesus under the name Arsinoe

Another change took place about 196. Ephesus was captured by Antiochus

the Great; and the Asiatic spirit again became dominant through the

influence of the Syrian monarch. The bee regained its place as the

characteristic type on the silver coinage. A period of greater freedom

under the Pergamenian influence, 189-133, was marked by an increase in

prosperity, and by a great variety in the classes and types of Ephesian

coinage.

Ephesus formed part of the Roman Province of Asia, which was organised

in 133 B.C. The Roman possession of the city was temporarily

interrupted by the invasion of King Mithridates in 88 B.C. It was from

Ephesus that he issued orders for the great massacre, in which 80,000

Romans (according to Appian, 150,000 according to Plutarch) were put to

death in the Province of Asia. The Ephesians did not spare even the

Roman suppliants at the altar of the goddess, disregarding the right of

asylum which had hitherto been universally respected, even by invaders.

But Sulla soon reconquered Asia; and Ephesus remained undisturbed in

Roman possession for many centuries, though sacked by the Goths in A.D.

263.

In the Roman Province of Asia, Pergamum, the old capital of the Kings,

continued to be the titular capital; but Ephesus, as the chief harbour

of Asia looking towards the west, was far more important than an

ordinary city of the Province. It was the gate of the Province, both on

the sea-way to Rome, and also on the great central highway leading from

Syria by Corinth and Brundisium to Rome. The Roman governors naturally

fell into the habit of entering the Province by way of Ephesus, for

there was, one might almost say, no other way at first; and this custom

soon became a binding rule, with uninterrupted precedents to guarantee

it. After the harbour of Ephesus had grown more difficult of access in

the second century, and other harbours (probably Smyrna in particular)

began to contest its right to be the official port of entrance, the

Emperor Caracalla confirmed the custom of "First Landing" at Ephesus by

an Imperial rescript.

The drawing in Figure 15 expresses the Ephesian pride in this right. It

shows a Roman war-vessel, propelled by oars, not sails, lightly built,

active and independent of winds. The legend "First Landing" marks it as

the ship that conveys the Proconsul to his landing-place in Ephesus.

The coin was struck under Philip, A.D. 244-8; but the right was of

great antiquity.

Figure 15

Figure 15: Ephesus--the first landing place

The type of a ship occurs in another form with a different meaning on

Ephesian coins. A ship under sail, which is shown in Figure 16, is a

merchant vessel; and indicates the maritime trade that frequented the

harbour of Ephesus. Even if no other evidence were known, this type

would furnish sufficient proof that Ephesus possessed a harbour. The

same type occurs on coins of Smyrna, but not of any other of the Seven

Cities; because none of the others had harbours.

Not only was Ephesus the greatest trading city of the Province Asia,

and also of all Asia north of Taurus (as Strabo says); it derived

further a certain religious authority in the whole Province from the

Great Goddess Artemis. The Ephesian Artemis was recognised, even in the

first century after Christ, as in some sense a deity of the whole

Province Asia. This belief was probably a creation of the Roman period

and the Roman unity; and it deserves fuller notice as an instructive

instance of the effect produced by a Roman idea working itself out in

Greek forms.

Figure 16

Figure 16: The sea-borne commerce of Ephesus

The Roman administrative idea "Province" was expressed by the Greek

word "Nation": in Strabo "the Nation Asia" corresponds to the Latin

Asia Provincia. This Greek rendering shows a truly creative instinct:

in place of a mere external unity produced by conquest and compulsion

it substitutes an internal and organic unity springing from national

feeling. But the "Nation" must necessarily have a national religion:

without the common bond of religion no real national unity was possible

or conceivable to the Greek and the Anatolian mind. As the bond the

Imperial policy set up the State religion, the worship of the Majesty

of Rome and of the reigning Emperor as the incarnate God in human form

on earth (praesens divus) and of the deceased Emperors who had returned

to Heaven--after the fashion described in chapter 10. But while the

Province loyally accepted this religion, it was not satisfied with it.

There was a craving after a native Asian deity, a more real Divine

ideal: the Imperial religion was after all a sham religion, and no

amount of shows and festivals and pretended religious form could give

it religious reality or satisfy the deep-seated religious cravings of

the Asian mind. A deity who had been a power from of old in the land

was wanted, and not a deity who was invented for the purpose and the

occasion.

In the circumstances of the country, and in conformity with the ideas

of the time, such a deity could be found only in the tutelary divinity

of some great, leading city; and practically only two cities were of

national Asian standing, Pergamum and Ephesus. As we have seen in

chapter 10, the Pergamenian gods, Dionysos the Leader (Kathegemon) and

Asklepios the Saviour (Soter), were being pushed towards that position,

and the towns of Asia were encouraged to adopt the worship of these two

deities alongside of their own native gods. But the Ephesian goddess

had a stronger influence than the deities of Pergamum, for every city

of Asia was brought into trading and financial relations with Ephesus,

and thus learned to appreciate the power of the goddess. Every city

became familiarised with transactions in which the gods of the two

parties were named, the Ephesian Artemis and the god or goddess of the

city to which the other contracting party belonged. In this way Artemis

of Ephesus was in A.D. 55 the deity "whom all Asia and the civilised

world worshipped." A commentary on these words of Acts 19:27 is

furnished by an inscription of Akmonia in Phrygia, dated 85 A.D.,

recording the terms of a will, in which the testator invokes as

overseers and witnesses a series of deities, the Divine Emperors and

the gods of his country, Zeus and Asklepios the Saviour and Artemis of

Ephesus: here Zeus is the native Acmonian god, and Asklepios and

Artemis are the two provincial gods belonging to the two capitals, the

official and the virtual.

While Ephesus was ranked in the estimation of the world by her goddess

Artemis, the Imperial worship was not neglected. A shrine and a great

altar of Augustus was placed in the sacred precinct of the goddess in

the earlier years of his reign: it is taken as a type on coins of the

Commune (Figure 17), where the two sacred stags (compare Figure 26,

chapter 25ff) mark the close connection between the Imperial and the

Ephesian religion even at that early time (see chapter 10).

Figure 17

Figure 17: The Altar of Augustus in the precinct of Artemis

This was a purely municipal, not a Provincial, cult of Augustus; and in

the competition among the cities of Asia in A.D. 26 for the honour of

the temple to Tiberius (chapter 19) Ephesus was passed over by the

Senate on the ground that it was devoted to the worship of Artemis. But

Provincial temples of the Imperial religion were built in Ephesus, one

under Claudius or Nero, one under Hadrian, and a third under Severus;

and the city boasted that it was Temple-Warden or Neokoros of three

Emperors.

Sometimes it styles itself "four times Neokoros"; but the fourth

Temple-Wardenship seems to be of Artemis, not of a fourth Emperor;

though the fact that the title (which ordinarily was restricted to

Imperial temples) was allowed in respect of the temple of Artemis shows

that a very close relation was formed between the Imperial religion and

the worship of Artemis as a goddess of the whole Province. A coin shows

the four temples, containing the statues of Artemis and three Emperors,

and marks the closeness of the connection between the cults (Figure

18).

Figure 18

Figure 18: The four Temple Wardenships of Ephesus

Two subjects still claim some notice, the changes in the relation of

sea and land, and the changes in the constitution of the city.

The stages of the former cannot be precisely dated; but the Gulf of

Ephesus was gradually filled up as the centuries passed by, and

navigation was after a time rendered difficult by shallows and changes

of depth, caused by the silting action of the Cayster. The entrance to

the gulf grew narrower; and a channel was not easily kept safe for

ships. Engineering operations, intended to improve the water-way, were

carried out by the Pergamenian kings of the second century B.C. and by

the Romans in the first century after Christ; these show the time when

the evil was becoming serious. When the ship in which St. Paul

travelled from Troas to Jerusalem in A.D. 57 sailed past Ephesus

without entering the harbour, this may probably be taken as a sign that

ships were beginning to avoid Ephesus unless it was necessary to take

or discharge cargo and passengers.

The state of the coast during the second century after Christ is shown

by the following incident. Apollonius of Tyana, defending himself

before Domitian, spoke of Ephesus as having now outgrown the site on

which it had been placed and extended to the sea. This furnishes a

conclusive proof both that the sea no longer reached up to Ephesus when

the speech was composed, and that it was not so distant from the city

as the modern seashore, for it is impossible to suppose that the city

ever reached to the present coastline. The words probably imply that

the seashore was near the lower (i.e. western) end of the Hermaion, and

that Ephesus extended into the valley of the stream which flows from

Ortygia to join the Cayster now, but at that time fell into the sea. It

remains uncertain whether Philostratus composed the speech about 210 or

found it in his authorities. The difference however is not serious.

There is no reason to think that the words are as old as Apollonius'

supposed trial about A.D. 90. They represent the ideas that were

floating in the Asian world, A.D. 100-200; and even a century would not

produce much difference in the coast line.

But even in the second and third centuries after Christ Ephesus was

still a great trading city, and therefore must have still had a harbour

open, though not easy of access. It is certain that only energetic

engineering work kept an open channel. The last kilometre of the modern

river course is straight, in contrast with the winding course

immediately above; the channel is embanked with a carefully built wall,

in order to increase the scour of the water; and this part of the

course is evidently the result of a great and well-designed scheme for

improving the bed of the river. Probably, this was a new channel, cut

specially in order to avoid the shallows of the entrance to the gulf.

The ultimate result, however, is certain. Ephesus ceased to be

accessible for shipping, and the city harbour became an inland marsh.

It is probable that this result had been accomplished before the time

of Justinian, 527-563 A.D.; he chose Ayassoluk for the site of his

great Church of St. John Theologos, and this site implies that all

thought of maritime relations had ceased.

The constitution of Ephesus sought to maintain by a division into

Tribes an equipoise between the diverse elements which were united in

the city. Apparently there were originally three, Epheseis, including

the native population, Euonymoi, the Athenian colonists, and Bembinaioi

(Bembineis), possibly the colonists of other Greek regions (taking name

from Bembina, a village of Argolis, beside Nemea). Two more Tribes,

Teioi and Karenaioi, were introduced to accommodate new bodies of

settlers from the Ionian city Teos and, presumably, from Mysia (where

the town Karene was situated). Ephorus, who wrote in the middle of the

fourth century, describes these as the five Ephesian Tribes.

A sixth Tribe was introduced at some later time; but the date of its

formation is uncertain. It is mentioned under the name Sebaste, i.e.

Augustan, a name given to it in honour of Augustus; but the Tribe was

not first instituted then, for, had that been so, its divisions

(Chiliastyes) would have naturally been called by names characteristic

of the period; but they bear names which point to an earlier origin. It

would therefore appear that the new name Sebaste was given to one of

the existing Tribes; and the latest formed Tribe was chosen for the

purpose. As to the origin of the sixth Tribe, nothing is known except

that it was later than about 340 B.C., and older than the time of

Augustus. The only two occasions on which the formation of a new Tribe

seems reasonably probable were the refoundation by Lysimachus about 287

B.C., and the remodelling of the constitution by Antiochus II, 261-246

B.C. Lysimachus introduced bodies of new citizens from the Ionian

cities of Lebedos and Colophon; but he did not form a new Tribe to hold

them. He classed the Lebedians as a special division (Chiliastys) of

the Tribe Epheseis, which he evidently instituted under the name

Lebedioi; and if a complete list of the Chiliastyes were preserved, we

might find another called Colophonioi. Apparently Lysimachus was

anxious to avoid a too marked break with the past, and left the old

Tribes unchanged in names and number. It remains that the sixth Tribe

must have been formed by Antiochus II. Now it has been shown in chapter

12 that Antiochus placed in Ephesus a body of Jews as citizens, and it

is expressly recorded that he settled the constitution on a lasting

basis, which remained unchanged at least until 15 B.C. It has also been

shown in that chapter that a body of Jewish citizens could be

introduced into a Hellenic city only by placing them in a special

Tribe. The old five Tribes had their own long-established religious

rites, which could not be avoided by any member, and were impossible

for Jews. A new Tribe was required whose bond of unity should not be of

a kind to exclude the Jews. Antiochus formed a sixth Tribe and placed

all his new citizens in it. The original name of this Tribe is unknown;

but it was probably such as to give an appearance of Hellenic character

(as the Jewish Tribe in Alexandria was called Macedones). The only

known Chiliastyes of this Tribe were Labandeos (which seems Carian, and

may mark a body of Carian colonists) and Sieus (from the name of an

aquatic plant like parsley, that grew in the marshes near Ephesus): the

latter seems intended to give a native appearance to this latest and

most foreign of classes in the State.

It is not necessary to suppose that the new Tribe consisted exclusively

of Jews. It would be sufficient to make two provisions: first, one of

the Chiliastyes of the new Tribe must have been reserved for the Jews;

secondly, the bond of unity in the whole Tribe must not be a pagan

ritual. It must be observed that, while it was hardly possible for the

king to tamper with the religion of any of the old Tribes, the

character of the new one was entirely within his control.

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

Chapter 18: The Letter to the Church in Ephesus

These things saith he that holdeth the seven stars in his right

hand, he that walketh in the midst of the seven golden lamps.

I know thy works, and thy toil and patience, and that thou canst not

bear evil men, and didst try them which call themselves apostles,

and they are not, and didst find them false; and thou hast patience

and didst bear for my name's sake, and has not grown weary. But I

have this against thee, that thou didst leave thy first love.

Remember therefore from whence thou art fallen, and repent, and do

the first works; or else I come to thee, and will move thy

candlestick out of its place, except thou repent. But this thou

hast, that thou hatest the works of the Nicolaitans, which I also

hate.

He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith to the

Churches.

To him that overcometh, to him will I give to eat of the tree of

life, which is in the Paradise of God.

The message to the Church in Ephesus comes from Him "that holdest the

seven stars in His right hand, that walketh in the midst of the seven

golden lamps." If we review the openings of the other six letters, none

could so appropriately be used to the Church in Ephesus as this

description. The only exordium which could for a moment be compared in

suitability with it is the opening of the Sardian letter, "he that hath

the Seven Spirits of God and the Seven Stars." The second part in that

case is almost identical with part of the Ephesian exordium, but the

first part is different.

The similarity between the Ephesian and Sardian letters is not confined

to the opening address, but can be traced throughout. If Ephesus was

the practical centre and leading city of Asia at that time, though not

the official capital of the Province, Sardis was the ancient capital of

Lydia, and the historical centre of the Asian cities; the tone and

spirit of the history of the two Churches had been to a certain degree

analogous; and therefore a resemblance in the letters was natural. The

Author of the letters assumes much the same character in addressing

these two cities, emphasising in both cases his relation with all the

Seven Churches. The capital of a country stands for the whole, and he

who addresses the practical capital may well lay stress upon his

relation to all the other cities of the country. But the similarities

and differences between these two letters can be discussed more

satisfactorily when we take up the Sardian letter and have both before

us.

Ephesus, as in practical importance the leading city of the Province

Asia, might be said in a sense to be the centre, to be in the midst of

the Seven Churches; and the Divine figure that addresses her

appropriately holds in His hand the Seven Stars, which "are the Seven

Churches." The leading city can stand for the whole Province, as the

Province can stand for the whole Church; and that was so customary and

usual as to need no explanation or justification. To the Christians,

Ephesus and Asia were almost convertible terms; Ephesus stood for Asia,

Asia was Ephesus. Hence in the list of Equivalent names compiled by

some later scribe, the explanation is formally given, No. 40, "Asia"

means the city Ephesus.

As to the holding of the seven stars, Mr. Anderson Scott, in his

admirable little edition, published in the Century Bible, remarks that

"in the image before the eye of the Seer the seven stars probably

appear as a chain of glittering jewels hanging from the hand of

Christ." This image suits excellently the description which we have

given already of the Seven Churches as situated on the circling road

that goes forth from Ephesus, traverses them all in succession and

returns to its point of origin in the representative city of the

Province. The analogy from pagan art quoted in chapter 19 shows readily

this figure would be understood by the Asian readers.

After the initial address, the letter begins, according to the usual

plan, with the statement that the Author has full knowledge of the

character and fortunes of the Church. He knows what the Ephesians have

done.

The past history of the Ephesian Church had been one of labour and

achievement, enduring and energetic. Above all it had been

distinguished by its insight into the true character of those who came

to it with the appearance of Apostles. It lay on the great highway of

the world, visited by many Christian travellers, some coming to it for

its own sake, others merely on their way to a more distant destination.

Especially, those who were travelling to and from Rome for the most

part passed through Ephesus: hence it was already, or shortly

afterwards became, known as the highway of the martyrs, "the

passage-way of those who are slain unto God," as Ignatius called it a

few years later, i.e., the place through which must pass those who were

on their way to Rome to amuse the urban population by their death in

the amphitheatre. Occasionally, it is true, they were conducted to Rome

by a different road. Ignatius, for example, did not pass through

Ephesus, but was taken along the overland route, for some reason

unknown to us. The reason did not lie in the season of the year, for he

was at Smyrna on 7th August, and probably reached Rome on 17th October,

an open time for navigation. But Ignatius knew, though he himself was

led by another route, that the ordinary path of death for Eastern

martyrs was by land to Ephesus and thence by sea to Rome.

Among the travellers there came to Ephesus, or passed through it, many

who claimed to be teachers; but the Ephesian Church tested them all;

and, when they were false, unerringly detected them and unhesitatingly

rejected them.

The recital of the past history and the services of the Church occupies

a much greater proportion of the Ephesian letter than of any other of

the Seven. The writer dwells upon this topic with emphatic

appreciation. After describing the special kind of work in which the

Ephesians had been most active and useful, he returns again to praise

their career of patience and steadfastness, and describes their

motive--"for my name's sake"--which enhances their merit. The best

counsel, the full and sufficient standard of excellence for the

Ephesians, is to do as they did of old. Others may have to improve; but

Ephesians are urged not to fall short of their ancient standard of

action.

The best commentary on this is found in the letter of Ignatius to the

Ephesians, with its profound and frank admiration, which might seem

almost to be exaggerated were it not justified by the language of St.

John. The Syrian bishop wrote as one who felt that he was honoured in

associating with the envoys from the Ephesian Church and in being

"permitted by letter to bear it company, and to rejoice with it."

Ignatius shows clearly in his letter the reasons for his admiration.

The characteristics which he praises in the Ephesian Church are the

same as those which St. John mentions. And yet they are so expressed as

to exclude the idea that he remembered the words of this letter and

either consciously or unconsciously used them: "I ought to be trained

for the contest by you in faith, in admonition, in endurance, in long

suffering," sect. 3: "for ye all live according to truth and no heresy

hath a home among you; nay, ye do not so much as listen to any one if

he speak of ought else save concerning Jesus Christ in truth," sect. 6:

"as indeed ye are not deceived," sect. 8: "I have learned that certain

persons passed through you from Syria, bringing evil doctrine; whom ye

suffered not to sow seed in you, for ye stopped your ears," sect. 9:

"you were ever of one mind with the Apostles in the power of Jesus

Christ," sect. 11.

The ideas are the same; but they are scattered about through Ignatius'

letter, and not concentrated in one place. Moreover the words are

almost entirely different. The only important words common to those

passages of Ignatius and the letter which we are studying are

"endurance," which almost forced itself on any writer, and "Apostles";

but Ignatius speaks of the true Apostles, St. John of the false. The

idea of testing, which is prominent in St. John, is never explicitly

mentioned by Ignatius, and yet it is implied and presupposed in the

passages quoted from sections 6, 8, 9. But he was interested only in

the result, the successful championing of truth, whereas St. John was

necessarily interested quite as much in the way by which the Ephesians

attained the result.

The probability, then, is that Ignatius was not familiar with the

Ephesian letter of St. John. He could hardly have kept so remote from

the expression of this letter, if it had been clear and fresh in his

memory. Hence his testimony may be taken as entirely independent of the

Revelation, and as showing that the reputation of Ephesus in the

Christian world about the beginning of the second century had not grown

weaker or less brilliant in the short interval since St. John wrote.

But, while nothing is required of the Ephesians except that they should

continue to show their old character, yet a return to their earlier

spirit was urgently necessary. The fault of the Ephesian Church was

that it no longer showed the same spirit: the intense enthusiasm which

characterised the young Church had grown cooler with advancing age.

That was the serious danger that lay before them; and it is the common

experience in every reform movement, in every religion that spreads

itself by proselytising. The history of Mohammedanism shows it on a

large scale. No religion has ever exercised a more rapid and almost

magical influence over barbarous races than Islam has often done,

elevating them at once to a distinctly higher level of spiritual and

intellectual life than they had been capable of even understanding

before. But in the case of almost every Mohammedanised race, after the

first burst of enthusiastic religion, under the immediate stimulus of

the great moral ideas that Mohammed taught, has been exhausted, its

subsequent history presents a spectacle of stagnation and

retrogression.

The problem in this and in every other such case is how to find any

means of exercising a continuous stimulus, which shall maintain the

first enthusiasm. Something is needed, and the writer of this letter

perhaps was thinking of some such stimulus in the words that follow,

containing a threat as to what shall be done to Ephesus if it continues

to degenerate, and fails to reinvigorate its former earnest enthusiasm.

But a less serious penalty is threatened in this case than in some of

the other letters--not destruction, nor rejection, not even the

extirpation of the weak or erring portion of the Church, but only "I

come in displeasure at thee, and will move thy lamp, the Church, out of

its place."

Some commentators regard the threat as equivalent to a decree of

destruction, and point to the fact that the site is a desert and the

Church extinct as a proof that the threat has been fulfilled. But it

seems impossible to accept this view. It is wrong method to disregard

the plain meaning, which is not destruction but change; and equally so

to appeal to present facts as proving that destruction must have been

meant by this figurative expression.

Equally unsatisfactory is another interpretation, that Ephesus shall be

degraded from its place of honour, which implies an unconscious

assumption that Ephesus already occupied its later position of

metropolitan authority in the Asian Church. As yet Ephesus had no

principate in the Church, except what it derived from its own character

and conduct: while its character continued, its influence must

continue; if its character degenerated, its influence must disappear.

Ephesus has always remained the titular head of the Asian Church; and

the Bishop of Ephesus still bears that dignity, though he no longer

resides at Ephesus, but at Magnesia ad Sipylum. For many centuries,

however, Smyrna has been in practice a much more important See than

Ephesus.

The natural meaning must be taken. The threat is so expressed that it

must be understood of a change in local position: "I will move thy

Church out of its place."

Surely in this milder denunciation we may see a proof that the evil in

Ephesus was curable. The loss of enthusiasm which affected that Church

was different in kind from the lukewarmness that affected Laodicea, and

should be treated in a different way. The half-heartedness of the

Laodiceans was deadly, and those who were so affected were hopeless,

and should be irrevocably and inexorably rejected. But the cooling of

the first Ephesian enthusiasm was a failing that lies in human nature.

The failing can be corrected, the enthusiasm may be revived; and, if

the Ephesians cannot revive it among themselves by their own strength,

their Church shall be moved out of its place.

The interpretation of Grotius comes near the truth: "I will cause thy

population to flee away to another place." We do not know whether the

form in which he expresses his interpretation is due to the belief

current in the country that the Christian people of Ephesus fled to the

mountains and settled in a village four hours distant, called

Kirkindje, which their descendants still consider to be the

representative of the ancient Ephesus. But if Grotius had that fact in

view, his interpretation does not quite hit the mark. The writer of the

Seven Letters was not thinking of an arbitrary fact of that kind, which

might befall any city, and was in no way characteristic of the real

deep-seated nature of one city more than of another. He had his eye

fixed on the broad permanent character of Ephesian scenery and

surroundings, and his thought moved in accord with the nature of the

locality, and expressed itself in a form that applied to Ephesus and to

no other of the Seven Churches.

There is one characteristic that belongs to Ephesus, distinctive and

unique among the cities of the Seven Churches: it is change. In most

ancient sites one is struck by the immutability of nature and the

mutability of all human additions to nature. In Ephesus it is the

shifting character of the natural conditions on which the city depends

for prosperity that strikes every careful observer and every student

either of history or of nature. The scenery and the site have varied

from century to century. Where there was water there is now land: what

was a populated city in one period ceased to be so in another, and has

again become the centre of life for the valley: where at one time there

was only bare hillside or the gardens of a city some miles distant, at

another time there was a vast city crowded with inhabitants, and this

has again relapsed into its earlier condition: the harbour in which St.

John and St. Paul landed has become a mere marsh, and the theatre where

the excited crowd met and shouted to Diana, desolate and ruinous as it

is, has been more permanent than the harbour. The relation of sea and

land has changed in quite unusual fashion: the broad level valley was

once a great inlet of the sea, at the head of which was the oldest

Ephesus, beside the Temple of the Goddess, near where the modern

village stands. But the sea receded and the land emerged from it. The

city followed the sea, and changed from place to place to maintain its

importance as the only harbour of the valley.

All those facts were familiar to the Ephesians; they are recorded for

us by Strabo, Pliny, and Herodotus, but Ephesian belief and record are

the foundation for the statements of those writers. A threat of

removing the Church from its place would be inevitably understood by

the Ephesians as a denunciation of another change in the site of the

city, and must have been so intended by the writer. Ephesus and its

Church should be taken up, and moved away to a new spot, where it might

begin afresh on a new career with a better spirit. But it would be

still Ephesus, as it had always hitherto been amid all changes.

Such was the meaning that the Ephesians must have taken from the

letter; but no other of the Seven Cities would have found those words

so clear and significant. Others would have wondered what they might

mean, as the commentators are still wondering and debating. To the

Ephesians the words would seem natural and plain.

But after this threat the letter returns to the dominant note. The

Ephesian Church was still, as it had been from the beginning, guarding

the way, testing all new teachers, and rejecting with sure judgment the

unworthy. In the question which beyond all others seemed to the writer

the critical problem of the day the Ephesians agreed with him, and

hated the works of the Nicolaitans. In two other letters that party in

the early Church is more fully described. In the Ephesian letter the

Nicolaitans are only named.

The promise contained in the perorations of the Seven Letters is

different in every case, and is evidently adapted in each instance to

suit the general tone of the letter and the character and needs of the

city. To the Ephesian who overcometh, the promise is that he shall eat

of the tree of life, which is in the Garden of God. Life is promised

both to Smyrna and to Ephesus; yet how differently is it expressed in

the two cases. Smyrna must suffer, and would be faithful unto death,

but it shall not be hurt of the second death. Ephesus had been falling

from its original high level of enthusiasm; it needed to be quickened

and reinvigorated, and none of the promises made to the other Churches

would suit its need; but the fruit of the tree of life is the

infallible cure, the tree whose very leaves were for the healing of the

nations, the tree in which every true Christian acquires a right of

participation (22:2, 14). The expression is, of course, symbolical; and

its real meaning can hardly be specified. It would be vain to ask what

St. John had precisely in his mind; but it might be a more hopeful task

to inquire what meaning the Asian readers would take from the phrase.

It is a Jewish expression; but the Asian readers would take it in the

way in which many Jewish ideas seem to have become efficacious in the

Province, viz., in a sort of syncretism of Jewish and native Asian

thought.

Every image or idea in this letter finds a parallel or an illustration

in Jewish thought and literature. Yet it cannot be said with truth that

the letter is exclusively Jewish in tone. There is nothing in it which

would seem strange or foreign to the Hellenic or Hellenised people for

whom the book was in the first instance written. Even the tree of life

carried no un-Hellenic connotation to Ephesian readers. The tree was as

significant a symbol of life-giving Divine power to the Asian Greeks as

to the Jews, though in a different way. Trees had been worshipped as

the home of the Divine nature and power from time immemorial, and were

still so worshipped, in Asia Minor as in the ancient world generally.

On some sacred tree the prosperity and safety of a family or tribe or

city was often believed to depend. When the sacred olive-tree on the

Acropolis of Athens put forth a new shoot after the city had been

burned by the Persians, the people knew that the safety of the State

was assured. The belief was widely entertained that the life of a man

was connected with some tree, and returned into that tree when he died.

The tree which grew on a grave was often thought to be penetrated with

the spirit and life of the buried man; and an old Athenian law punished

with death any one that had cut a holm-oak growing in a sepulchral

ground, i.e. heroon. Sacred trees are introduced in Figure 4 chapter 6,

Figure 23 chapter 21 and Figure 14A chapter 17.

It will probably seem to many persons an unworthy and even irrational

procedure to trace any connection between the superstitious veneration

of sacred trees and the symbolism of St. John. But it was shown in

chapter 13 that although Ignatius abhorred paganism, and though the

memory of his pagan days caused a lasting sense of shame in his mind,

yet he could compare the life of a Christian congregation to the

procession at a pagan festival, and could use symbolism derived from

the pagan mysteries to shadow forth the deepest thoughts of

Christianity. In all those cases the same process takes place: the

religious ideas of the pagans are renovated in a Christian form,

ennobled and spiritualised. The tree of life in the Revelation was in

the mind of the Ephesians a Christianisation of the sacred tree in the

pagan religion and folklore: it was a symbolic expression which was

full of meaning to the Asian Christians, because to them the tree had

always been the seat of Divine life and the intermediary between Divine

and human nature. The problem which was constantly present to the

ancient mind in thinking of the relation of man to God appears here:

how can the gulf that divides human nature from the Divine nature be

bridged over? how can God come into effective relation to man? In the

holy tree the Divine life is bringing itself closer to man. He who can

eat of the tree of life is feeding on the Divine power and nature, is

strengthening himself with the body and the blood of Christ. The idea

was full of power to the Asian readers.

But to us the "tree of life" carries in itself little meaning. It seems

to us at first little more than a metaphor in this passage, and in

Revelation 22 it appears to us to be a mere detail in a rather fanciful

and highly poetical allegory. A considerable effort is needed before we

can even begin dimly to appreciate the power which this idea had in the

minds of Ephesian readers: we have to recreate the thoughts and mind of

that time, before we can understand their conception of the "tree of

life."

Accordingly, although the "tree of life" is different from any

expression that occurs, so far as known, in Greek literature, it

contains nothing that would seem strange or exotic to Greeks or Asians.

And every other idea in the letter would seem equally natural, and

would appeal to equally familiar beliefs and habits of life. While we

need not doubt that the writer took the "tree of life" from his own

Jewish sphere of thought, yet he certainly avoids in all these letters

anything that is distinctly anti-Hellenic in expression. So far as the

Seven Letters are concerned, he is in advance of, not in hostility to,

the best side of Hellenic thought and education.

Thus ends the letter. It is a distinctly laudatory one, when it is

examined phrase by phrase: it shows admiration and full appreciation of

a great career and a noble history. Yet it does not leave a pleasant

impression of the Ephesian Church; and there is a lack of cordial and

sympathetic spirit in it. The writer seems not to have loved the

Ephesians as he did the Smyrnaeans and Philadelphians. He respected and

esteemed them. He felt that they possessed every great quality except a

loving enthusiasm. But when, in order to finish with a word of praise,

he seeks for some definite laudable fact in their conduct at the

present moment, the one thing which he finds to say is that they hated

those whom he hated. Their disapproval and their hatred were correctly

apportioned: in sympathy and love they were deficient. A common hatred

is a poor and ephemeral ground of unanimity.

The Ephesians stand before us in the pathway of the world, at the door

by which the West visited the East, and from which the East looked out

upon the West, as a dignified people worthy of their great position,

who had lived through a noble history in the past, and were on the

whole not unworthy of it in the present, who maintained their high

tradition--and yet one thing was lacking, the power of loving and of

making themselves loved.

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

Chapter 19: Smyrna: The City of Life

Smyrna was founded as a Greek colony more than a thousand years before

Christ; but that ancient Aeolian Smyrna was soon captured by Ionian

Greeks, and made into an Ionian colony. Ionian Smyrna was a great city,

whose dominion extended to the east far beyond the valley, and whose

armies contended on even terms against the power of Lydia. Battles

fought against the Lydians on the banks of the Hermus are mentioned by

the Smyrnaean poet Mimnermus in the seventh century. But Lydian power

with its centre at Sardis was increasing during that period, and Smyrna

gradually gave way before it, until finally the Greek city was captured

and destroyed about 600 B.C. by King Alyattes. In one sense Smyrna was

now dead; the Greek city had ceased to exist; and it was only in the

third century that it was restored to the history of Hellenic

enterprise in Asia. There was, however, a State named Smyrna during

that long interval, when the Ionian Smyrna was merely a historical

memory. It is mentioned in an inscription of 368 B.C. as a place of

some consequence; but it was no longer what the Greeks called a city.

It was essential to the Greek idea of a city that it should have

internal freedom, that it should elect its own magistrates to manage

its own affairs, and that its citizens should have the education and

the spirit which spring from habitually thinking imperially. This

Asiatic Smyrna between about 600 and 290 was, as Strabo says, a loose

aggregate of villagers living in various settlements scattered over the

plain and the surrounding hills; it possessed no sovereign power or

self-governing institutions; and it has left no trace on history.

Aristides, however, says that there was a town in that period

intermediate in position between the old and the later city.

Smyrna was treated more harshly than Ephesus by the Lydian conquerors:

apparently the reason was that it was more typically Greek and more

hostile to the Asiatic spirit of the Lydian realm, whereas the native

Anatolian element was stronger in Ephesus. The purely Greek Smyrna

could not be made to wear Lydian harness, and was destroyed. The

half-Asiatic Ephesus was easily changed into a useful Lydian town

without the complete sacrifice of autonomy and individuality.

The design was attributed to Alexander the Great of marking the triumph

of Hellenism by refounding Greek Smyrna; and later coins of Smyrna show

his dream, in which the Smyrnaean goddesses, the two Nemeseis or Fates,

appeared to him and suggested to him that plan. But it was left for

King Lysimachus, after Antigonus had made a beginning, to carry the

design into effect. His refoundation of Smyrna and of Ephesus was a

part of a great scheme, the completion of which was prevented by his

death. The new Hellenic Smyrna was in a different place from the old

Ionian city. The earlier city had been on a steep lofty hill

overhanging on the north the extreme eastern recess of the gulf: the

new city was on the southeast shore of the gulf about two miles away.

The aim in the former was security against sudden attack, but there

could never have been beside it a very good harbour. The later city was

intended to be a maritime and trading centre, a good harbour and a

convenient starting-point for a land-road to the east. The type of a

merchant ship, which appears on its coins, as on those of Ephesus

(Figure 16, chapter 17), indicates its maritime character: see also

Figure 22 in this chapter.

Its maritime power was maintained by two ports. One was a small

land-locked harbour, the narrow entrance of which could be closed by a

chain: the other was probably only the adjacent portion of the gulf

which served as a mooring-ground. The inner harbour lay in the heart of

the modern city, where the bazaars now stand. In that situation, half

surrounded by houses and close under the hill of Pagos, it was readily

liable to grow shallower and to be ultimately filled up; but the small

ancient ships found it so useful that the harbour authorities had to

keep it carefully. In 1402 Tamerlane besieged the lower city, which was

held by the Knights of Rhodes with their stronghold in a castle

commanding the harbour; and he blocked the entrance by a mole in the

process of his operations. After the entrance was once closed, the

negligent government of the now Turkish city was not likely to try to

reopen it; moreover as the size of ships increased, the usefulness of

so small a harbour ceased. Thus the natural process of filling up the

old harbour went on unchecked; and it has long disappeared, though it

was still visible in the middle of the eighteenth century and even

later.

To its maritime character was due the close association with Rome which

Smyrna formed at an early period. From the time that the great republic

began to interfere in the affairs of the East, common interests

maintained a firm alliance and "friendship" (according to the Latin

term) between Rome and Smyrna. A common danger and a common enemy

united them. At first Smyrna was struggling to maintain its freedom

against the Seleucid power, and Rome's Eastern policy sprang out of the

agreement which its great enemy Hannibal had made with the Seleucid

king, Antiochus the Great. At a later time Rome supported Smyrna as a

counterpoise to the too great maritime power of Rhodes. As early as

195, when Antiochus was still at the height of his power, Smyrna built

a temple and instituted a worship of Rome; this bold step was the

pledge of uncompromising adherence to the cause of Rome, while its

fortunes were still uncertain. After a century, when a Smyrnaean public

assembly heard of the distress in a Roman army during the war against

Mithridates, the citizens stripped off their own clothes to send to the

shivering soldiers.

The faithfulness of Smyrna to this alliance was a just ground of pride

to the city, and was fully acknowledged by her powerful friend. Cicero

expressed the Roman feeling that Smyrna was "the city of our most

faithful and most ancient allies"; and in 26 A.D. the Smyrnaeans argued

before the Senate that the new temple to be dedicated by the Commune of

Asia to Tiberius should be built in Smyrna, because of their faithful

friendship dating from a time before the East had learned that Rome was

the greatest power in the world; and they were preferred to all other

cities of the Province.

The view of Smyrna in which its character and situation are best seen

is got from the deck of a ship lying out in the gulf before the city.

The traveller from the west sails up an arm of the sea, which runs far

inland. At the southeastern end he finds Smyrna, with the hills behind

it on the south and west, the sea on its north side, and on the east a

beautiful little valley, nine miles by four, bounded by more distant

mountains. The buildings of the city rise out of the water, cluster in

the hollow below the hills, and on the lower skirts of Pagos, "the

Hill," or straggle up irregularly towards the summit. There is a

wonderful feeling of brightness, light, and activity in the scene: in

such a matter only the personal experience can be stated, but such is

the impression that the view has always made on the present writer. The

approach to Constantinople from the east gives a similar impression;

and part of the reason lies in the long land-locked sea-way which leads

to the harbour, giving in both cases the appearance of inland cities

with all the advantage of a situation on the sea.

The Smyrnaeans were specially proud of the beauty of their city. The

frequent legend on their coins, "First of Asia," was contested by

Pergamum and Ephesus; all three were first of Asia in one respect or

another: Smyrna defined her rank on some coins as "First of Asia in

beauty and size." Strabo says its beauty was due to the handsomeness of

the streets, the excellence of the paving, and the regular arrangement

in rectangular blocks. The picturesque element, which he does not

mention, was contributed by the hills and the sea, to which in modern

times the groves of cypress trees in the large Turkish cemeteries must

be added. Groves of trees in the suburbs are mentioned by Aristides as

one of the beauties of the ancient city. On the west the city included

a hill which overhangs the sea and runs back southward till it nearly

joins the western end of Pagos: in the angle the road to the south

issued through the Ephesian Gate. The outer edge of the western hill

afforded a strong line of defence, which the wall of Lysimachus took

advantage of; and Pagos constituted an ideal acropolis, as well as a

striking ornament to crown the beauty of the city.

The citizens were also proud of their distinction every branch of

literature; and Apollonius of Tyana is said to have encouraged them in

this, and to have advised them to rest their self-esteem more in their

own character than in the beauty of their city: "for thought," as he

said, "though it is the most beautiful of all cities under the sun, and

makes the sea its own, and holds the fountains of Zephyrus, yet it is a

greater charm to wear a crown of men than a crown of porticoes and

pictures and gold beyond the standard of mankind: for buildings are

seen only in their own place, but men are seen everywhere and spoken

about everywhere and make their city as vast as the range of countries

which they can visit."

The words of Apollonius show that "the crown of Smyrna" was a familiar

phrase with the Smyrnaeans; and there can be no doubt that the phrase

arose form the appearance of the hill Pagos, with the stately public

buildings on its rounded top and the city spreading out down its

rounded sloping sides. In fact, the words state plainly that the crown

of Smyrna consisted of buildings, and, in the picturesque language of

current talk (which always catches salient features), buildings are

likened to a crown because they stand on a conspicuous place and in an

orderly way. As to the modern appearance only a personal impression can

be stated: "with Mount Pagos and its ruined castle rising out of the

clustering houses, it looks a queenly city crowned with her diadem of

towers'": so Mrs. Ramsay in 1901 described Smyrna as it used to appear

from the sea. Until about 1890 the brow of the rounded hill was crowned

with a well-preserved garland of walls and battlements; and the

appearance of the circling city, the hill sloping back towards the

centre, and the frowning walls crowning the edge of the rounded summit,

has probably made the same impression on many travellers.

Aelius Aristides, who lived much in Smyrna, can hardly find language

strong enough to paint the beauty and the crown of Smyrna. He compares

the city, as the ideal city on earth, to the crown of Ariadne shining

in the heavenly constellation. He describes it as sitting like a statue

with its feet planted on seashore and harbours and groves of trees, its

middle parts poised equally above the plain and beneath the summit, and

its top in the distance gently rising by hardly perceptible gradations

to the acropolis, which offered an outlook over the sea and the town,

and stood always a brilliant ornament above the city. Thus Smyrna city

was a flower of beauty, such as earth and sun had never showed to

mankind. He repeats the comparison to a statue and to a flower in

several of his orations. The likeness depends partly on the appearance

of the city as sloping up from the sea, partly on the orderly

arrangement of the part, partly on the circular head with its crown of

buildings, viz., Pagos with its acropolis. The idea of the crown is in

his mind, though he varies the phrase: the truth was that Aristides in

his highly wrought orations would not use a figure that was in

everybody's mouth, and he plays with the idea but rarely uses the word.

Several of his highly ornate sentences become clearer when we notice

that he is expressing in a series of variations the idea of a crown

resting on the summit of the hill.

When Aristides says that, since Smyrna has been restored after the

disastrous earthquake, "Spring's gates and Summer's are opened by

crowns," the reference to some close connection between Smyrna and the

crown is so marked that Reiske suggests that the Crowns were the

deities of flowers (like Flora in Latin). We now know that the Crown of

Smyrna was the head and bloom of the city's flower. Again he declares

that, by the revival of Smyrna, "the crown has been preserved to

Ionia."

The comparison of Smyrna to a flower has a close connection with the

"crown." The crown or garland was usually a circlet of flowers; and the

mention of a crown immediately aroused in the ancient mind the thought

of a flower. Crowns were worn chiefly in the worship of the gods. The

worshipper was expected to have on his head a garland of the flowers or

foliage sacred to the god whose rites he was performing. The guests at

an entertainment were often regarded as worshippers of Bacchus and wore

the sacred ivy: frequently, also, the entertainment was a feast

connecting with the ritual of some other deity, and the crown varied

accordingly. Thus the ideas of the flower and of the crown suggest in

their turn the idea of the god with whose worship they were connected,

i.e., the statue of the god. The tutelary deity of Smyrna was the

Mother-goddess, Cybele; and when Aristides pictured Smyrna as a statue

sitting with her feet on the sea, and her head rising to heaven and

crowned with a circlet of beautiful buildings, he had in mind the

patroness and guardian of the city, who was represented enthroned and

wearing a crown of battlements and towers. Her image was one of the

most frequent types on the coins of the city, and in many

alliance-coins she appears for Smyrna as in Figure 19. The crown of

Smyrna was the mural crown of Smyrna's goddess.

From the same origin arises his repeated allusion to the necklace of

Smyrna. If there was a crown on the top of the head, a clearly marked

street or any line which encompassed the lower part of the hill may be

compared to a necklace. He speaks of the city as drawing to itself its

various ornaments of sea and suburbs in a variegated necklace: a

figurative expression which recalls the chain of the Seven Stars

hanging from the hand of the Divine Author of the Seven Letters (as

described in the Ephesian Letter).

Figure 19

Figure 19: The Goddess of Smyrna

But what Aristides chiefly thought of, when he mentions the necklace,

was the splendid Street of Gold, which he alludes to several times in a

more or less veiled and figurative way. He mentions once the streets

that took their names from temples and from gold. Apollonius (as

already quoted) alludes in similar figurative style to the gold of

Smyrna, and connects it with the crown of Smyrna, which shows that it

crossed the sloping hill, and by its conspicuous buildings contributed

to that orderly arrangement of edifices which constituted the idea of

the crown. Aristides, likewise, refers to this magnificent street when

he says that, as you traverse the city from west to east, you go from a

temple to a temple and from a hill to a hill. It is suggested in Dr.

Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible, iv., p. 554, that this street ran

from the Temple of Zeus Akraios to the Temple of the Mother-goddess

Cybele Sipylene. The latter was probably on the hill Tepejik on the

eastern outskirts of the city: the former has been identified recently

by Mr. Fontrier, the chief authority on the topography of Smyrna, with

certain remains on the western slope of Pagos. A street connecting

those two temples would curve round the lower slopes of the hill (owing

to the conformation of the ground), and would by its length and its

fine buildings form a conspicuous band which might well be compared in

ornate rhetoric to a circlet of jewels round the neck of the statue.

The comparison of Smyrna to a statue appears in the address of

Apollonius, and it is evident either that the comparison passed through

his influence into Smyrnaean usage and became a current expression, or

that the biographer of Apollonius deliberately attributed to the older

orator a simile which was commonly used in Smyrna (for Aristides, in

all his ornate descriptions of Smyrna, catches up and elaborates the

expressions familiar among the citizens). The latter supposition is

more probable: the biographer's custom was to select prominent and

recognised characteristics of a great city like Smyrna, and show that

they were all due to wise counsel given by the divinely inspired

Apollonius.

Thus Apollonius is described as recommending to the citizens a certain

strenuous activity of spirit as the true path to honour and success for

their city: "competitive unanimity" is his phrase. Aristides mentions

as characteristic of Smyrna "the grace which extends over every part

like a rainbow, and strains the city like a lyre into tenseness

harmonious with itself and with its beautiful surroundings, and the

brightness which pervades every part and reaches up to heaven, like the

glitter of the bronze armour in Homer." In these words Aristides is

playing on a common idea in Greek philosophy, which is applied by

Apollonius to Smyrna. The application is distinctly an older idea taken

up by Aristides; and the probability is that this again was the

recognised character of Smyrna, which Philostratus in his usual way

derives from the wise counsel given by his hero.

The prevalent wind, now called Imbat, i.e. Landward, sets up the long

gulf from the western sea; and blows with wonderful regularity through

the hot weather, rising almost every day as the sun grows warm, blowing

sometimes with considerable strength in the early afternoon, and dying

down towards sunset. This westerly breeze, Zephyrus, was in ancient

times, and is still, reckoned by the inhabitants as one of the great

advantages of their city. It breathes a pleasant coolness through the

city in the heat of summer; and people luxuriate in its refreshing

breath and never tire of lauding its delightful effect. In ancient

times they boasted in the words of Apollonius (already quoted) that

they possessed the fountains of Zephyr, and could therefore reckon with

certainty on continuous westerly breezes. As Aristides says, "the winds

blow through every part of the town, and make it fresh like a grove of

trees." The inhabitants never realised that the Zephyr brings with it

some disadvantages. It comes laden with moisture, and it prevents free

passage of the drainage from the city to the open gulf.

According to Strabo, the one defect in the situation of Smyrna was that

the lowest parts of the city were difficult to drain. The level has

risen in modern times through the accumulation of soil; but in ancient

times there was little difference between the level of sea and land

until the rise of the hills was reached. The difficulty of drainage,

however was not due solely to the lowness of the level. It was

aggravated by the winds. The prevalent wind blowing eastwards up the

gulf heaps up the water on the shore, and prevents the discharge from

finding its way out to sea. Hence in modern time there is often a

malodour on the quay when the west wind is blowing fresh.

But the people of Smyrna did not mention this or any other defect of

their city in talking with others. Municipal rivalry and local pride

were keen and strong in ancient times. The narrower Greek conception of

patriotism which restricted it to the limits of the city made those

feelings far more powerful in ancient times; and Rome tried in vain to

put Imperial in the place of local patriotism: she could plant the

seeds of a wider feeling and raise it to a certain height, but the

growth was not so strong and deep-rooted as the municipal pride.

Smyrna boasted that it was the city of Homer, who had been born and

brought up beside the sacred river Meles. Homer is one of the most

frequent types on coins of the city; and there was a temple called

Homereion in the city. The same name was applied to a small bronze

coin, which showed the poet sitting, holding a volumen on his knees,

and supporting his chin on his right hand.

According to the allusions of Aristides, the Meles was a stream close

to the city, between it and the open plain, having an extremely short

course, so that its mouth was close to its source; it flowed with an

equable stream, unvarying in summer and winter; its channel was more or

less artificial; and its water was not cold in winter (when Aristides

bathed in it by order of the god Asklepios, and found it pleasantly

warm). These characteristics suit only the splendid fountains of

Diana's Bath, Khalka-Bunar, on the east outskirts of the modern city,

and the stream that flows thence to the sea with an even current and

volume. The source is at so low a level that an artificial channel has

always been needed to carry off the water. In modern time the locality

has been entirely altered; the water is dammed up to supply part of the

city; the surplus runs off through a straight cutting to the sea, and

all the picturesqueness of the scene has been lost with the

disappearance of the trees and the natural surroundings.

Figure 20

Figure 20: The River-god Meles

This identification is confirmed by the representation of the god

Meles, given on a coin of Smyrna (Figure 20). He appears in the

ordinary form, which Greek art appropriated to the idea of a river-god,

except that he has not a cornucopia resting on his bent left arm. The

cornucopia symbolised the fertilising power of the river, which

supplies the water that the dry soil of Asia everywhere needs: the

river turns an arid desert into a garden. But the Meles, flowing down a

little way from the source to the sea, has no opportunity for diffusing

fertility, and the cornucopia would be unsuitable to it. It was a

stream to give pleasure and health by its fountains, and was worshipped

as a healing power; but its water rises at so low a level that it was

not used by the agriculturist.

The patron-goddess of Smyrna was a local variety of Cybele, known as

the Sipylene Mother. Like the Artemis of Ephesus, her oldest home was

in the mountains on the north of the valley, famous in myth and history

as Sipylos, where Niobe dwelt and Tantalus reigned; and she came down

to the plain with her worshippers, and took up her abode

"Before-the-City." She became a more moralised conception in the Ionian

Greek city; and Nemesis was the aspect which she bore to the Greek

mind. In Smyrna alone, of all the Greek cities, Nemesis was regarded

not as a single figure, but as a pair. The twin figures Nemesis often

appear as a type on coins of the city: they stand as a rule on the

ground, one holding a bridle, the other a cubit-rule with a wheel at

her feet, but in the coin represented in Figure 21 the wheel becomes a

chariot drawn by griffins, on which the twin goddesses are borne.

Aristides describes the plain of Smyrna as won from the sea, but not in

the same way as some plains (e.g., those of Ephesus and Miletus) were

won, viz., by silting up. Probably geologists would confirm his

statement that the sea once extended much farther to the East. But when

he wrote the change had not taken place in recent time; and little

change has taken place between the first century and the twentieth. But

in two respects there has been change. The coast in front of the city

has advanced, the city has encroached a good deal on the sea, and the

inner harbour has been entirely filled up. But in the southeastern

corner of the gulf, near the mouth of the Meles, the sea has encroached

on the land. The steady action of the west wind through many months of

every year drives the sea on that corner and washes away the coast

slowly but steadily. But the rivulets which flow into the eastern end

of the gulf are all mountain streamlets, which carry little silt, but

wash down gravel and pebbles into the plain, and are dry or almost dry

in the hot season. The Meles alone flows with a full and unvarying

current, but its course is very short.

Figure 21

Figure 21: The twin goddesses Nemesis of Smyrna

Under the Roman government Smyrna enjoyed the eventless existence of a

city which suffered few disasters and had an almost unbroken career of

prosperity. From the sixth century onwards it was the only important

harbour for inland caravan trade on the west coast of Asia Minor; and

its importance in comparison with other cities of the coast necessarily

increased as time passed. In the centuries that followed the lot of

every city in Asia Minor was an unhappy one; and Smyrna suffered with

the rest. But it was the last to suffer from the eastern raids; and it

was generally the ally of western powers in that time, as once it had

been the ally of Rome. The circumstances of sea and land gave it

lasting vitality. Frequent earthquakes have devastated it, but only

seemed to give it the opportunity of restoring itself more beautifully

than before. No conquest and no disaster could permanently injure it.

It occupied the one indispensable situation; it was the doorkeeper of a

world.

Figure 22

Figure 22: The alliance of Smyrna and Thyatira

The "alliances" of Smyrna were very numerous; and she was the only city

which had formed that kind of engagement for mutual recognition of

religious rites and privileges with all the rest of the Seven Cities.

As a specimen of these, Figure 22 shows an "alliance" with Thyatira.

The Amazon Smyrna, the mythical foundress of the ancient Aeolic city,

armed with the Amazons' weapon, the double-axe, wearing the short tunic

and high boots of the huntress and warrior, holds out her right hand to

greet the peaceful figure of Thyatira, who is dressed in the long tunic

and mantle (peplos) of a Greek lady, and rests her raised left hand on

a sceptre. Both wear the mural crown, which indicated the genius of a

city. Behind the foot of Smyrna appears the prow of a ship.

Its position saved it from conquest till all other cities of the land

had long been under Turkish rule; and its commercial relations with the

west made it the great stronghold of the European spirit in Asia Minor.

The Knights of St. John held it during the fourteenth century. Even

after Pagos was captured by the Turks, the castle on the inner harbour

was a Christian stronghold till Tamerlane at last took it in 1402.

Since then Smyrna has been a Turkish city; but the Christian element

has always been strong and at the present time outnumbers the

Mohammedan in the proportion of three to one; and the city is called by

the Turks Infidel Smyrna, Giaour Ismir.

In the Byzantine ecclesiastical order, Smyrna was at an early time

separated from the rest of Asia, and made independent of Ephesus

(autokephalos). In the new order which takes its name from Leo VI it

appears as a metropolis with six subject bishoprics on the shores of

the gulf or in the lower Hermus Valley.

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

Chapter 20: The Letter to the Church in Smyrna

These things saith the first and the last, which was dead, and

lived:

I know thy tribulation, and thy poverty (but thou art rich), and the

blasphemy of them which say they are Jews, and they are not, but are

a synagogue of Satan. Fear not the things which thou art about to

suffer: behold, the devil is about to cast some of you into prison,

that ye may be tried; and ye shall have tribulation ten days. Be

thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee the crown of life.

He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith to the

churches.

He that overcometh shall not be hurt of the second death.

The letter to the Smyrnaeans forms in many ways a marked contrast to

the Ephesian letter; it is constructed exactly on the same plain, but

the topics are of a very different kind. Of all the seven letters this

is expressed in the most continuous and unbroken tone of laudation. It

is instinct with life and joy. The writer is in thorough sympathy with

the Church which he is addressing; he does not feel towards it merely

that rather cold admiration which he expresses for the noble history of

the Ephesian Church, a history which, alas! belonged only to the past:

he is filled with warm affection. The joy that brightens the letter is

caused not by ease and comfort and pleasures, but by the triumph over

hardship and persecution, by superiority to circumstances; and the life

that invigorates and warms it is that strong vitality which overcomes

death and rises victorious from apparent dissolution.

Another marked difference between the two letters is this. While the

Ephesian letter appeals throughout to the past history of the Church in

Ephesus, and attempts to rouse a fresh enthusiasm among the

congregation by the memory of their previous glory as Christians, the

Smyrnaean letter is to a remarkable degree penetrated with local

feeling and urban patriotism, which must be pointed out in the details,

one by one.

The Smyrnaean Church is addressed by "the first and the last, which was

dead and lived."

The meaning of this opening address is obscured by the unfortunate

mistranslation, which mars both the Authorised and the Revised

Versions, "was dead and lived again." The insertion of this word again

is unjustified and unjustifiable: there is nothing in the Greek

corresponding to it, and the quotations from Matthew 9:18, John 5:25,

Ezekiel 37:3 (which Alford gives in illustration) do not constitute

sufficient defence. The analogy of Revelation 13:2ff corroborates the

plain sense of this letter. The idea is, not that life begins a second

time after a period of death, but that life persists in and through

death. The Divine Sender of the letter to Smyrna "was dead and lived,"

and so likewise Smyrna itself "was dead and lived." If anything should

be inserted in the translation to make the meaning quite clear, the

word needed is yet, "which was dead and yet lived."

Again, the phrase "was dead" also is not an exact equivalent of the

Greek words: it would be nearer the true force of the Greek to render

"became dead" or "became a corpse."

All Smyrnaean readers would at once appreciate the striking analogy to

the early history of their own city which lies in that form of address.

Strabo, as usual, furnishes the best commentary. He relates that the

Lydians destroyed the ancient city of Smyrna, and that for four hundred

years there was no "city," but merely a state composed of villages

scattered over the plain and the hillsides around. Like Him who

addresses it, Smyrna literally "became dead and yet lived." A practical

corroboration of these last words is found in an inscription belonging

to the fourth century B.C., which mentions Smyrna as existing during

the period when, as Strabo says, it had been destroyed and had not been

refounded. During those four centuries Smyrna had ceased to exist as a

Greek city, but it lived on as a village state after the Anatolian

system: then the new period began, and it was restored as an

autonomous, self-governing Greek city, electing its own magistrates and

administering its own affairs according to the laws which it made for

itself.

In a sense both Smyrna and Ephesus had changed their character and

situation in ancient time; but the salient fact in the one case was

simple change of the city's position, in the other apparent destruction

and death under which lay hidden a real continuance of life. Strabo

emphatically says that Smyrna was obliterated from the roll of cities

for four centuries; but other authorities speak of Smyrna as a State

existing during that period of annihilation. The words of the ancients

literally are that Smyrna was dead and yet lived. The two letters are

adapted to the historical facts with delicate discrimination; change is

the word in the first letter, life under and amid death is the

expression in the second.

The idea of life is, of course, to be understood in its fullest sense

when applied to a Christian congregation. It implies the energetic

discharge of all the duties and functions of a Church. The contrast

between apparent destruction and real vitality is expressed in several

forms through this letter. The Church seemed poor, but was rich. It

suffered apparent tribulation, but was really triumphant and crowned

with the crown of life. Its enemies on the other hand were pretenders;

they boasted that they were the true Jews, but they were not; they

claimed to be the people of God, but they were only a synagogue of

Satan.

After the introductory address, the letter begins with the usual

statement: the writer has full knowledge of the past history of the

Smyrnaean Church. The history of the Church had been a course of

suffering, and not, as the Ephesian history had been, of achievement

and distinction. The Smyrnaean Church had had a more trying and

difficult career than any other of the Asian Churches. It had been

exposed to constant persecution. It was poor in all that is ordinarily

reckoned as wealth; but it was rich in the estimation of those who can

judge of the realities of life. There is here the same contrast between

appearance and reality as in the opening address: apparent poverty and

real wealth, apparent death and real life.

The humble condition and the sufferings of the Smyrnaean Church are in

this letter pointedly connected with the action of the Jews, and

especially with the calumnies which they had circulated in the city and

among the magistrates and the Roman officials. The precise facts cannot

be discovered, but the general situation is unmistakable; the Smyrnaean

Jews were for some reason more strongly and bitterly hostile to the

Christians than the Jews of Asia generally. But the Asian Jews are

little more than a name to us. From general considerations we can form

some opinion about their position in the cities, as is shown in chapter

12; but in respect of details we know nothing. Accordingly we cannot

even speculate as to the reason for the exceptionally strong

anti-Christian feeling among the Smyrnaean Jews. We must simply accept

the fact; but we may certainly conclude from it that the national

feeling among them was unusually strong.

In an inscription of the second century "the quondam Jews" are

mentioned as contributing 10,000 denarii to some public purpose

connected with the embellishment of the city. Bockh understood this

enigmatic phrase to mean persons who had forsworn their faith and

placed themselves on the same level as the ordinary pagan Smyrnaeans;

but this is certainly wrong. Mommsen's view must, so far as we can

judge, be accepted, that "the quondam Jews" were simply the body of the

Jews of Smyrna, called "quondam" because they were no longer recognised

as a separate nation by the Roman law (as they had been before A.D.

70). The reference proves that they maintained in practice so late as

130-37 their separate standing in the city as a distinct people, apart

from the rest of the citizens, although legally they were no longer

anything but one section of the general population. Many Jews possessed

the rights of citizenship in some at least of the Ionian cities, such

as Smyrna. The quondam Jews who made that contribution to embellish

Smyrna were probably for the most part citizens.

We may also probably infer from the strong hatred felt by the Jews,

that at first many of the Christians of Smyrna had been converted from

Judaism. It was the Jewish Christians, and not the pagan converts, whom

the national Jews hated so violently. Except in so far as the converts

had been proselytes of the synagogue, the Jews were not likely to care

very much whether Pagans were converted to Christianity: their violent

hatred was roused by the renegade Jews (as they thought) like St. Paul,

who tried to place the unclean Pagans on a level with themselves.

The action of the Jews in the martyrdom of Polycarp must be regarded

(as a succession of writers have remarked) as corroborating the

evidence of this letter. In that case the eagerness of the Jews to

expedite the execution of the Christian leader actually overpowered

their objection to profane the Sabbath day, and they came into the gay

assemblage in the Stadium, bringing faggots to make the fire in which

Polycarp should be consumed. It must, however, be observed that they

are not said to have been present at the sports in the Stadium. The

games were over, as usual, at about the fifth hour, 11 AM. Thereafter

the rather irregular trial of Polycarp was held; and about 2 PM the

execution took place, and the most bitter opponents of the Christians

had ample time to hear the news, assemble to hear the sentence, and to

help in carrying it into effect. Undoubtedly, many who would abhor to

appear as spectators of the games on a Sabbath would feel justified in

putting to death an enemy of their faith on that day.

Severe trials still awaited the Church in Smyrna: "The devil is about

to cast some of you into prison"...The expression must be understood as

symbolical; and it would not be permissible to take "prison" as

implying that imprisonment was the severest punishment which had as yet

been, or was likely to be, inflicted on Christians. The inference has

even been drawn from this passage that death was still hardly known as

a penalty for the crime of Christianity, and was not even thought of as

a possibility in the immediate future. In fact, such a sense for the

term "prison" would be an anachronism, introducing a purely modern

idea. Imprisonment was not recognised by the law as a punishment for

crime in the Greek or the Roman procedure. The State would not burden

itself with the custody of criminals, except as a preliminary stage to

their trial, or in the interval between trial and execution. Fine,

exile, and death constituted the usual range of penalties; and in many

cases, where a crime would in modern times be punished by imprisonment,

it was visited with death in Roman law.

The "prison" into which the devil would cast some of the Smyrnaean

Christians must be understood as a brief epitome of all the sufferings

that lay before them; the first act, viz., their apprehension and

imprisonment, is to be taken as implying all the usual course of trial

and punishment through which passed the martyrs described in the later

parts of the book. Prison was thought of by the writer of the letter as

the prelude to execution, and was understood in that sense by his

readers.

That this is so is proved by the promise that follows, "Be thou

faithful unto death, and I will give thee the crown of life": Endure

all that falls to the lot of the true and steadfast Christians,

beginning with arrest and imprisonment, ending with execution: that

death will not be the end, but only the entrance to the true life, the

birthday of martyrdom. The martyr "was dead and lived."

The importance of this idea in the letter is proved by the conclusion,

where it recurs in a slightly varied form: "he that overcometh shall

not be hurt of the second death." It is this triumph over death that

constitutes the guiding thought of the whole letter, just as change was

the guiding thought of the Ephesian letter. He that persists to the

end, he that is steadfast and overcomes, shall triumph over death:

apparent death affects him; but not the complete and permanent death.

Here, again, the final promise is seen to be peculiarly appropriate to

the character and needs of the persons addressed.

The mention of the crown would carry a special meaning to the Smyrnaean

readers, and would rouse in their hearts many old associations. The

"crown of Smyrna" had been before their eyes and minds from childhood

(as was shown in chapter 19). The promise now is that a new crown shall

be given to Smyrna. She shall wear no longer a mere crown of buildings

and towers, nor even the crown of good citizens which Apollonius

advised her to put on, but a crown of life. The earthly Smyrna wore a

mural crown like that of her patron goddess: the true Smyrna shall wear

a crown suited for the servants of the one living God.

Another expression which must be taken in a figurative or symbolic

sense is, "thou shalt have tribulation ten days." The "ten days" means

simply a period which can be measured, i.e., which comes to an end. The

persecution will rage for a time, but it will not be permanent. The

Church will live through it and survive it, and has therefore no reason

to be afraid of it.

The expression "be faithful," again, would inevitably remind Smyrnaean

readers of the history of their city, which had been the faithful

friend and ally of Rome for centuries. It cannot be a mere accident

that the only one of the Seven Churches, with which the epithet

faithful is associated in the letters, is the Church of that city which

had established its historic claim to the epithet in three centuries of

loyalty, the city which had been faithful to Rome in danger and

difficulty, the city whose citizens had stripped off their own garments

to send to the Roman soldiers when suffering from cold and the

hardships of a winter campaign. The honour in which Smyrna was always

held by the Romans was proclaimed to be a return pro singulari fide

(Livy, xxxviii, 39); to Cicero it was "the most faithful of our

allies"; and its services were rewarded in A.D. 26 by the permission

granted to it, in preference even to Ephesus and Sardis, to dedicate

the second Asian temple to the reigning Emperor Tiberius and his

family.

The same reflection occurs here as in the case of Ephesus. Some may

think that such an explanation of the reason why this special form of

words in the exordium of this letter was chosen, and why the epithet

"faithful" is applied to the Church, is fanciful and even unworthy. It

is evident, however, that the study which is here presented has been

made from a different point of view. It is not in accordance with right

method to form a priori theories of what is right or wrong, dignified

or undignified, possible or impossible, in the interpretation of St.

John's words. The only true method is to take the words, and ask what

they mean, and what must the readers, for whom they were in the first

place written, have understood from them. Now considering how exactly

those words, "was dead and lived," applied to ancient Smyrna, it seems

certain that the reference must inevitably have been appreciated by the

Smyrnaeans; and if so, it cannot have been an accidental coincidence.

The writer deliberately chose those words to appeal to local sentiment

and patriotism. The same remark applies to his choice of "faithful" as

the appropriate epithet for the Smyrnaean Church. Not merely had the

Church been faithful; the whole city regarded faithfulness as the chief

glory of Smyrna; and the topic must have been familiar to all

inhabitants and a commonplace in patriotic speeches.

It is evident that the writer of the Seven Letters did not discourage

such feelings of attachment to one's native city, but encouraged local

patriotism and used it as a basis on which to build up a strenuous

Christian life. The practical effect of such teaching as this is that a

Christian could be a patriot, proud of and interested in the glory and

the history of his own city.

This gives a different impression of the writer's character from what

might be gathered from later parts of the Apocalypse; but it is not

good method to take parts of a book and determine the author's

character from them alone. Rather, the Seven Letters are a truer index

to the writer's character than any other part of the Apocalypse,

because in these letters he is in closer contact with reality than in

any other part of the book.

Accordingly, we must accept the plain evidence of this letter and infer

(as in the Ephesian letter already) that to the writer of the letter

the life of the Church in Smyrna was not disconnected from the life of

the city; and this must be regarded as a general principle to be

applied in other cases. The Church was to him the heart and soul of the

city, and its members were the true citizens. Just as the so-called

Jews in Smyrna were not the true Jews, but a mere synagogue of Satan,

so the Pagans were not the true citizens, but mere servants of the

devil. The true Jews and the true citizens were the Christians alone.

To them belonged the heritage of the city's past history: its

faithfulness, its persistence, its unconquerable and indestructible

vitality, all were theirs. To them also belonged the whole ancient

heritage of the Jews, the promises and the favour of God.

In the letter to Smyrna then we see an influence of which no trace was

visible in the Ephesian letter. The stock topics of patriotic orators,

the glories of the city, are plainly observable in the letter; and the

writer had certainly at some time mixed in the city life, and become

familiar with current talk and the commonplaces of Smyrnaean municipal

patriotism. Patriotism still was almost entirely municipal, though the

Roman Empire was gradually implanting in the minds of ordinary men a

wider ideal, extending to a race and an empire, and not confined to a

mere city. Greece had vainly tried to make the Hellenic idea strong in

the common mind; philosophers had freed themselves from the narrowness

of municipal patriotism; but it was left to Rome to make the wider idea

effective among men.

In the Ephesian letter, on the other hand, it was the eternal features

and the natural surroundings of the city that the writer referred to.

The Smyrnaean letter is not without similar reference. The writer did

not confine his attention to those ephemeral characteristics which have

just been mentioned, or (to speak more accurately) he regarded those

characteristics as merely the effect produced by eternal causes. He had

thought himself into harmony with the natural influences which had made

Smyrna what it was, and which would continue to mould its history; and

form this lofty standpoint he could look forward into the future, and

foretell what must happen to Smyrna and to the Church (which to him was

the one reality in Smyrna). He foresaw permanence, stability, reality

surpassing the outward appearance, life maintaining itself strong and

unmoved amid trial and apparent death. In Ephesus he saw the one great

characteristic, the changing, evanescent, uncertain relations of sea

and land and river; and interpreted with prophetic instinct the

inevitable future. In Smyrna he saw nothing of that kind. The city must

live, and the Church must live in it. Sea and plain and hills were here

unchanging in their combined effect, making the seat of a great city.

The city must endure much, but only for a definite, limited period; as

a city it would suffer from invaders, who would surely try to capture

it; and the Church not only would suffer along with the city, but would

also suffer from the busy trading community, in which the element

hostile to God would always be strong.

And history has justified the prophetic vision of the writer. Smyrna,

the recipient of the most laudatory of all the Seven Letters, is the

greatest of all the cities of Anatolia. At the head of its gulf, which

stretches far up into the land, it is at present the one important

seaport, and will remain always the greatest seaport, of the whole

country. But the same situation which gives it eternal importance, has

caused it to suffer much tribulation. It has been the crown of victory

for many victors. It has tempted the cupidity of every invader, and has

endured the greed and cruelty of many conquerors; but it has arisen,

brilliant and strong, from every disaster. No city of the East

Mediterranean lands gives the same impression of brightness and life,

as one looks at it from the water, and beholds it spread out on the

gently sloping ground between the sea and the hill, and clothing the

sides of the graceful hill, which was crowned with the walls and towers

of the medieval castle, until they were pulled down a few years ago.

The difference in the beauty of the city caused thereby shows how much

of the total effect was due to that "crown of Smyrna."

That hill seems at the first view to be only a rounded hillock of 450

feet in elevation. But, when you examine it more closely, you find that

it is not merely an isolated conical hill, as it seems from the sea to

be. It is really only a part of the vast plateau that lies behind it,

and pushes it forward, like a fist, towards the sea. It is far stronger

than at first it appeared, for it is really a corner of the main mass

of the Asiatic continent, and is supported from behind by its

immeasurable strength. Strength surpassing appearance, brightness,

life: those are the characteristics of the letter and of the city.

In this letter no one can fail to recognise the tone of affection and

entire approval. Whereas the writer urged the people of Ephesus to be

as they once were, he counsels the Smyrnaeans to continue as they are

now. Ephesus has to recover what it has lost, but Smyrna has lost

nothing. The persecution and poverty which had been the lot of its

Church from the beginning, and which would still continue for a period,

kept it pure. There was nothing in it to tempt the unworthy or the

half-hearted; whereas the dignity and high standing of the Ephesian

Church had inevitably attracted many not entirely worthy members. The

writer looks confidently forward to the continuance of the same

steadfastness in Smyrna. He does not even hint at the possibility of

partial failure; he does not say, "If thou be faithful, I will give

thee the crown"; he merely exhorts them to be faithful as they have

been.

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

Chapter 21: Pergamum: The Royal City: The City of Authority

Pergamum was, undoubtedly, an ancient place, whose foundation reaches

back into the beginnings of town life in Asia. The situation is marked

out by nature for a great fortified town, but is too large for a mere

village. If we could fix the date of its foundation, we should know

also the period when society has become so far developed and organised

as to seek for defence against foreign invasion, and for offensive

power, by combination on a great scale and the formation of a large

centre of population. Beyond all other sites in Asia Minor it gives the

traveller the impression of a royal city, the home of authority: the

rocky hill on which it stands is so huge, and dominates the broad plain

of the Caicus so proudly and boldly. The modern town is below the hill,

where the earliest village was.

It is difficult to analyse such impressions, and to define the various

causes whose combination produces them; but the relation of the vast

hill to the great plain is certainly the chief cause. It would be

impossible for any stronghold, however large and bold, to produce such

an impression, if it stood in a small valley like those of Ephesus and

Smyrna, for if the valley and the city were dominated by the still

greater mass of the enclosing mountains. The rock rules over and as it

were plants its foot upon a great valley; and its summit looks over the

southern mountains which bound the valley, until the distant lofty

peaks south of the Gulf of Smyrna, and especially the beautiful twin

peaks now called the Two Brothers, close in the outlook. Far beneath

lies the sea, quite fifteen miles away, and beyond it the foreign soil

of Lesbos: the view of other lands, the presence of hostile powers, the

need of constant care and watchfulness, all the duties of kingship are

forced on the attention of him who sits enthroned on that huge rock.

There is here nothing to suggest evanescence, mutability, and

uncertainty, as at Sardis or Ephesus; the inevitable impression is of

permanence, strength, sure authority and great size. Something of the

personal and subjective element must be mixed up with such impressions;

but in none of the Seven Cities does the impression seem more universal

and unavoidable than in Pergamum.

The history and the coinage of Pergamum can be traced back into the

fifth century; but its superiority and headship in Asia began in 282,

when Philetaerus threw off allegiance to King Lysimachus and founded

the kingdom of Pergamum, which was transmitted through a succession of

kings, named Eumenes or Attalus, until 133. During those 151 years

Pergamum was the capital of a realm varying in size from the first

kingdom, simply the Caicus Valley (and hardly all of it), to the range

of territories summed up in the vague expression "all the land on this

side of Taurus." For the first few years the Seleucid dynasty supported

Philetaerus in opposition to Lysimachus; but soon the rivalry of

Seleucid and Pergamenian kings became the governing political fact. The

former steadily lost ground until about 222 B.C., when Antiochus the

Great restored the power of his dynasty, reduced Attalus I to the

original bounds of Pergamenian authority, and threatened even the

existence of his kingdom. Roman aid expelled Antiochus in 190, and

enlarged the Pergamenian kingdom to its widest extent.

In 133 Attalus III bequeathed the whole kingdom to the Romans, who

formed it into the Province of Asia. Pergamum was the official capital

of the Province for two centuries and a half: so that its history as

the seat of supreme authority over a large country lasts about four

centuries, and had not yet come to an end when the Seven Letters were

written. The impression which the natural features of its position

convey was entirely confirmed to the writer of the letters by its

history. It was to him the seat where the power of this world, the

enemy of the Church and its Author, exercised authority. The authority

was exercised in two ways--the two horns of the monster, as we have

seen in chapter 9--civil administration through the Proconsul, and the

State religion directed by the Commune of Asia.

The first, and for a considerable time the only, Provincial temple of

the Imperial cult in Asia was built at Pergamum in honour of Rome and

Augustus (29 B.C. probably). A second temple was built there in honour

of Trajan, and a third in honour of Severus. Thus Pergamum was the

first city to have the distinction of Temple-Warden both once and twice

in the State religion; and even its third Wardenship was also a few

years earlier than that of Ephesus. The Augustan Temple (Figure 7,

chapter 10) is often represented on its coins and on those struck by

the Commune. As the oldest temple of the Asian cult it is far more

frequently mentioned and figured than any other Asian temple; it

appears on coins of many Emperors down to the time of Trajan, and is

generally represented open, to show the Emperor crowned by the

Province.

The four patron deities of Pergamum are mentioned in an oracle,

advising the people to seek safety from a pestilence through the aid of

Zeus, Athena, Dionysos, and Asklepios. These represent, doubtless, four

different elements in the Pergamenian population. Zeus the Saviour and

Athena the Victory-Bearing had given the State is glorious victories

over foreign enemies, and especially the Gauls; and the greatest

efforts of Pergamenian art were directed to glorify them as

representatives of the Hellenic spirit triumphing over barbarism. The

great Altar with its long zone of stately reliefs, showing the gods of

Hellas destroying the barbarian giants, was dedicated to Zeus Soter.

While the first two of those gods represent the Greek spirit and

influence, the last two were more in accordance with the Anatolian

spirit, and their worship bulked far more largely in the religious life

of the city. Both of them were near the animal type, and if we could

penetrate beneath the outward appearance imparted to them in art by the

Greek anthropomorphic spirit, and reach down to the actual ritual of

their Pergamenian cult, we should indubitably find that they were

worshipped to a great degree as animal-gods, the God-Serpent and the

God-Bull. Where the Pergamenian kings were insisting on their Hellenic

character or blazoning in art their victory over barbaric enemies, they

introduced Zeus and Athena, but when they were engaged in the practical

government of their mixed people, mainly Anatolian, though mixed with

Greek, they made most use of Asklepios and Dionysos.

Dionysos the Leader (Kathegemon) was the god of the royal family; and

the kings claimed to be descended from him, and to be in succession his

embodiment and envisagement on earth, just as the Seleucid sovereigns

of Syria were the incarnation of Apollo. This cult owed its importance

in Pergamum to the kings; and its diffusion through Asia must be

attributed to them; but the worship, having once been established,

persisted through the Imperial period, for religious institutions were

rarely lost so long as paganism lasted. The worship was practised in

Imperial times by a religious society, bearing the name Ox-herds

(Boukoloi), at the head of which was the Archi-Boukolos; it was

accompanied by mysterious rites, and the mystic name of the god seems

to have been the Bull.

The anthropomorphic spirit of Greek religion retained very few traces

of the bull character in the Hellenic conception of Dionysos; but

Asklepios was more closely associated with the serpent. The Hellenic

religious spirit represented the god as a dignified human figure, very

similar in type to Zeus, supporting his right hand on a staff round

which a serpent is twined. His serpent nature clings to him, though

only as an attribute and adjunct, in the fully Hellenised form. In the

Anatolian ritual the god was the Asklepian serpent, rather than the

human Asklepios. Thus in Figure 23 the Emperor Caracalla, during his

visit to Pergamum, is represented as adoring the Pergamenian deity, a

serpent wreathed round the sacred tree. Between the God-Serpent and the

God-Emperor stands the little figure of Telesphorus, the Consummator, a

peculiarly Pergamenian conception closely connected with Asklepios.

Figure 23

Figure 23: Caracalla adoring the God-Serpent of Pergamum

Asklepios the Saviour was introduced from Epidauros in a comparatively

recent period, perhaps the fifth century. He appears on coins from the

middle of the second century B.C. and became more and more the

representative god of Pergamum. On alliance coins he regularly stands

for his city, as in Figure 10, chapter 14.

As Asklepios was imported to Pergamum for Epidaurus in Argolis, it may

be asked why his character in ritual was so strongly Anatolian and so

little Hellenic. The reason is that he belonged to the old Pelagian

stratum in religion, which persisted most strongly in such remote and

rural parts of the Peloponnesus; and he had participated little in the

progressive Hellenisation of the old Greek gods; now the Pelagian

religion was closely kindred in character to the Anatolian.

On the royal coinage Athena and other Hellenic gods are almost the only

divine types; but on the cistophori, which were intended to be the

common coinage in circulation through the whole Pergamenian kingdom

after 200 B.C., neither kings nor specifically Hellenic gods appear,

but only symbols taken from the cults of Dionysos and Asklepios. On the

obverse is the cista mystica of Dionysos (Figure 24) within a wreath of

his sacred plant the ivy: the lid of the box is pushed open by a

serpent which hangs out with half its length. The relation of the

God-Bull to the God-Serpent in the Anatolian ritual is well known: "the

bull is father of the serpent, and the serpent of the bull": such was a

formula of the Phrygian Mysteries. On the reverse are two Asklepian

serpents with their lower parts intertwined and heads erect: between

them is a bowcase containing a strung bow.

Figure 24

Figure 24: Obverse of Cistophorus with serpent and mystic box of

Dionysos

The monogram of the first three letters of the name Pergamum is the

only indication on these coins of Pergamenian origin and domination. It

was clearly the intention of the kings in this coinage to avoid all

appearance of domination over Asia, and to represent the unity of their

realm as a voluntary association in the common religion of the two

deities whose ritual is symbolised in barbaric Anatolian forms on the

cistophori, without the slightest admixture of Greek anthropomorphism,

and whose worship we have already traced in several cities of the

Pergamenian realm. The cistophori were struck at first in Pergamum, but

soon in most of the great cities of the Pergamenian realm. Only those

struck in Pergamum bore the Pergamenian monogram. The others bore the

name or symbols of their own place of coinage. These coins are a true

historical monument. They express a phase of administration, the

Pergamenian ideal of constructive statesmanship, which is attested by

no historian and hardly by any other monument.

Figure 25

Figure 25: Reverse of Cistophorus with serpents and bowcase

The cistophori show clearly the point of view from which the symbolism

of the Apocalypse is to be interpreted. They reveal a strong tendency

in the Asian mind to express its ideas and ideals, alike political and

religious, through symbols and types; and they prove that the converted

pagan readers for whom the Apocalypse was originally written were

predisposed through their education and the whole spirit of

contemporary society to regard visual forms, beasts, human figures,

composite monsters, objects of nature, or articles of human

manufacture, when mentioned in a work of this class, as symbols

indicative of religious ideas. This predisposition to look at such

things with a view to a meaning that lay underneath them was not

confined to the strictly Oriental races; and the symbolism of the

Apocalypse ought not to be regarded as all necessarily Jewish in

origin. Much of it is plainly Jewish; but, as has been pointed out in

chapters 11 and 12, a strong alloy of Judaism had been mingled in the

composition of society in the Asian cities, and many Judaic ideas must

have become familiar to the ordinary pagans, numbers of whom had been

attracted within the circle of hearers in the synagogues, while purely

pagan syncretism of Jewish and pagan forms was familiar in various

kinds of ritual or magic.

Except for archaeological and antiquarian details, which are numerous,

little more is known about Pergamum. Its importance and authority in

the Roman administration of the Province Asia are abundantly proved by

the evidence which has been quoted above; and yet they are not directly

attested by any ancient authority except the Apocalypse, and have to a

great extent escaped notice. In the latest study of the Province Asia,

a large volume containing an admirable summary of the chief results of

modern investigation, published in the summer of 1904 by Monsieur V.

Chapot, Pergamum is treated as a place quite secondary to Ephesus and

Smyrna in the Roman administration while Ephesus is regarded as in

every sense the Roman capital. Consideration of the fact that Pergamum

was honoured with the first, the second, and the third Neokorate before

any other city of Asia shows beyond question its official primacy in

the Province. The Imperial religion "was the keystone of the Imperial

policy"; the official capital of the Province was necessarily the

centre of the Imperial ritual; and conversely the city where the

Imperial religion had its centre must have been officially regarded as

the capital of the Province. In many Provinces there was only one seat

of the Imperial religion; but in Asia the spirit of municipal pride and

rivalry was so strong that it would have endangered the hold of the

State cultus on the other great cities, if they had been forced to look

to any one city as the sole head of the religion. Roman policy showed

its usual adaptability by turning municipal pride to its purpose and

making it act in an Imperial channel, so that the object of competition

among all the great cities was to attain higher rank in the State

religion.

Pergamum, then, as being first promoted to all three stages in the

Imperial worship must have been the official capital and titular seat

of Roman authority; but there were several capitals (metropoleis),

three, and seven, and more than seven.

The name of the city lives in literary language through the word

"parchment" (Pergamena), applied to an improved preparation of hide

adapted to purposes of writing, which had been used in Ionia from a

very early period.

The Jewish community in Pergamum is mentioned in Josephus, Ant. Jud,

xiv, 10, 22.

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

Chapter 22: The Letter to the Church in Pergamum

These things saith he that hath the sharp-pointed two-edged sword.

I know where thou dwellest, where Satan's throne is; and thou

holdest fast my name, and didst not deny my faith, even in the days

of Antipas my witness, my faithful one, who was killed among you

where Satan dwelleth. But I have a few things against thee, because

thou hast there some that hold the teaching of Balaam, who taught

Balak to cast a stumbling-block before the children of Israel, to

make them eat things sacrificed to idols and commit fornication.

After that fashion hast thou too some that hold the teaching of the

Nicolaitans. Repent therefore; or else I come upon thee quickly, and

I will make war against them with the sword of my mouth.

He that hath an ear let him hear what the Spirit saith to the

Churches.

To him that overcometh will I give of the hidden manna; and I will

give him a white stone, and upon the stone a new name written, which

no man knoweth but he that receiveth it.

In this letter, the intimate connection between the Church and the

city, and the appropriateness, in view of the rank and position of the

city, of the opening address to the Church are even more obvious than

in the two previous letters. "These things saith he that hath the sharp

two-edged sword." The writer is uttering the words of Him who wears the

symbol of absolute authority, and is invested with the power of life

and death. This is the aspect in which he addresses himself to the

official capital of the Province, the seat of authority in the ancient

kingdom and in the Roman administration. To no other of the Seven

Cities could this exordium have been used appropriately. To Pergamum it

is entirely suitable. He that hath the absolute and universal authority

speaks to the Church situated in the city where official authority

dwells.

The distinguishing characteristic of this letter is the oft-recurring

reference to the dignity of Pergamum as the seat of Roman official

authority; and we have to follow out this reference in one detail after

another. The author of the letter speaks as invested with an authority

similar and yet immeasurably superior to that of the Imperial

government. The sword which he bears is the sharp-pointed,

double-edged, cut-and-thrust sword used in the Roman armies, not the

Oriental scimitar, or the mere cutting sword employed by many nations,

and especially by the Greek soldiers. The name by which it is here

called denoted a barbarian and non-Greek sword (originally a Thracian

term), and therefore was suitable for the weapon borne by the Romans,

who were a "barbarian" race, in contrast with the Greeks. The Romans

did not themselves refuse the epithet "barbarian": e.g., the Roman

adaptations of Greek plays are said by the Roman poets even to be

"translations in a barbarian tongue." Hence St. Paul in Romans 1:14,

when he speaks of himself as indebted both to Greeks and to barbarians,

means practically (though not quite exclusively) Greeks and Romans.

In Roman estimation the sword was the symbol of the highest order of

official authority, with which the Proconsul of Asia was invested. The

"right of the sword," just gladii, was roughly equivalent to what we

call the power of life and death (though, of course, the two

expressions are not exactly commensurate); and governors of Provinces

were divided into a higher and a lower class, according as they were or

were not invested with this power. When the Divine Author addresses

Pergamum in this character, His intention is patent, and would be

caught immediately by all Asian readers of the Apocalypse. He wields

that power of life and death, which people imagine to be vested in the

Proconsul of the Province.

The writer knows well the history of the Church in Pergamum. Its

fortunes had been mainly determined by the rank and character of the

city as the seat of government and authority; and He who knows its

history expresses the fulness of His knowledge in the striking words,

"I know where thou dwellest, where Satan's throne is." In these

remarkable words is compressed a world of meaning. "Satan" is a term

here employed in a figurative sense to denote the power or influence

that withstands the Church and all who belong to it. The usage is

similar to that seen in 1 Thessalonians 2:18: it has elsewhere been

pointed out that in that passage "Satan" probably implies the clever

device whereby, without any formal decree of expulsion or banishment

(which would have been difficult to enforce or to make permanent), the

Apostle was prevented from returning to Thessalonica. Similarly, in the

present case, "Satan" is the official authority and power which stands

in opposition to the Church.

But the situation has now developed greatly. When St. Paul was writing

that letter to the Thessalonians, the civil power that hindered him was

the authority of the city magistrates. The Imperial administration had

not at that time declared itself in opposition to the new teaching, and

was in practice so conducted as to give free scope to this or almost

any other philosophic or moral or religious movement. But before the

Seven Letters were written, the Imperial government had already ranged

itself definitely in opposition to the Church of Christ. The procedure

against the Christians was fixed and stereotyped. Their loyalty was now

tested by the one criterion recognised alike by public opinion and by

government policy, viz., their willingness to perform the ritual of the

State religion, and make offering to the Imperial God, the Divine

Emperor. Those who refused to comply with this requirement were

forthwith condemned to death as traitors and enemies of the State.

In this State religion of the Empire, the worship of the Divine

Emperors, organised on a regular system in Asia as in all other

Provinces, Satan found his home and exercised his power in opposition

to God and His Church. Pergamum, as being still the administrative

capital of the Province, was also the chief seat of the State religion.

Here was built the first Asian Temple of the divine Augustus, which for

more than forty years was the one centre of the Imperial religion for

the whole Province. A second Asian Temple had afterwards been built at

Smyrna, and a third at Ephesus; but they were secondary to the original

Augustan Temple at Pergamum.

In this Pergamenian Temple, then, Satan was enthroned. The authority

over the minds of its Asian subjects, possessed by the State, and

arrayed against the Church, was mainly concentrated in the Temple. The

history of the Church in Pergamum had been determined by its close

proximity to the seat of State opposition, "where Satan's throne is."

Such, beyond all doubt, was the chief determining fact in prompting

this remarkable expression. But it is probable that other thoughts in a

secondary degree influenced the language here. The breadth of meaning

in these letters is so great, that one suggestion is rarely sufficient;

the language was prompted by the whole complex situation. In many cases

we cannot hope to do more than describe some one side of the situation,

which happens to be known to us; but here we can see that the form of

the expression was clearly determined in some degree by the historical

associations and the natural features of the city. Pergamum had for

centuries been the royal city, first of the Attalid kings, and

afterwards of the viceroy or Proconsul who represented the Emperor in

the Province. History marked it out as the royal city, and not less

clearly has nature done so. No city of the whole of Asia Minor--so far

as I have seen, and there are few of any importance which I have not

seen--possesses the same imposing and dominating aspect. It is the one

city of the land which forced from me the exclamation "A royal city!" I

came to it after seeing the others, and that was the impression which

it produced. There is something unique and overpowering in its effect,

planted as it is on its magnificent hill, standing out boldly in the

level plain, and dominating the valley and the mountains on the south.

Other cities of the land have splendid hills which made them into

powerful fortresses in ancient time; but in them the hill is as a rule

the acropolis, and the city lies beneath and around or before it. But

here the hill was the city proper, and the great buildings, chiefly

Roman, which lie below the city, were external ornaments, lending

additional beauty and stateliness to it.

In this case, again, the natural features of the city give a fuller

meaning to the words of the letter.

Some confusion is caused by the peculiar relation between Ephesus and

Pergamum. Each of the two was in a sense the metropolis of Asia. It is

impossible, in the dearth of information, to define the limits of their

circles of influence; and it was, in all probability, hardly possible

to do so very exactly at the time when the Seven Letters were written.

Pergamum was the historical capital, originally the one metropolis of

Asia, and still the official capital. But Pergamum was badly situated

for commerce and communication; it did not lie on any of the great

natural lines of trade between Rome and the East (though it was

situated on the Imperial Post-road to the East, in the form in which

that route was organised by Augustus and lasted throughout the first

century); and therefore it could not permanently maintain its premier

rank in the Province. The sea-ends of the two great roads across Asia

Minor were at Ephesus and Smyrna; one or other of those two cities must

inevitably become the capital of the Roman Province; and the

circumstances of the time were more in favour of Ephesus. Smyrna,

indeed, offered the better harbour, more accessible for ships, at the

head of a gulf extending far up into the land, bringing sea-borne trade

nearer the heart of the country; it had permanent vitality as the chief

city of Asia; and the future was with it. But Ephesus commanded the

most important land route; and this gave it a temporary advantage,

though the changing nature of its situation denied it permanent

possession of the honour.

The Christian Church and its leaders had from the first seized on

Ephesus as the centre of the Asian congregations, whether through a

certain unerring instinct for the true value of natural facts, or

because they were driven on in that direction by circumstances--but are

not these merely two different expressions and aspects of one fact?

Pergamum, however, and even Smyrna, had also a certain claim to the

primacy of Asia; and it is interesting to observe how all those varied

claims and characteristics are mirrored and expressed in these letters.

To the superficial eye Pergamum was, apparently, even yet the capital;

but already in the time of St. Paul, A.D. 56, the Ephesians had claimed

primacy in Asia for their goddess (Acts 19:27), and at a later period

the Imperial policy was induced to grant official Roman recognition and

to make the worship of the goddess part of the State religion of the

Province. Considering the close connection in ancient times between

religion, political organisation, and the sentiment of patriotism, we

must conclude that this wider acceptance of Ephesian religion over the

whole of Asia, beginning from non-official action, and finally made

official and Imperial, marked and implied the rise of Ephesus to the

primacy of the Province; but, at the time when the Seven Letters were

written, the popular recognition of the goddess in the Asian cities had

not been confirmed by Imperial act.

As being close to the centre of the enemy, Pergamum had been most

exposed to danger from State persecution. Here, for the firs time in

the Seven Letters, this topic comes up. The suffering which had fallen

to the lot of Smyrna proceeded chiefly from fellow-citizens, and, above

all, from the Jews; but the persecution that fell to the lot of

Pergamum is clearly distinguished from that kind of suffering. In

Pergamum it took the form of suffering for the Name, when Christians

were tried in the proconsular court, and confronted with the

alternative of conforming to the State religion or receiving immediate

sentence of death. Naturally, that kind of persecution originated from

Pergamum, and had there its centre; but many martyrs were tried and

condemned there who were not Pergamenians. Prisoners were carried from

all parts of the Province to Pergamum for trial and sentence before the

authority who possessed the right of the sword, jus gladii, the power

of life and death, viz., the Roman Proconsul of Asia.

Two errors must here be guarded against. "Antipas, my witness, who was

killed among you," is the only sufferer mentioned. But it would be

utterly erroneous to infer (as some have done) that Antipas had been

the only Christian executed as yet in Pergamum or in the Province. His

name is mentioned and preserved only as the first in the already long

series: the subsequent chapters of the Revelation, which tell of the

woman drunk with the blood of the saints, show what were the real

facts. That one name should stand as representative of the whole list

is entirely in the style of the Apocalypse.

In the second place, it would be equally erroneous to argue that

persecution was still only partial and local, not universal, and that

only members of the Church of Pergamum had as yet suffered death. It is

not even certain that Antipas was a member of that congregation: the

words are not inconsistent with the possibility that Antipas was

brought up for trial from some other city, and "killed among the

Pergamenians." A wide-spread persecution had already occurred, and the

processes of law had been fully developed in it. The Apocalypse places

us in view of a procedure developed far beyond that which Tacitus

describes as ruling in the reign of Nero; and such a formed and

stereotyped procedure was elaborated only through the practice and

precedents established during later persecution.

The honourable history and the steadfast loyalty of the Pergamenian

Church, however, had been tarnished by the error of a minority of the

congregation, which had been convinced by the teaching of the

Nicolaitans. This school of thought and conduct played an important

part in the Church of the first century. Ephesus had tried and rejected

it; the Smyrnaean congregation, despised and ill-treated by their

fellow-citizens, had apparently not been much affected by it; in

Pergamum a minority of the Church had adopted its principles; in

Thyatira the majority were attracted by it, and it there found its

chief seat, so far as Asia was concerned. Probably the controversy with

regard to the Nicolaitan views was fought out and determined in Asia

more decisively than in any other Province, though the same questions

must have presented themselves and demanded an answer in every Province

and city where the Graeco-Roman civilisation was established. The

character of this movement, obscure and almost unknown to us, because

the questions which it raised were determined at so early a date, will

be most conveniently treated under Thyatira; but it is necessary here

to point out that it was evidently an attempt to effect a reasonable

compromise with the established usages of Graeco-Roman society and to

retain as many as possible of those usages in the Christian system of

life. It affected most of all the cultured and well-to-do classes in

the Church, those who had most temptation to retain all that they could

of the established social order and customs of the Graeco-Roman world,

and who by their more elaborate education had been trained to take a

somewhat artificial view of life and to reconcile contradictory

principles in practical conduct through subtle philosophical reasoning.

The historian who looks back over the past will find it impossible to

condemn the Nicolaitan principles in so strong and even bigoted fashion

as St. John condemned them. But the Apostle, while writing the Seven

Letters, was not concerned to investigate all sides of the case, and to

estimate with careful precision exactly how much could be reasonably

said on behalf of the Nicolaitans. He saw that they had gone wrong on

the essential and critical alternative; and he cared for nothing more.

To him, in the absorbing interest of practical life, no nice weighing

of comparative right was possible; he divided all Christians into two

categories, those who were right and those who were wrong. Those who

were wrong he hated with his whole heart and soul; and he almost loved

the Ephesians, as we have seen, because they also hated the

Nicolaitans. The Nicolaitans were to him almost worse than the open and

declared enemies of Christ on the pagan side; and he would probably

have entirely denied them the name of Christians.

But the historian must regard the Nicolaitans with intense interest,

and must regret deeply that we know so little about them, and that only

from their enemies. And yet at the same time he must feel that nothing

could have saved the infant Church from melting away into one of those

vague and ineffective schools of philosophic ethics except the stern

and strict rule that is laid down here by St. John. An easy-going

Christianity could never have survived; it could not have conquered and

trained the world; only the most convinced, resolute, almost bigoted

adherence to the most uncompromising interpretation of its own

principles could have given the Christians the courage and

self-reliance that were needed. For them to hesitate or to doubt was to

be lost.

Especially, it is highly probable that the Nicolaitans either already

had, or soon would have, reached the conclusion that they might

justifiably comply with the current test of loyalty, and burn a little

incense in honour of the Emperor. The Church was not disloyal; even its

most fanatical defenders claimed to be loyal; then why should its

members make any difficulty about proving their loyalty by burning a

few grains of incense? A little incense was nothing. An excellent and

convincing argument can readily be worked out; and then--the whole

ritual of the State religion would have followed as a matter of course;

Christ and Augustus would have been enthroned side by side as they were

in the compromise attempted by the Emperor Alexander Severus more than

a century later; and everything that was vital in Christianity would

have been lost. St. John, like St. Paul in 1 Corinthians, saw the real

issue that lay before the Church--either it must conquer and destroy

the Imperial idolatry, or it must compromise and in so doing be itself

destroyed. Both St. Paul and St. John answered with the most hearty,

unwavering, uncompromising decisiveness. Not the faintest shadow of

acquiescence in idolatry must be permitted to the Christian. On this

the Nicolaitans, with all good intention, went wrong; and to St. John

the error was unpardonable. He compares the Nicolaitans to the

Israelites who were led astray into pleasure and vice by the subtle

plan of Balaam. No words of condemnation are too strong for him to use.

Their teaching was earthly, sensual, devilish. In their philosophical

refinements of argumentation he saw only "the deep things of Satan."

It is clear also that the Nicolaitans rather pitied and contemned the

humbler intelligence and humbler position of the opposite section in

the Church; and hence we shall find that both in the Thyatiran and in

the Pergamenian letter St. John exalts the dignity, authority and power

that shall fall to the lot of the victorious Christian. Christ can and

will give His true followers far more than the Nicolaitans promise. No

power or rank in the world equals the lofty position that Christ will

bestow; the Imperial dignity and the name of Augustus cannot be

compared with the dignity and name of the glorified Christ which He

will give to His own.

Further light is, as usual, thrown on the opening address of the letter

by the promise at the end: "To him that overcometh will I give of the

hidden manna, and I will give him a white stone, and upon the stone a

new name written, which no one knoweth but he that receiveth it."

The "white stone" was, doubtless, a tessera, and ought, strictly

speaking, to be called by that name, but the word is not English and

therefore is unsuitable. There is no English word which gives an

adequate rendering, for the thing is not used among us, and therefore

we have no name for it. It was a little cube or rectangular block of

stone, ivory, or other substance, with words or symbols engraved on one

or more faces. Such tesserae were used for a great variety of purposes.

Here it is a sort of coupon or ticket bearing the name, but it is not

to be given up: it is to remain secret, not to be shown to others, but

to be kept as the private possession of the owner.

An explanation of the white pebble or tessera with the New Name has

been sought in many different objects used in ancient times, or ideas

current among ancient peoples, Greek, Roman, and Jewish. Some scholars

quote the analogy of the tessera given to proved and successful

gladiators inscribed with the letters SP, which they regard as a new

title spectatus, i.e., tried and proved; but this analogy, though

tempting in some ways, will not bear closer examination. The letters SP

on the gladiatorial tesserae are considered by Mommsen to stand, not

for spectatus, but for spectavit. Various theories are proposed about

the meaning; but no theory makes out that a new name was given to the

proved gladiator with the tessera: he was simply allowed to retire into

private life after a proved and successful career, instead of being

compelled to risk his reputation and life when his powers were failing.

The analogy fails in the most essential points.

Moreover, it is necessary that any suggestion as to the origin of the

sayings in the Seven Letters should be taken from a phase of life

familiar to the society to which they were addressed. But gladiatorial

exhibitions and professional gladiators (to whom alone the tesserae

were given) were an exotic in the Eastern Provinces: they were not much

to the taste of the Hellenes, but were an importation from Rome. The

influence of Roman fashions over the Provinces was, indeed, strong

enough to make gladiatorial exhibitions a feature in many of the

greater festivals in Asia; but it does not appear that they ever became

really popular there, or that gladiatorial metaphors and allusions to

the life of professional gladiators ever passed into current speech.

None of the gladiatorial tesserae which are known as yet have been

found in the Province Asia. There is therefore no reason to think that

the Asian readers would have caught the allusion to such tesserae even

if St. John had intended it (which is altogether unlikely).

Still more unsatisfactory are the comparisons suggested between this

white stone and the voting ballot used by jurors or political voters,

the tessera that served as an entrance-ticket to distributions,

banquets, or other public occasions, and so on through all the various

purposes served by such tesserae or stones. All are unsatisfactory and

elusive; they do not make the reader feel that he has gained a clear

and definite impression of the white pebble.

Yet, while none of these analogies is complete or satisfactory in

itself, perhaps none is entirely wrong. The truth is that the white

pebble with the New Name was not an exact reproduction of any custom or

thing in the social usage of the time. It was a new conception, devised

for this new purpose; but it was only a working up into a new form of

familiar things and customs, and it was therefore completely

intelligible to every reader in the Asian Churches. It had analogies

with many things, though it was not an exact reproduction of any of

them. Probably the fact is that the pebble is simply an instrument to

bear the Name, and all the stress of the passage is laid on the Name

which is thus communicated. The reason why the pebble is mentioned lies

in a different direction from any of the suggestions quoted above.

Two facts, however, are to be noticed with regard to this "white

pebble." In the first place, it is lasting and imperishable. Hence,

such a translation as "ticket" or "coupon" would--apart from the modern

associations--be unsuitable. A "ticket" is for a temporary purpose;

this pebble is eternal. According to the ancient view a close relation

existed between permanent validity and record on some lasting

imperishable material. The mere expression in writing of any idea or

word or right or title gave it a new kind of existence and an added

effectiveness, placed it in short on a higher plane in the universe.

But this new existence was, of course, dependent on the permanence of

the writing, i.e., on the lasting nature of the material. Horace plays

with the popular idea, when he declares that his lyric poetry is a

monumentum aere perennius: laws, the permanent foundation of peace and

order in a city, were written on bronze; but poetry will outlast even

bronze. The New Name, then, must be written, not simply left as a sound

in the air; and it must be written, not on the parchment made in the

city but on an imperishable material like this pebble.

In the second place the colour is important. It was white, the

fortunate colour. Suitability of the material to the subject in writing

seems to have been considered to some degree in ancient time. Dr.

Wunsch, one of the leading authorities, lays great stress on the fact

that curses and imprecations were usually written on lead, as proving

that lead was the deadly and ill-omened metal in Greece; and since many

imprecations were found at Tel-Sanda-hannah in the southwest of

Palestine engraved on limestone tablets, there is some temptation to

regard limestone as selected for a similar reason, and to contrast its

dark, ill-omened hue with the "white stone" engraved with the New Name

in this case. Some doubt however is cast on this theory of material by

the fact that a private letter, of a kind which would not be written on

a material recognised as deadly and ill-omened, has recently been found

incised on a leaden tablet: it is published as the oldest Greek letter

in the Austrian Jahreshefte, 1904, p. 94.

Equally difficult is the allusion to the New Name. We take it as clear

and certain that the "new name" is the name which shall be given to the

conquering Christian; and the words are connected with the already

established custom of taking a new name at baptism.

The name acquired in popular belief a close connexion with the

personality, both of a human being and of a god. The true name of a god

was kept secret in certain kinds of ancient religion, lest the

foreigner and the enemy, by knowing the name, should be able to gain an

influence over the god. The name guaranteed, and even gave, existence,

reality, life: a new name implied the entrance on a new life.

This old superstition takes a peculiar form among the modern Jews of

Palestine. It is their custom to change a person's name in the case of

a dangerous illness, as is mentioned by Mr. Macalister in the Quarterly

Statement of the Palestine Exploration Fund, April, 1904, p. 153. The

new name, which is retained ever afterwards, if the patient survives,

frequently has reference to life, or is that of some Old Testament

saint whose life was specially long.

Accordingly the New Name that is given to the victorious Christian

marks his entrance on a new and higher stage of existence; he has

become a new person. Yet this alone would make an inadequate and

unsatisfying explanation. We miss the element of authority and power,

which is imperatively demanded to suit the case of Pergamum. To furnish

this element the New Name must be the name of God. Here, again, we find

ourselves brought close to the sphere of popular religion, superstition

and magic. Knowledge of the compelling names of God, the names of God

which influence nature and the mysterious forces of the universe, was

one of the chief sources of the power which both the Mysteries and the

magic ritual claimed to give their votaries. The person that had been

initiated into the Mysteries learned not merely the landmarks to guide

him along the road to the home of the Blessed--the white poplar and the

other signs by the way--he learned also the names of God which would

open the gates and bars before him, and frighten away hostile spirits

or transform them into friends. Mr. Anderson Scott gives an excellent

note on this passage, which may be supplemented from Dieterich's

Mithrasliturgie, pp. 32-39. He who knows the right name of a demon or

divine being can become lord over all the power that the demonic being

possesses, just as he who knows the name of a man was considered to

possess some power over the man, because the name partakes of reality

and not merely marks a man's personality, but is almost identified with

it.

Probably no incompatibility between these two aspects of the New Name,

as the name of God and as the name of the Individual Christian, was

felt by the ancient readers of this letter. The name that was written

on the white stone was at once the name of the victorious Christian and

the name of God. These two points of view approximated towards one

another, and passed into one another. Personal names frequently were

derived from, or even identical with, a Divine name. The ordinary

thought of primitive Greek and of Anatolian religion--that the heroised

dead had merely returned to the Divine Mother who bore them, and become

once more identified with and merged in the divine nature--also helped

to obliterate the difference which we in modern times feel between the

two points of view. Here and in the Philadelphian letter the name of

God is also the name of the victorious Christian, written on him in the

latter case, given him on a white tessera in the Pergamenian letter.

Pergamum and Philadelphia are the two Churches which are praised

because they "held fast my name," and "did not deny it"; and they are

rewarded with the New Name, at once the Name of God and their own, an

eternal possession, known to the bearers only, the symbol and

instrument of wider power; they shall not merely be "Christians," the

people of Christ; they shall be the people of His new personality as He

is hereafter revealed in glory, bearing that New Name of His glorious

revelation.

The allusion to the "hidden manna" is one of the few touches in the

Seven Letters derived purely and exclusively from the realm of Jewish

belief and superstition. It is not even taken from the Old Testament;

but is a witness that some current Jewish superstitions acquired a

footing in the early Christian Church. According to a Jewish tale the

manna laid up "before the Testimony" in the Ark was hidden in a cave of

Mount Sinai, and would be revealed when Messiah came. That superstition

is here used as a symbol to indicate the heavenly food that should

impart strength to the Christian. It is, however, quite probable that

there is some special suitability in this symbol, due to popular, mixed

Jewish and pagan, belief current in Asia, which we have failed to

catch.

As to the spirit in which popular beliefs are here used, Mr. Anderson

Scott in the note just quoted has said all that there is to say. The

same form of expression, which is so frequent elsewhere in the Seven

Letters, occurs here. A contrast is intended between the ordinary

popular custom and the better form in which that custom is offered to

the true Christian: to the victorious Christian shall be given the

possession of a far more powerful and efficacious name than any which

he could learn about in the various kinds of popular ritual, a name

which will mark the transformation of his whole nature and his

recreation in a new character.

The promises and the principles of Christianity had to be made

intelligible to minds habituated to think in the customary forms of

ancient popular thought; and they are therefore expressed in the

Apocalypse according to the popular forms, but these forms must be

understood as merely figurative, as mere attempts, necessarily

imperfect, to reach and teach the popular mind. The words and thoughts

in the Seven Letters, when taken singly and separately, are to a

remarkable extent such as a pagan mystic of the first or second century

might have used; and we shall probably find that some champion will

hereafter appear to prove that the Seven Letters took their origin from

no mere Christian, but from a pagan mystic circle tinged with

semi-Gnostic developments of Christianity. The same view has already

been advocated by influential scholars with regard to the epitaph of

the Phrygian bishop, Avircius Marcellus--with equal unreason in both

cases (unless perhaps the Seven Letters present a more startlingly

pagan resemblance in some parts than the bishop's epitaph). Those who

advocate such theories fail to catch the spirit which lies in the

Christian document as a whole. The whole, in literature, is far more

than the sum of the separate parts: there is the soul, the life, the

spirit that gives vitality and unity to the parts. To miss that

character in such a document is to miss what makes it Christian. To

miss that, is to miss everything. All those mystic rites and popular

cults were far from being mere imposture or delusion; they had many

elements of truth and beauty; they were all trying to reach the same

result as Christianity, to satisfy the wants of the popular mind, to

guide it right in its groping after God. They all used many of the same

facts and rites, insisted on many similar customs and methods, employed

often the same words and symbols as Christianity used; and yet the

result is so utterly different in character and spirit that one would

have been inclined to say that not even a single paragraph or sentence

of any Christian document could have been mistaken for a product of one

of those Mystic circles of devotees, had it not been for the treatment

that the testament of Avircius Marcellus has recently received from

some high authorities--discussed point by point, detail after detail,

without regard to the spirit of the whole, and thus proved to be

non-Christian by ignoring all that is Christian in it.

There is, however, a certain obscurity, which must evidently be

intentional, in this passage; more is meant than lies on the surface.

Now the earlier part of the letter is characterised by an unmistakable

and yet carefully veiled opposition to the State religion and to the

government which had provoked that opposition; and this quality in the

letter guides us to the proper understanding of the conclusion, which

is one of the most remarkable passages in the Seven Letters. The

readers of this letter, who possessed the key to its comprehension,

hidden from the common world, could not fail to be struck with the

analogy between this New Name and the Imperial title Augustus. That

also had been a new name, deliberately devised by the Senate to

designate the founder, and to mark the foundation of the new Empire: it

was an old sacred word, used previously only in the language of the

priests, and never applied to any human being: hence Ovid says: "Sancta

vocant augusta patres" (Fast., 1., 609). That old word was appropriated

in 27 B.C. to the man who had been the saviour of Rome, and whom

already the popular belief had begun to regard as an incarnation of the

divine nature in human form, sent down to earth to end the period of

war and introduce the age of peace. This sacred, divine name marked out

the man to whom it was applied as one apart from the world, standing on

a higher level, possessor of superhuman power in virtue of this new

name and transmitting that power through the name to his descendants.

The analogy was striking; and the points of difference were only to the

advantage of the Christian. His new name was secret, but all the more

efficacious on that account. The readers for whom this letter was

written--the Christians of Pergamum, of all Asia, of the whole

world--would catch with certainty the hidden meaning. All those

Christians, when they were victorious, were to be placed in the same

position as, or rather higher than, Augustus, having a New Name, the

Name of God, their own secret possession, which no man would know and

therefore no man could tamper with by acquiring control through

knowledge. As Augustus had been set above the Roman world by his new

name, so they would be set above the world by theirs.

This is the answer which the Church made to the persecuting Emperor,

who beyond all his predecessors prided himself on his divine nature and

his divine name. To insult, proscription, a shameful death, it returns

a triumphant defiance: the Emperor is powerless: the supreme power and

authority remain with the victorious Christian, who defeats the Emperor

by virtue of the death which the Emperor inflicts. Here for the first

time in the Seven Letters the absolute and inexorable opposition

between the Church and the Imperial government is clearly expressed. It

is not merely that the State persecutes the Church. The Church

proscribes and sets itself above the Augustan government and the

Augusti themselves. And this is done in the letter to the Church of

that city where the Imperial government with the Imperial religion had

placed its capital and its throne.

The taking of a new name, and the meaning attached to this in the usage

of the time, was orally illustrated by the late Dr. Hort, from the case

of Aelius Aristides, the famous orator of Hadrianoi and Smyrna, as I am

informed by a correspondent, though the lecture in which the

illustration was stated seems never to have been published. The facts

are known from various passages of Aristides, chiefly in the Lalia

(Hymn) to Aesculapius and in the Sacred Discourses.

The case of Aristides, who was born probably in A.D. 117, may be taken

as applicable to the period of the Apocalypse. Aristides had a new

name, which was given him by the God, appearing to him in the form of

Aesculapius. That deity was his chief protector and adviser and helper,

though the mother of the God also regarded him as her protege and

favourite. Aesculapius cured him of his disease, guided him in his life

by ordering him to devote himself to oratory, revealed himself to his

favoured servant, and gave him the name Theodorus. There is much

probability that the name was given in a vision, though the

circumstances are not quite clear.

The evidence lies chiefly in a remarkable passage at the end of

Aristides' Hymn to Aesculapius, which Reiske declares himself unable to

understand, though he suggests that it refers to some prophecy

vouchsafed to Aristides by Aesculapius in a dream. Words which Reiske

could not understand must be very obscure; and hence the passage has

attracted little attention.

It is rather bold to suggest an explanation where that excellent

scholar says "non intelligo"; but the words of Aristides seem to

illustrate the passage before us so well, that an interpretation may be

offered. The words and the situation are as follows. Aristides has just

related how through the orders and aid of Aesculapius he had appeared

in Rome and given a successful display of oratory before the two

Emperors, the ladies of the Imperial family and the whole Imperial

court, just as Ulysses had been enabled by Athena to display his

eloquence in the ball of Alcinous before the Phaeacian audience. He

proceeds in the following very enigmatic words: "And not only had these

things been done in this way, but also the Symbol or Synthema was with

me encouraging me, whilst you showed in act that there were many

reasons why you brought me before the public, viz., that I might be

conspicuous in oratory, and that the most perfect (the highest circles

and the educated class) might hear with their own ears the better

counsels (i.e. the teaching of a true philosophy and morality)."

The nature of the Synthema which Aristides received from the god he

does not explain. The obscurity in which he leaves it is obviously

intentional. It was a secret between the god and himself; he, and he

alone, had been initiated by the god into this ministry, and it was not

to be published for every one to know. Only they should understand who

might be initiated into the same mystery: the word and the sign would

be enough for them: others who were outside should remain ignorant.

But Aristides adds one word which gives a hint as to the purpose and

effect of the Synthema: the Synthema was something that addressed him

in an earnest, rousing way, a practical sign and proof that the god for

various reasons brought him before the assembled world in order that he

should gain distinction as an orator and that the noblest should hear

with their own ears good counsel on good subjects. The Synthema then

was a symbol always present with him and speaking direct to him; it as

a pledge of success from the god who gave it, and thus filled him with

god-given confidence. Hence it served for a call to action as an

orator; for it recalled the orders and assurances and promises which

the god had given him in the past, and was a pledge that there still

subsisted between the god and his votary that same bond of connection

and mutual confidence.

Aristides does not expressly say that the Synthema was connected with

the new name that was bestowed on him by the god; but there can hardly

be any doubt that the name and the sign stood in some close relation to

one another, and were given him at the same time, probably (as Reiske

thought) in a dream. In that dream or vision the god had commissioned

him to the profession of oratory, had promised him constant aid, had

guaranteed him brilliant success, and as a proof and pledge of the

promised aid had bestowed on him a new name, Theodorus, "the gift of

god," and a sign. So much seems practically certain. Only one thing has

to be added, which seems to spring directly from these facts: the Sign

must have been the form in which the new name was communicated. Perhaps

in writing, perhaps in some other way, Aristides had always with him

the proof of the god's presence and aid. The name was the power of the

god, at once encouraging him to effort and guaranteeing success.

In a sense not unlike this, the term Synthemata was used to indicate

the signs or words of a symbolic code which two persons arranged with

one another in order that their letters might convey more meaning to

the intended recipient than to any chance reader who was not aware of

the secret.

It is to be observed that, though Aristides regarded Aesculapius as his

special protector and guide in life, the name which was given him was

not Asclepiodoros, but Theodoros. Aesculapius, who gave him the name,

was merely the form in which the ultimate divine power envisaged itself

to Aristides; it was "the god," and not Aesculapius, whose name he

bore.

Orators of that period seem commonly to have regarded themselves as

sent by divine mission, and as charged with a message of divine truth.

So Dion Chrysostom several times claims divine mission; and in one of

his speeches at Tarsus he explains that all that happens to us in an

unexpected, unintended, self-originated way, ought to be regarded by us

a sent to us by the god, and therefore, as he has appeared in that way

before the Tarsian audience, they should regard him as speaking with

authority as the divine messenger. The speech was delivered probably in

the third period of Dion's career, which began when he received news of

the death of Domitian, and thus his case illustrates strictly

contemporary belief about those travelling orators and teachers, who in

many ways show so close analogy to the Christian Apostles and

travelling preachers.

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

Chapter 23: Thyatira: Weakness Made Strong

Thyatira was situated in the mouth of a long vale which extends north

and south connecting the Hermus and Caicos Valleys. Down the vale a

stream flows south to join the Lycus (near whose left bank Thyatira was

situated), one of the chief tributaries of the Hermus, while its

northern end is divided by only a ridge of small elevation from the

Caicos Valley. The valleys of the two rivers, Hermus and Caicos,

stretch east and west, opening down from the edge of the great central

plateau of Anatolia towards the Aegean Sea. Nature has marked out this

road, a very easy path, for the tide of communication which in all

civilised times must have been large between the one valley and the

other. The railway traverses its whole length now: in ancient times one

of the chief routes of Asia Minor traversed it.

Not merely did all communication and trade between those two great and

rich valleys pass up and down the vale; but also, in certain periods

and in certain conditions of the general economy of Asia Minor and the

Aegean lands, a main artery of the Anatolian system of communication

made use of it. The land-road connecting Constantinople with Smyrna and

the southwestern regions of Asia Minor goes that way, and has been at

some periods an important route. The Imperial Post-road took that

course in Roman times. Above all, when Pergamum was the capital of Asia

under the kings, that was the most important road in the whole country;

and its importance as the one great route from Pergamum to the

southeast (including all the vast regions of the central Anatolian

plateau, Syria and the East generally) was proportionate to the

importance which the official capital of the Province retained under

the Roman administration.

In the middle of that vale, with a very slight rising ground to serve

for a citadel or acropolis, Thyatira was built by Seleucus I, the

founder of the Seleucid dynasty, whose vast realm, extending from the

Hermus Valley to the Himalayas, was everywhere bounded loosely

according to the varying strength of rival powers. The boundary at this

northwestern extremity was determined at that period by the power of

Lysimachus, who ruled parts of Thrace, Mysia and the coastlands as far

south as Ephesus. For defence against him, a colony of Macedonian

soldiers was planted at Thyatira between 300 and 282 B.C. The situation

chosen implies that the Caicos Valley belonged at that moment to

Lysimachus. Now Philetaerus governed Pergamum and guarded the treasure

of Lysimachus for many years, and during that time the whole Caicos

Valley would naturally go along with Pergamum, while the Hermus Valley

belonged to the Seleucid realm.

In 282 Philetaerus revolted and founded the Pergamenian kingdom. At

first he was encouraged by Seleucus in order to weaken Lysimachus; but

soon this bond of a common enmity was dissolved at the death of the

enemy, and then Thyatira was a useful garrison to hold the road, first

in the interest of the Seleucid kings and afterwards on the Pergamenian

side. So long as the kings of Pergamum were masters of Thyatira they

were safe from Seleucid attack; but if the Syrian kings possessed that

key to the gate of the Caicos Valley, Pergamum was narrowed in its

dominion and weakened in its defences. Thus, the relation between the

two cities was necessarily a very close one. The condition of Thyatira

was the best measure of the power of Pergamum.

Figure 26

Figure 26: The hero of Thyatira

This historical sketch is necessary, in order to show the character of

Thyatira and the place which it holds in history. It came into

existence to be a garrison-city; and its importance to the two rival

dynasties who alternately ruled it lay in its military strength. But no

city has been given by nature less of the look or strength of a

fortress than Thyatira. It lies in an open, smiling vale, bordered by

gently sloping hills, of moderate elevation, but sufficient to

overshadow the vale. It possesses no proper acropolis, and the whole

impression which the situation gives is of weakness, subjection and

dependence. The most careless and casual observer could never take

Thyatira for a ruling city, or the capital of an Empire. It is

essentially a handmaid city, built to serve an Empire by obstructing

for a little the path of its enemies and so giving time for the

concentration of its military strength.

The natural weakness of the position imposed all the more firmly on the

kingdom whose frontier it guarded the necessity of attending to its

military strength by careful fortification and by maintaining in it a

trained and devoted garrison. The military spirit of the

soldier-citizens had to be encouraged to the utmost. This tendency

towards militarism must inevitably characterise Thyatira in all times

of uncertainty and of possible warfare: the function of the city was to

make a weak position strong, supply a defect, and guard against an

ever-threatening danger.

Figure 27

Figure 27: Caracalla adoring the God of Thyatira

The religion of an ancient city always summed up its character in

brief. The Thyatiran religion is obscure, and our chief authority lies

in the coins of the city. A hero Tyrimnos represents the Thyatiran

conception of the city's function in the world. He goes forth on

horseback with the battle-axe over his shoulder, the fit representative

of a military colony, to conquer, and to dash his enemies in pieces.

How far he may have a Macedonian origin, as brought with them by the

first Macedonian soldiers who were settled there, remains doubtful; but

his aspect in art is entirely that of a common Anatolian heroic figure,

as shown in Figure 26.

This hero Tyrimnos is closely related in nature to the tutelary god of

Thyatira, whose full titles are recorded in inscriptions: he was styled

Propolis because he had his temple in front of the city, Propator as

the divine ancestor (doubtless both of the city as a whole and

specially of some leading family or families), Helios the sun-god,

Pythian Tyrimnaean Apollo, a strange mixture of Hellenic and Anatolian

names. This god is never named on the coins, so far as published; but

he often appears as a type on them, a standing figure, wearing only a

cloak (chlamys) fastened with a brooch round his neck, carrying a

battle axe over one shoulder, and holding forth in his right hand a

laurel-branch, which symbolises his purifying power. This elaborate and

highly composite impersonation of the Divine nature, with so many names

and such diversity of character, seems to have been produced by a

syncretism of different religious ideas in the evolution of the city.

Examples are given in Figures 27, 28.

Thyatira was certainly inhabited before the time of Seleucus. The site

is so favourable that it must become a centre of population from the

beginning of history in the valley. But it was made a city by Seleucus

with a great accession of population. Previously it had been a mere

Anatolian village round a central temple. The foundation of the

garrison city was not without effect on the religion of the locality.

It was inevitable that the newcomers should worship the god whose power

in the country had been proved by the experience of generations; but

they brought with them also their own religious ideas, and these ideas

necessarily affected their conception of the nature of this god whom

they found at home in the land and whose power they respected and

trusted. Tyrimnos, whatever his origin may have been, was the heroic

embodiment of the spirit of the garrison city; and the Anatolian god of

the locality took into himself some of the nature of the hero, as

Helios Tyrimnaios Pythios Apollo, a conception at once Anatolian,

military, and Hellenic. The god united in himself the character of all

sections of the population, so that all might find in him their own

nature and the satisfaction of their own religious cravings.

Figure 28

Figure 28: The Emperor and the god of Thyatira supporting with joined

hands the Imperial Trimnean Pythian Games

He stands for his city in alliance-coins with Pergamum; and frequently

a female figure, wearing a turreted crown (the accepted representation

of the genius of any fortified city), holds him forth on her extended

right hand (as on Figure 27), thus intimating that Thyatira was devoted

to the service of this god. In Figure 28 the Emperor Elagabalus, in the

dress of a Roman general, is shown with his right hand in that of

Apollo Tyrimnaios, supporting between them an urn, over which is the

name "Pythia." The urn is the regular symbol of those gymnastic and

other competitive sports in which the Hellenic cities delighted; and

the name inscribed above shows that the Thyatiran games were modelled

upon the Pythian games of Greece. Between the Emperor and the god is an

altar flaming with the sacrifice. The coin was, indubitably, struck in

gratitude for some favour granted by the Emperor in connection with

those games in Thyatira. What the favour was can be determined with

great probability.

The union of the Emperor and the god in supporting these games is the

symbolic fashion of intimating, in a way adapted for the surface of a

coin, that the Emperor and the god were united in the honour of the

festival, that is to say, the festival was no longer celebrated in

honour of the god alone, but included both Emperor and god. In other

words Elagabalus sanctioned the addition of the honourable title

Augustan to the old Tyrimnaean festival. During the third century the

feast and the games regularly bear the double title, an example of the

closer relation between the Imperial and the popular religion in Asia

under the later Empire.

Seleucus I, the founder of Thyatira, is mentioned by Josephus as having

shown special favour to the Jews and made them citizens in the cities

which he founded in Asia. The probability that he settled a body of

Jews in Thyatira must therefore be admitted, for he knew well that

soldiers alone could not make a city (see chapter 11). Beyond this it

is not possible to go with certainty; but some slight indications are

known of the presence of Jews in Thyatira. Lydia the Thyatiran in

Philippi was "God-fearing," i.e., she had come within the circle of

influence of the Synagogue. Professor E. Schurer in a very interesting

paper has suggested the possibility that the sanctuary of Sambethe the

Oriental (Chaldean, or Hebrew, or Persian) Sibyl in the Chaldean's

precinct before the city of Thyatira might have been formed under

Hebrew influence: according to this suggestion the sanctuary would have

arisen in an attempted syncretism of Jewish and pagan religious ideas.

But this remains as yet a mere tantalising possibility.

The history of Thyatira is a blank. Its fate in the many centuries of

fighting between Mohammedans (Arabs first, then Turks) and Christians

must have been a sad one. It is one of those cities whose situation

exposes them to destruction by every conqueror, and yet compels their

restoration after every siege and sack. It lies right in the track of

invasion: it blocks the way and must be captured by an invader; it

guards the passage to a rich district, and hence it must be defended to

the last, and so provoke the barbarity of the assailant: but it could

never be made a really strong fortress in ancient warfare, so as to

resist successfully. Yet the successful assailant must in his turn

refortify the city, if he wants to hold the country. He must make it

the guardian of his gate; he must make it a garrison city. Its

situation defines its history; but the history has not been recorded.

The same local conditions which ensured for Thyatira so unfortunate a

fate in unsettled times favoured its prosperity in a period of profound

peace. The garrison city could never be a large one, for a multitude of

inhabitants devoted to the arts of peace would seriously detract from

its military strength. But in the long peace of the Roman Empire

Thyatira ceased to be a mere military city, though the historical

memory and the military character of the municipal religion still

persisted. The city grew large and wealthy. It was a centre of

communication. Vast numbers passed through it. It commanded a rich and

fertile vale. Many of the conditions of a great trading city were

united there.

This period of great prosperity and increase was only beginning when

the Seven Letters were written. Thyatira was still a small city,

retaining strong memories of its military origin, and yet with

fortifications decayed and dismantled in the long freedom from terror

of attack, which had lasted since 189 B.C. Yet the Roman peace had at

first brought no prosperity, only oppression and extortion. When the

Empire at last was inaugurated, prosperity returned to Asia (see

chapter 10); and Thyatira soon began to take advantage of its

favourable situation for trade, though it was not till the second

century after Christ that the full effect became manifest.

The coinage of Thyatira is a good index of the character of the city.

As a military colony, in its earlier stage of existence, it struck

various classes of coins, including cistophori. This coinage came to an

end before 150 B.C.; for the military importance of Thyatira lay in its

position as a frontier city; and that ceased after 189 B.C. It was not

until the last years of the reign of Claudius, 50-4 A.D., that it began

again to issue coins. They gradually became more numerous; and in the

latter part of the second century, and in the third century, the

coinage of Thyatira was on a great scale, indicating prosperity and

wealth in the city.

It is therefore not surprising that more trade-guilds are known in

Thyatira than in any other Asian city. The inscriptions, though not

specially numerous, mention the following: wool-workers, linen-workers,

makers of outer garments, dyers, leather-workers, tanners, potters,

bakers, slave-dealers and bronze-smiths. The dealers in garments and

the salve-dealers would have a good market in a road-centre. Garments

were sold ready made, being all loose and free; and from the mention of

dealers in outer garments we may infer the existence of special trades

and guilds for other classes of garments. The woman of Thyatira, a

seller of purple, named Lydia, who was so hospitable to St. Paul and

his company at Philippi (Acts 16:14), belonged doubtless to one of

those guilds: she sold not simply purple cloth but purple garments, and

had emigrated to push the trade in Thyatiran manufactures in the

Macedonian city. The purple in which she dealt cannot be regarded as

made with the usual dye, for that was obtained from a shell-fish found

chiefly on the Phoenician and the Spartan coasts. The colour in which

Lydia dealt must have been a product of the Thyatiran region; and

Monsieur Clerc, in his work on the city, suggests what is at once seen

plainly to be true, that the well-known Turkey-red was the colour which

is meant. This bright red is obtained from madder-root, which grows

abundantly in those regions. It is well known that the ancient names of

colours were used with great laxity and freedom; and the name purple,

being established and fashionable, was used for several colours which

to us seem essentially diverse from one another.

Figure 29

Figure 29: The Thyatiran bronzesmith

A special interest attaches to Figure 29. The divine smith, Hephaestus,

dressed as a workman, is here seated at an anvil (represented only by a

small pillar), holding in his left hand a pair of forceps, and giving

the finishing blow with his hammer to a helmet, for which the goddess

of war, Pallas Athene, is holding out her hand. Considering that a

guild of bronze-smiths is mentioned at Thyatira, we cannot doubt that

this coin commemorates the peculiar importance for the welfare of

Thyatira of the bronze-workers' handicraft; and we must infer that

bronze work was carried to a high state of perfection in the city.

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

Chapter 24: The Letter to the Church in Thyatira

These things saith the Son of God, who hath his eyes like a flame of

fire, and his feet are like bright bronze:

I know thy works, and thy love and faith and ministry and patience,

and that thy last works are more than the first. But I have this

against thee, that thou sufferest the woman of thine, Jezebel, which

calleth herself a prophetess; and she teacheth and seduceth my

servants to commit fornication, and to eat things sacrificed to

idols. And I gave her time that she should repent; and she willeth

not to repent of her fornication. Behold, I set her on a banqueting

couch, and them that commit adultery with her, to enjoy great

tribulation, except they repent of her works. And I will kill her

children with death; and all the churches shall know that I am he

which searcheth the reins and hearts: and I will give unto each one

of you according to your works. But to you I say, to the rest that

are in Thyatira, as many as have not this teaching, which know not

the deep things of Satan, as they say; I lay upon you no other

burden. Howbeit that which ye have, hold fast till I come.

And he that overcometh, and he that keepeth my works unto the end,

to him will I give authority over the nations: and he shall rule

them with a rod of iron, as the vessels of the potter are broken to

shivers; as I also have received of my Father: and I will give him

the morning star.

He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith to the

churches.

This is in many respects the most obscure, as it is certainly the

longest, and probably in a historical view the most instructive of all

the Seven Letters. Its obscurity is doubtless caused in a considerable

degree by the fact that the history of Thyatira, and the character and

circumstances of the city in the first century after Christ, are almost

entirely unknown to us. Hence those allusions to the past history and

the present situation of affairs in the city, which we have found the

most instructive and illuminative parts of the letters to Ephesus,

Smyrna, and Pergamum, are in the case of Thyatira the most obscure. We

have some idea of what were the proper topics for an orator to enlarge

on when he wished to please the people of Ephesus or Pergamum. We know

how a rhetorician like Aelius Aristides tickled the ears of the

Smyrnaeans. We know what events in the past history of those cities, as

well as of Sardis, had sunk into the heart of the inhabitants, and were

remembered by all with ever fresh joy or sorrow. Even in the case of

the secondary cities, Laodicea and Philadelphia, we learn something

from various ancient authorities about the leading facts of their

history and present circumstances, the sources of their wealth, the

staple of their trade, the disasters that had befallen them. But about

Thyatira we know extremely little. Historians and ancient writers

generally rarely allude to it, and the numerous inscriptions which have

been discovered and published throw little or no light (so far as we

can at present detect) upon the letter which we are now studying.

There is a considerable resemblance between the Thyatiran and

Pergamenian letters. Those were the only two of the Seven Cities which

had been strongly affected by the Nicolaitan teaching, and both letters

are dominated by the strenuous hatred of the writer for that heresy.

Moreover, those two cities lay a little apart from the rest, away in

the north. They were the two Mysian cities of the Seven. Pergamum was

always called a Mysian city. Thyatira was sometimes called "the last,

i.e. the most southerly, city of Mysia"; and it stood in the closest

relations with Pergamum, when the latter was the capital of the Attalid

kings; although, in the proverbial uncertainty of the Mysian frontier,

most people considered it a city of Lydia. It may therefore be presumed

that the two had a certain local character in common.

Accordingly, there may be traced a common type both in the preliminary

addresses and in the promises at the end of those two letters. The

strength of authority, the sword as the symbol of the power of life and

death, the tessera inscribed with the secret name of might--such are

the topics that give character to the Pergamenian exordium and

conclusion. The Thyatiran letter proceeds from "the Son of God, who

hath His eyes like a flame of fire and His feet like unto brighter

bronze" (the very hard alloyed metal, used for weapons, and under

proper treatment assuming a brilliant polished gleam approximating to

gold); to the victorious Christian of Thyatira is promised "authority

over the nations, and he shall rule them with a rod of iron as the

vessels of the potter are broken to shivers"; the terror and, as one

might almost say, the cruelty of this promise is mitigated by the

conclusion, "and I will give him the morning star." The spirit of the

address and the promise is throughout of dazzlingly impressive might,

the irresistible strength of a great monarch and a vast well-ordered

army.

The words which are used in this Thyatiran address have an

appropriateness, which we can only guess at. The term "chalkolibanos,"

which may be rather vaguely rendered "bright bronze," never occurs

except in the Apocalypse. Its exact sense was doubtless known to the

guild of the bronze-workers in Thyatira; but only the name of this city

guild has been preserved, without any information as to the industry

which they practised. This is one of the details on which better local

knowledge would almost certainly throw light.

It may be regarded as probable, though no other authority ever mentions

this obscure term, that chalkolibanos was made in Thyatira; but all

that can be stated with certainty is that the city was a trading and

manufacturing centre, that we know of an exceptionally large and varied

series of trade-guilds in it, and that among them occurred the

bronze-smiths and modellers in bronze (either as two separate guilds or

as one). The word chalkolibanos occurs also in 1:15, but (as has been

pointed out in chapter 13) the description of "one like unto a son of

man," 1:12ff, was obviously composed with a view to the Seven Letters,

so as to exhibit there, united in one personality, the various

characteristics which were to be thereafter mentioned separately in the

letters. Accordingly the chalkolibanos may probably have suggested

itself in the first place for the purposes of the Thyatiran letter; so

that its use in 1:15 may be secondary, merely to prepare for the

letter.

The omission of the "sword" as the symbol of might also shows

characteristic accuracy in the choice of details. The sword was the

symbol of higher official authority according to the Roman usage. It

shows, therefore, a marked appropriateness that the writer should use

the term "sword" in reference to Pergamum, the official capital and

seat of the Roman Proconsul, but avoid it in the case of Thyatira. On

the other hand the "rod of iron" is expressive of might that is not

thought of as associated with formal authority, but merely arises from

innate strength. Thyatira could not properly bear the sword, but only

the iron bar.

The original character of Thyatira had been military. It was a colony

of Macedonian soldiers, planted to guard the long pass leading north

and south between the Hermus Valley and the Caicus Valley, between

Sardis and Pergamum. Its tutelary deity was Tyrimnos, originally

apparently a hero, but merged in the divine nature as Apollo

Tyrimnaios. The hero is represented often as a horse-man with a

double-edge battle-axe on his shoulder, an appropriate deity for a

military colony. The glitter and brilliance and smashing power of a

great army, or a military colony, or the Divine Author of the Thyatiran

letter, are embodied in him.

In short, just as in the case of Pergamum, so here again, the promise

sets the true and victorious Christian in the place and dignity of the

Roman Emperor. Rome was the only power on earth that exercised

authority over the nations, and ruled them with a rod of iron, and

smashed them like potsherds: to the Roman State that description is

startlingly applicable. Accordingly the promise here designates the

victor as heir to a greater, more terrible, more irresistible strength

than even the power of the mighty Empire with all its legions. The

opposition was more precisely and antithetically expressed in the case

of Pergamum, at least to the readers who were within the circle of

ancient ideas and education; though probably the modern mind is likely

to recognise the antithesis between the Church and the Empire more

readily and clearly in the Thyatiran letter, since we at the distance

of nearly 2,000 years can more readily call up in imagination the

military strength of the Empire and its armies. But in the first

century the minds of men were filled and awed by the thought of the

Emperor as the central figure of the whole earth, concentrating on

himself the loyal religious feelings of all nations, and holding in his

hands that complete authority, indefinable because too wide for

definition, which the autocrat of the civilised world exercised by the

simple expression of his will; and that is the idea to which the

Pergamenian letter appealed.

It could not escape the attention of an Asian reader at that time that

this irresistible power and strength were promised to the city which

was at that time the smallest and feeblest, and in general estimation

the least distinguished and famous, of all the Seven Cities, except

perhaps Philadelphia, which might vie with Thyatira for the last place

on the list.

The local surroundings of Thyatira accentuate this comparatively humble

character of its fortunes. It lies in the middle of a long valley

between parallel ridges of hills of no great elevation, which rise with

gentle slope from the valley. Thus there is the most marked contrast

between the situation of Thyatira--now "sleeping safe in the bosom of

the plain" under the peace of the Roman rule, though (if any enemies

had existed) easily open to attack from every side, dominated by even

those low and gentle ranges of hills on east and west, beautiful with a

gentle, smiling, luxuriant softness and grace--and the proud and lofty

acropolis of Sardis, or the huge hill of Pergamum, or the

mountain-walls of Ephesus and the castled hill of Smyrna, each with its

harbour, or the long sloping hillside on which Philadelphia rises high

above its plain, or the plateau of Laodicea, not lofty, yet springing

sharp and bold from the plain of the Lycus, crowned with a long line of

strong walls and so situated on the protruding apex of a triangular

extent of hilly ground that it seems to stand up in the middle of the

plain.

Military skill, such as the Pergamenian kings had at their command,

could of course so fortify Thyatira as to make it strong enough to hold

the passage up the long valley. The importance of the city to the kings

lay in the fact that it guarded the road from the Hermus Valley and the

East generally to Pergamum. Its function in the world at first had been

to serve as attendant and guard to the governing royal city. Now, under

the long peace of the Imperial rule, it had become a town of trade and

peaceful industry, profiting by its command of a fertile plain and

still more by its situation on a great road; and beyond all doubt the

military character of its foundation by the kings, as a garrison of

Macedonian soldiers to block the road to their capital from the south,

was now only a historical memory.

Thus Thyatira of all the Seven Cities seemed in every way the least

fitted by nature and by history to rule over the nations; and it could

not fail to be observed by the Asian readers as a notable thing, that

the Church of this weakest and least famous of the cities should be

promised such a future of strength and universal power. Beyond all

doubt the writer of the Seven Letters, who knew the cities so well,

must have been conscious of this, and must have relied on it for the

effect which he aimed at.

As we go through the Seven Letters point by point, each detail confirms

our impression of the unhesitating and sublime confidence in the

victory of the Church which prompts and enlivens them. The Emperor, the

Roman State with its patriotism, its religion, and its armies, the

brutal populace of the cities, the Jews, and every other enemy of the

Church, all are raging and persecuting and slaying to the utmost of

their power. But their power is naught. The real Church stands outside

of their reach, immeasurably above them, secure and triumphant,

"eternal in the heavens," while the individual Christians work out

their victory in their own life and above all by their death; so that

the more successfully the enemy kills them off, the more absolute is

his defeat, and the more complete and immediate is their victory. The

weakest and least honoured among those Christian martyrs, as he gains

his victory by death, is invested with that authority over the nations,

which the proud Empire believed that its officials and governors

wielded, and rules with a power more supreme than that of Rome herself.

The conclusion of the promise, "I will give him the morning star,"

seems to have been added with the calculated intention of expressing

the other side of the Christian character. The honour promised was

evidently too exclusively terrible. But the addition must be in keeping

with the rest of the promise. The brightness, gleam and glitter, as of

"an army with banners," which rules through the opening address and the

concluding promise, is expressed in a milder spirit, without the

terrible character, though the brilliance remains or is even increased,

in the image of "the morning star."

Having observed the close relation between the Pergamenian and the

Thyatiran letter, we shall recognise a similar analogy between the

Ephesian and the Sardian, and again between the Smyrnaean and the

Philadelphian letters. Those six letters constitute three pairs; and

each pair must be studied not only in its separate parts, but also in

the mutual relation of the two parts. Only the Laodicean letter stands

alone, just as Laodicea stood apart from the other six, the

representative of the distant and very different Phrygian land.

As usual, the letter proper begins with the statement that the writer

is well acquainted with the history and fortunes of the Thyatiran

Church. The brief first statement is entirely laudatory. "I know thy

works, and thy love and faith and ministry and patience, and that thy

last works are more than the first." Whereas Ephesus had fallen away

from its original spirit and enthusiasm, Thyatira had grown more

energetic as time elapsed.

But after this complimentary opening, the letter denounces the state of

the Thyatiran Church in the most outspoken and unreserved way. It had

permitted and encouraged the Nicolaitan doctrine, and harboured the

principal exponent of that teaching in the Province.

We observe here, first of all, that the Nicolaitan doctrine had not

caused any falling off in the good deeds of the Church. On the

contrary, it was probably the emulation between the two parties or

sections of the Church, and the desire of the Nicolaitans to show that

they were quite as fervent in the faith as the simpler Christians whose

opinions they desired to correct, that caused the improvement in the

"works" of the Thyatiran Church. We recognise that it was quite

possible for Nicolaitans to continue to cherish "love and faith and

ministry and patience," and to improve in the active performance of the

practical work of a congregation (among which public charities and

subscriptions were doubtless an important part). Public subscriptions

for patriotic and religious purposes were common in the Graeco-Roman

world; the two classes were almost equivalent in ancient feeling; all

patriotic purposes took a religious form, and though only the religious

purpose is as a rule mentioned in the inscriptions in which such

contributions are recorded, the real motive in most cases was

patriotic, and the custom of making such subscriptions was undoubtedly

kept up by the Christian Church generally (see Acts 11:29, 24:17; 1 Cor

16:1, 2; 2 Cor 9:1-5). The Thyatiran Nicolaitans, true to their

cherished principle of assimilating the Church usage as far as possible

to the character of existing society, would naturally encourage and

maintain the custom. It makes this letter more credible in other

points, that in this one it cordially admits and praises the generosity

of the whole Thyatiran Church, including the Nicolaitans.

It seems therefore to be beyond all doubt that, as a rule, the

Nicolaitans of Thyatira, with the prophetess as their leader, were

still active and unwearied members of the Church, "full of good works,"

and respected by the whole congregation for their general character and

way of life. The sentiment entertained with regard to them by the

congregation is attested by the letter: "Thou sufferest the woman

Jezebel, which calleth herself a prophetess, and she teacheth." It is

evident that the lady who is here so rudely referred to was generally

accepted in Thyatira as a regular teacher, and as a prophetess and

leader in the Church. There was no serious, general, active opposition

to her; and therein lay the fault of the whole congregation; she had

firmly established herself in the approval of the congregation; and, as

we have seen, she was so respected because by her liberal and zealous

and energetic life she had deserved the public esteem. She was

evidently an active and managing lady after the style of Lydia, the

Thyatiran merchant and head of a household at Philippi; and it is an

interesting coincidence that the only two women of Thyatira mentioned

in the New Testament are so like one another in character. The question

might even suggest itself whether they may not be the same person,

since Lydia seems to disappear from Philippian history (so far as we

are informed of it) soon after St. Paul's visit to the city. But this

question must undoubtedly be answered in the negative, for it is

utterly improbable that the hostess of St. Paul would ever be spoken

about so mercilessly and savagely as this poor prophetess is here. The

prophetess furnishes just one more example of the great influence

exerted by women in the primitive Church.

The extremely bitter and almost virulent tone in which the prophetess

is spoken of seems, therefore, not to be due to her personal character,

but to be caused entirely by the principles which she set forth in a

too persuasive and successful way: she was exercising an unhealthy

influence, and her many excellent qualities made her the more

dangerous, because they increased the authority of her words. At the

present day, when we love milder manners and are full of allowance for

difference of opinion and conduct in others, the harshness with which

disapproval is here expressed must seem inharmonious and repellent. But

the writer was influenced by other ways of thinking and different

principles of action; and we should not estimate either him or the

prophetess by twentieth century standards.

It may be added that I have read more than once Professor E. Schurer's

paper on the Thyatiran Jezebel--at first with admiration and interest,

but with growing dissatisfaction during subsequent thought, until in a

final closer study of the whole Seven Letters it seems to me to be

entirely mistaken in its whole line of interpretation. He finds in

"Jezebel" a prophetess and priestess of the temple of a Chaldean Sibyl

in Thyatira, where a mixture of pagan rites with Jewish ideas was

practised.

It is unnecessary here to dilate on the importance of the order of

prophets in the primitive Church; but we should be glad to know more

about this Thyatiran prophetess, a person of broad views and reasonable

mind, who played a prominent pat in a great religious movement, and

perished defeated and decried. She ranks with the Montanist

prophetesses of the second century, or the Cappadocian prophetess about

whom Firmilian wrote to Cyprian in the third century; one of those

leading women who seem to have emphasised too strongly one side of a

case, quite reasonable in itself, through failure to see the other side

sufficiently. They all suffer the hard fate of being known only through

the mouth of bitter enemies, whose disapproval of their opinions was

expressed in the harsh, opprobrious, half-figurative language of

ancient moral condemnation. Thus for the most part they are stigmatised

as persons of the worst character and the vilest life.

We take a much more favourable view of the character of the lady of

Thyatira than the commentators usually do. Thus Mr. Anderson Scott

speaks of her teaching as "encouragement to licentiousness," and of the

"libertinism which was taught and practised in Thyatira"; and she is

generally regarded as entirely false, abandoned and immoral in her life

and her teaching. This usual view is founded mainly on the

misinterpretation of 2:22, which will be explained in the sequel. It

seems to us to miss completely the real character and the serious

nature of the question which was being agitated at the time, and which

probably was finally determined and set at rest by the decision stated

in the Seven Letters and in the oral teaching of the author. In this

and various other so-called "heresies" the right side was not so clear

and self-evident as it is commonly represented in the usual popularly

accepted histories of the Church and commentaries on the ancient

authorities. The prophetess was not all evil--that idea is absolutely

contradictory of the already quoted words of the letter, 2:19--and the

opposite party had no monopoly of the good in practical life.

The strong language of 2:20, 21 is due in part to the common symbolism

found in the Old Testament and elsewhere, describing the lapses of

Israel into idolatry as adultery and gross immorality. But in greater

measure it is due to the fact that the idolatrous ritual of paganism

was always in practice associated with immoral customs of various

kinds; that, although a few persons of higher mind and nobler nature

might perhaps recognise that the immorality was not an essential part

of the pagan ritual, but was due to degeneracy and degradation, it was

impossible to dissociate the one from the other; and that the universal

opinion of pagan society accepted as natural and justifiable and

right--if not carried to ruinous extremes--such a way of life, with

such relations between the sexes, as Christianity and Judaism have

always stigmatised as vicious, degrading, and essentially wrong. The

principles of the Nicolaitans seemed to St. John certain to lead to an

acquiescence in this commonly accepted standard of pagan society, and

he held that the Nicolaitan prophetess was responsible for all that

followed from her teaching. That he was right no one can doubt who

studies the history of Greek and Roman and West Asiatic paganism as a

practical force in human life. That there were lofty qualities and some

high ideals in those pagan religions the present writer has always

recognised and maintained in the most emphatic terms; but, in human

nature, the inevitable tendency of paganism was towards a low standard

of moral life, as has been set forth more fully in an account of the

Religion of Greece and Asia Minor in Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible,

vol. v., pp. 109-155.

A third reason also determined the author to employ the strong language

which occurs in 2:20. Evidently the decision of the Apostolic Council,

though relating to a different question, dictated the form which the

author of the letter has employed. That decision was evidently present

in his memory as authoritative on an allied question; and he alludes to

it in an easily understood way, which he evidently expected his readers

to appreciate. He turns in verse 24 to address the section of the

Thyatiran Church which had not accepted the Nicolaitan teaching, and

tells them that he lays no other burden upon them. The burden which has

been already imposed on all Christians by the Council is sufficient,

"These necessary things, that ye abstain from things sacrificed to

idols . . . and from fornication" (Acts 15:28). The expression, "no

other burden," implies that the necessary minimum burden is already

before the writer's mind, and that he assumes it to be also before the

readers' mind; he assumes that the readers have already caught the

allusion in 2:20, "She teacheth and seduceth my servants to commit

fornication and to eat things sacrificed to idols," i.e., she teaches

them to violate the fundamental rule of the Apostolic Council. But, as

he implies, while this minimum burden must be borne and cannot be

avoided by any sophistry and skilful religious casuistry--which the

Nicolaitans regarded as high transcendental conception of the things of

God, but which is really "the cryptic lore and deep lies of the

devil"--he imposes on them no further burden. This is sufficient, but

it is inevitable: there is no more to be said. The Nicolaitans explain

this away, and thereby condemn themselves.

The following sentences are the one main source of all the little we

can gather about the Nicolaitan principles. The allusions in the

Pergamenian letter, obscure in themselves, become more intelligible

when read in connection with the words here. The obscurity is due to

our ignorance of what was familiar to the original Asian readers. They

were living through these questions, and caught every allusion and hint

that the writer of the letter makes.

The questions which are here treated belong to an early period in the

history of the Church. They are connected with the general conduct of

pagan converts in the Church. How much should be required of them? What

burdens should be imposed on them? The principles that should regulate

their conduct are here regarded, of course, from the point of view of

their relation to the general society of the cities in which they

lived. They had for the most part been members, and some of them

leading members, of that society before their conversion. We may here

leave out of sight the Christianised Jews in the Asian congregations,

who had in a way been outside of ordinary pagan society from the

beginning; for, though they were a part, and possibly even an

influential part, of the Church, yet the Seven Letters were not

intended specially for them, and hardly touch the questions that most

intimately concerned them. These letters are addressed to pagan

converts, and set forth in a figurative way the principles that they

should follow in their relations with ordinary society and the Roman

State.

On the other hand, the relation of the pagan converts to Judaism is

hardly alluded to in the Seven Letters. That question was now past and

done with; the final answer had been given; there was no need for

further instructions about it. In practice, of course, the relation

between Jewish Christians and pagan converts continued to exist in the

congregations; but the general principles were now admitted, and were

of such a kind as to place an almost impassable barrier between the

national Jews and the Church. To the writer of the Seven Letters, the

Jews were the sham Jews, "the synagogue of Satan," according to a twice

repeated expression: God had turned away from them, and had preferred

the pagan converts, who now were the true seed of Abraham: the sham

Jews would have to recognise the facts, accept the situation, and

humble themselves before the Gentile Christians: "Behold, I give of the

Synagogue of Satan, of them which say they are Jews and they are not,

but speak falsely; behold I will make them to come and worship before

thy feet, and to know that I have loved thee." Thus the situation in

the Church was developed now far beyond what it had been in the time of

St. Paul: and his settlement of the Jewish question had been accepted

completely by the Church, and is stated as emphatically and

aggressively here by this Jewish writer as by Paul himself.

It is unnecessary here to repeat the elaborate discussion of this

subject which is given in the Expositor, present series, vol. ii., pp.

429-444; vol. iii., pp. 93-110. There some of the many difficulties are

described which presented themselves every day to the converts from

paganism. It was accepted on all hands that they were to continue to

live in the world, and were not to seek to withdraw entirely out of it

(1 Cor 5:10). There were certain accepted customs, rules of politeness

and courtesy, ways of living and acting, which were recommended by

their gracious, refined, elegant character, and other ways which

without any special gracefulness were recommended simply because they

were the ordinary methods of behaviour. If we live in a

long-established and cultivated society, we must do many things, not

because we specially approve of them, or derive pleasure or advantage

of any kind from them, but simply from consideration for the feelings

of others, who expect us to do as the rest of society does. There are

even some things which we hardly quite approve; and yet we do not feel

that we ought to condemn them openly, or withdraw in a marked way from

social gatherings where they are practised. Such extremely strict

carrying out of our own principles would quickly become harsh, rude,

and misanthropic; and would justly expose any one who was often guilty

of it to the charge of self-conceit and spiritual pride.

How much might one accept; and what must one condemn? Such questions as

these were daily presenting themselves to the Christians in the

Graeco-Roman cities; and they were then almost invariably complicated

by the additional difficulty that all established usages, social

customs, rules of polite conduct, forms of graceful courtesy, were

(with rare exceptions) implicated in and coloured by idolatrous

associations. Grace before meat, thanksgiving after food, were in the

strictest sense slight acts of acknowledgment of the kindness and the

rights of pagan divinities. Such ceremonies had often become mere

forms, and those who complied with those customs were often hardly

conscious of the religious character of the action. How far was the

Christian bound to take notice of their idolatrous character and to

avoid acting in accordance with them, or even to express open

disapproval of them? So far as we can gather, the rule laid down by St.

Paul, and the practice of the Church, was that only in quite

exceptional, rare cases should open disapproval of the customs of

society be expressed; in many cases, where the idolatrous connection

was not obvious, but only veiled or remote, the Christian might (and

perhaps even ought to) comply with the usual forms, unless his

attention was expressly called by any one of the guests to the

idolatrous connection; in that case the rude remark was equivalent to a

challenge to deny or affirm boldly his religion, and the Christian must

affirm his religion, and refuse compliance. Also, where the idolatrous

character of the act was patent and generally recognised, the Christian

must refuse compliance. Hence there was a general tendency among the

Christians to avoid situations, offices, and paths of life, in which

the performance of idolatrous ceremonial was necessary; and on this

account they were generally stigmatised as morose, hostile to existing

society, and deficient in active patriotism, if not actually disloyal.

Besides these slighter cases, there were many of a much more serious

character. The Roman soldier, marching under the colours of his

regiment, was marching under the standard of idolatry, for the

standards (signa) were all divine, and worship was paid to them by the

soldiers as a duty of the service, and all contained one or more

idolatrous symbols or representations; moreover he was frequently

required, standing in his place in the ranks, to take part in

idolatrous acts of worship. The soldier could not retire and take to

some other way of life, for he was bound to the service through a long

term of years. Here, again, the rule and practice of the Church seems

to have been that in ordinary circumstances the converted soldier

should remain passive, and as far as possible silent, during the

ceremony at which he was compulsorily present, but should not actively

protest. A similar practice was encouraged by the Church in other

departments of life and work. But in every case, and in every

profession, the Christian, who in ordinary circumstances might remain

passive and unprotesting, was liable to be pointedly challenged as to

whether he would willingly perform this act of worship of the deity

whom he considered false. In case of such a challenge, there was only

one course open. The Christian could not comply with a demand which was

expressly made a test of his faith.

But apart from those many doubtful cases where the right line of

conduct was difficult to determine and might vary according to

circumstances, there was a large number of cases in which the decision

of the early leaders of the Church was absolute and unvarying. In

whatsoever society, or company, or meeting, or ceremonial, the

condition of presence and membership lay in the performance of pagan

ritual as an express and declared act of religion, the Christian must

have no part or lot, and could not accept membership or even be

present. Here the Nicolaitans took the opposite view, and could defend

their opinion by many excellent, thoroughly reasonable and highly

philosophic arguments. To illustrate this class of cases, we may take

an example of a meeting which was permissible, and of one which was

not, according to the opinion of those early leaders of the Church. A

meeting of the citizens of a city for political purposes was always

inaugurated by pagan ritual, and according to the strict original

theory the citizens in this political assembly were all united in the

worship of the patron national deity in whose honour the opening

ceremonies were performed; but the ritual had long become a mere form,

and nobody was in practice conscious that the condition of presence in

the assembly lay in the loyal service of the national deity. The

political condition was the only one that was practically remembered:

every member of a city tribe had a right to be present and vote. The

Christian citizen might attend and vote in such a meeting, ignoring and

passing in silence the opening religious ceremony.

But, on the other hand, there were numerous societies for a vast

variety of purposes, the condition of membership in which was

professedly and explicitly the willingness to engage in the worship of

a pagan deity, because the society met in the worship of that deity,

the name of the society was often a religious name, and the place of

meeting was dedicated to the deity, and thus was constituted a temple

for his worship. The Epistles of Paul, Peter, Jude, and the Seven

Letters, all touch on this topic, and all are agreed: the true

Christian cannot be a member of such clubs or societies. The

Nicolaitans taught that Christians ought to remain members; and

doubtless added that they would exercise a good influence on the

societies by continuing in them.

This very simple and practical explanation will, doubtless, seem to

many scholars to be too slight for the serious treatment that the

subject receives in the two letters which we are studying. Such

scholars regard grave matters of dogma as being the proper subject for

treatment in the early Christian document; they will probably ridicule

the suggestion that the question, whether a Christian should join a

club or not, demanded the serious notice of an apostle, and declare

that this was the sort of question on which the Church kept an open

mind, and left great liberty to individuals to act as they thought

right (just as they did in regard to military service, magistracies,

and other important matters); and they will require that Nicolaitanism

should be regarded from a graver dogmatic point of view. The present

writer must confess that those graver subjects of dogma seem to him to

have been much over-estimated; it was not dogma that moved the world,

but life. Frequently, when rival parties and rival nations fought with

one another as to which of two opposed dogmas was the truth, they had

been arrayed against one another by more deep-seated and vital causes,

and merely inscribed at the last the dogmas on their standards or chose

them as watchwords or symbols. We are tired of those elaborate

discussions of the fine, wire-drawn, subtle distinctions between sects,

and those elaborate discussions of the principles involved in heresies,

and we desire to see the real differences in life and conduct receive

more attention.

It is not difficult to show how important in practical life was this

question as to the right of Christians to be members of social clubs.

The clubs were one of the most deep-rooted customs of Graeco-Roman

society: some were social, some political, some for mutual benefit, but

all took a religious form. New religions usually spread by means of

such clubs. The clubs bound their members closely together in virtue of

the common sacrificial meal, a scene of enjoyment following on a

religious ceremony. They represented in its strongest form the pagan

spirit in society; and they were strongest among the middle classes in

the great cities, persons who possessed at least some fair amount of

money and made some pretension to education, breeding and knowledge of

the world. To hold aloof from the clubs was to set oneself down as a

mean-spirited, grudging, ill-conditioned person, hostile to existing

society, devoid of generous impulse and kindly neighbourly feeling, an

enemy of mankind.

The very fact that this subject was treated (as we have seen) so

frequently, shows that the question was not easily decided, but long

occupied the attention of the Church and its leaders. It was almost

purely a social and practical question; and no subject presents such

difficulties to the legislator as one which touches the fabric of

society and the ordinary conduct of life. In 1 Corinthians (as was

pointed out in the Expositor, loc. cit., ii., p. 436) the subject,

though not formally brought before St. Paul for decision, was

practically involved in a question which was submitted to him; but he

did not impose any absolute prohibition; and he tried to place the

Corinthians on a higher plane of thought so that they might see clearly

all that was involved and judge for themselves rightly.

After this the question must have frequently called for consideration,

and a certain body of teaching had been formulated. It is clear that

the Pergamenian and Thyatiran letters assume in the readers the

knowledge of such teaching as familiar; and 2 Peter 2:1ff refers to the

same formulated teaching (Expositor, loc. cit., iii. p. 106ff). This

teaching quoted examples from Old Testament history (especially Balaam

or Sodom and Gomorrah) as a warning of the result that must inevitably

follow from laxity in this matter; it drew scathing pictures of the

revelry, licence and intoxication of spirit which characterised the

feasts of these pagan religious societies, where from an early hour in

the afternoon the members, lounging on the dining-couches, ate and

drank and were amused by troops "of singing and of dancing slaves"; it

argued that such periodically recurring scenes of excitement must be

fatal to all reasonable, moderate, self-restraining spirit. The

steadily growing body of formulated moral principles on the subject was

set aside by the Nicolaitans, who taught, on the contrary (as is said

in 2 Peter, loc. cit.), that men should have confidence in their own

character and judgment, and who promised to set them free from a hard

law, while they were in reality enticing back to lascivious enjoyment

the young converts who had barely "escaped the defilements of the

world."

The author of the letters now before us depends for his effect on the

knowledge, which he assumes his readers to possess, of such striking

pictures as that in 2 Peter of the revels accompanying club-feasts.

Such revels were not merely condoned by pagan opinion, but were

regarded as a duty, in which graver natures ought occasionally to relax

their seriousness, and yield to the impulses of nature, in order to

return again with fresh zest to the real work of life. St. John had

himself often already set before his readers orally the contrast

between that pagan spirit of liberty and animalism, and the true

Christian spirit; and had counselled the Thyatiran prophetess to wiser

principles.

Thus, this controversy was of the utmost importance in the early

Church. It affected and determined, more than any other, the relation

of the new religion to the existing forms and character of Graeco-Roman

city society. The real meaning of it was this--should the Church accept

the existing forms of society and social unions, or declare war against

them? And this again implied another question--should Christianity

conform to the existing, accepted principles of society, or should it

force society to conform to its principles? When the question is thus

put in its full and true implication, we see forthwith how entirely

wrong the Nicolaitans and their Thyatiran prophetess were; we recognise

that the whole future of Christianity was at stake over this question;

and we are struck once more with admiration at the unerring insight

with which the Apostles gauged every question that presented itself in

the complicated life of that period, and the quick sure decision with

which they seized and insisted on the essential, and neglected the

accidental and secondary aspects of the case. We can now understand why

St. John condemns that very worthy, active, and managing, but utterly

mistaken lady of Thyatira in such hard and cruel and, one had almost

said, unfair language; he saw that she was fumbling about with

questions which she was quite incapable of comprehending, full of

complacent satisfaction with her superficial views as to the fairness

and reasonableness of allowing the poor to profit by those quite

praiseworthy associations which did so much good (though they contained

some regrettable features which might easily be ignored by a

philosophic mind), and misusing her influence, acquired by good works

and persuasive speaking, to lead her fellow-Christians astray. If she

were successful, Christianity must melt and be absorbed into the

Graeco-Roman society, highly cultivated, but over-developed, morbid,

unhealthy, "fast" (in modern slang). But she would not be successful.

The mind which could see the Church's victory over the destroying

Empire consummated in the death of every Christian had no fear of what

the lady of Thyatira might do. "I will kill her children (i.e., her

disciples and perverts) with death; and all the Churches shall know

that I am he which searcheth the reins and hearts." Probably "death" is

here to be understood as "incurable disease," according to the

universal belief that disease (and especially fever, in which there is

no visible affection of any organ) was the weapon of Divine power.

It was a hard and stern discipline, which undoubtedly left out some of

the most charming, right and lovable sides of life and human nature;

but it may be doubted if any less stern discipline could have availed

to teach the world as it then was and bend it to the reign of law. It

is a case similar to that of Scotland under the old Calvinistic regime,

stern and hard and narrow; but would any milder and more lovable rule

ever have been able to tame a stubborn and self-willed race, among whom

law had never before been able to establish itself firmly?

And as to the prophetess, she had had long time to think and to learn

wisdom; the question had been agitated for a great many years; but she

had learned nothing and forgotten nothing, and only clung more closely

to the policy of compromising with idolatry. Her end is expressed with

a grim irony, which was probably far more full of meaning to the

Thyatirans than to modern readers: there are allusions in the passage

that escape us. She should have her last great sacrificial meal at one

of those associations. "I set her on a dining-couch, and her vile

associates with her, and they shall have opportunity to enjoy

great--tribulation: unless they repent, for she has shown that she

cannot repent."

Probably, part of the effect of this denunciation depends on the

ancient custom and usage as regards women. Though women had in many

respects a position of considerable freedom in Anatolian cities, as has

been pointed out by many writers, yet it may be doubted whether ladies

of good standing took part in the club-dinners. We do not know enough

on the subject, however, to speak with any confidence; and can only

express the belief that the status of ladies in the Lydian cities lent

point to this passage. Possibly thus to set her down at the dinner

table was equivalent to saying that in her own life she would show the

effect of the principles which she taught others to follow, and would

sit at the revels like one of the light women. That women were members

of religious associations (though not, apparently, in great numbers) is

of course well know; but that is only the beginning of the question.

What was their position and rule of life? How far did thy take part in

the meal and revel that followed the sacrifice? To these questions an

answer has yet to be discovered.

It may be regarded as certain that the importance of the trade-guilds

in Thyatira made the Nicolaitan doctrine very popular there. The guilds

were very numerous in that city, and are often mentioned in great

variety in the inscriptions. It was, certainly, hardly possible for a

tradesman to maintain his business in Thyatira without belonging to the

guild of his trade. The guilds were corporate bodies, taking active

measures to protect the common interests, owning property, passing

decrees, and exercising considerable powers; they also, undoubtedly,

were benefit societies, and in many respects healthy and praiseworthy

associations. In no other city are they so conspicuous. It was

therefore a serious thing for a Thyatiran to cut himself off from his

guild.

To the remnant of the Thyatiran Church--those who, while suffering the

prophetess, and not showing clearly that they "hated the works of the

Nicolaitans," yet had not actively carried out her teaching in

practice--one word was sufficient. It was enough that they should

follow the established principle, and act according to the law as

stated in the Apostolic Council at Jerusalem. No burden beyond that was

laid upon them; but that teaching they must obey, and that burden they

must bear, until the coming of the Lord.

NOTE.--A confirmation of the suggestion made above may be found in an

inscription just published in Bulletin de Corresp. Hellen., 1904, p.

24. A leading citizen is there recorded to have given a dinner, as part

of a religious ceremony, to all the male and female community; and the

men dined in one temple and the women in another.

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

Chapter 25: Sardis: The City of Death

Sardis was one of the great cities of primitive history: in the Greek

view it was long the greatest of all cities. At the beginning of record

it stands forth prominently as the capital of a powerful empire. Its

situation marks it out as a ruling city, according to the methods of

early warfare and early kings; it was however more like a robber's

stronghold than an abode of civilised men; and in a peaceful and

civilised age its position was found inconvenient. In the Roman period

it was almost like a city of the past, a relic of the period of

barbaric warfare, which lived rather on its ancient prestige than on

its suitability to present conditions.

The great plain of the Hermus is bounded on the south by the broad

ridge of Mount Tmolus, which reaches from the main mass of the Central

Anatolian plateau like an arm extended westwards towards the sea. In

front of the mountains stretch a series of alluvial hills, making the

transition from the level plain to the loftier ridge behind. On one of

those hills stood Sardis. The hills in this neighbourhood are of such a

character that under the influences of the atmosphere each assumes the

form of a small elongated plateau having very steep sides, terminating

towards the north in a sharp point, and on the south joined by a neck

to the main mass of Tmolus. One of those small elevated plateaux formed

the site of the original Sardis, an almost impregnable fortress already

as it came from the hand of nature without any artificial

fortification. Only a small city could be perched on the little

plateau; but in the primitive time, when Sardis came into existence,

cities were small.

It was actually inaccessible except at one point, viz., the neck of

land on the south, which still offers the only approach. On all other

sides the rock walls were smooth, nearly perpendicular, and absolutely

unscalable even without a defender (except in rare conditions described

in the sequel). The local myth expressed the facts in a religious form

by saying that the ancient Lydian King, Meles, carried a lion, the

symbol of Sardis and type of the oldest Lydian coins, round the whole

city except at one point. The story is told by Herodotus, i., 84; but

he (or a glossator) has given an incorrect explanation, to the effect

that Meles thought it unnecessary to carry the lion round the southern

side of the city, because there it was precipitous. The exact opposite

was the case: the only approach to the old city must have been from the

beginning and must always be on the south. The story is a popular

explanation of the fact that the south alone was accessible and not

precipitous.

This southern approach is far from being easy. It is a tedious and

difficult climb at the present day, when the hill-sides are overgrown

with thorns, and only a sheep-track exists in place of a path. Even

when the summit was inhabited and a carefully made road led up to the

southern gates, the approach must have been long and steep by a winding

road, which could be defended with perfect ease. The plateau is fully

1,500 feet above the plain, from which its sides rise perpendicularly.

This small city on its lofty plateau was an ideal stronghold for a

prince of primitive times. It was large enough for his needs; it could

be easily fortified and defended at the only point where fortification

or defence was needed. It was like a watch-tower overlooking the whole

of the great plain. That primitive capital of the Hermus Valley seems

to have been called, not Sardis (which was a plural noun), but Hyde;

and it is mentioned by Homer under that name.

In this we part company from the guide whom usually we follow with such

implicit confidence, Strabo. He considers that Sardis was founded later

than the time of Homer, because it is not named by him. We must,

however, consider Sardis as coeval with the beginnings of the Lydian

kingdom, about 1,200 B.C. It was the princely capital from the time

that there began to be princes in Lydia. nature has made it the

overseer of the Hermus Valley; and its foundation marked out its master

for the headship first of that valley, and thereafter of the rest of

Lydia, whose fate was dependent on the Hermus Valley.

As civilisation and government grew more complex, and commerce and

society were organised on a greater scale, the lofty plateau proved too

small for the capital of an empire; and a lower city was built on the

west and north sides of the original city, and probably also on the

east side. The old city was now used as an acropolis, and is so called

by Herodotus. The new city was very distinctly separated from the old

by the great difference of level and by the long, steep, and difficult

approach at the southern end of the old city. Hence the double city was

called by the plural noun, Sardeis, like Athenai and various others.

The lower city lay chiefly on the west side, in a glen between the

acropolis-hill and the little river Pactolus, which flows northwards

out of Mount Tmolus to join the Hermus. The wealth of the Lydian kings,

ruling in Sardis, which arose from trade, a fertile territory carefully

cultivated, and the commerce of the East, was explained in popular

Greek legend as due to the golden sands of the Pactolus. Whether this

was a pure fable, or only an exaggeration, must be left uncertain.

There was no gold in the Pactolus during the Roman period, nor is there

any now; but it is said to be possible that the river, having in

earlier time traversed an auriferous area, might have cut for itself a

path below the level of the gold-bearing rock, and thus ceased to bring

down golden sand. No auriferous rock, however, is now known to exist in

the mountains of Tmolus; though, of course, no proper search has been

made in recent centuries.

As the capital of the great kingdom of Lydia, Sardis had a history

marked by frequent wars. In it the whole policy of a warlike kingdom

was focused. To fight against Lydia was to fight against Sardis. The

master of Sardis was the master of Lydia. Thus in early centuries

Sardis stood forth pre-eminent in the view of the Greek cities as the

Oriental enemy on whose action their fate depended. They were most of

them involved in war with Sardis, and fell one by one beneath its

power. It was the great, the wealthy, the impregnable city, against

which none could strive and prevail. In the immemorial contest between

Asia and Europe, it represented Asia, and the Greek colonies of the

coastlands stood for Europe. Sardis was the one great enemy of the

Ionian cities: it learned from them, taught them, and conquered them

all in succession. Among an impressionable people like the Greeks, such

a reputation lived long; and Sardis was to their mind fully justified

in inscribing on its coins the proud title, "Sardis the First

Metropolis of Asia, and of Lydia, and of Hellenism," as in Figure 9,

chapter 11. The Hellenism which found its metropolis in Sardis was not

the ancient Greek spirit, but the new form which the Greek spirit had

taken in its attempt to conquer Asia, profoundly modifying Asia, and

itself profoundly modified in the process. Hellenism in this sense was

not a racial fact, but a general type of aspiration and aims, implying

a certain freedom in development of the individual consciousness and in

social and political organisation. The term summed up the character of

"the Hellenes in Asia," i.e., the Hellenised population of Asia.

The destruction of the powerful kingdom, and the capture of the

impregnable city, by a hitherto hardly known and utterly despised

enemy, was announced to the Greek cities soon after the middle of the

sixth century B.C. The news came almost without preparation, and was

all the more impressive on that account. To the student of the past it

seems still to echo through history, as one of the most startling and

astonishing reverses of all time. To the Greeks it was unique in

character and effect. It was known that the Lydian king had consulted

the Delphic Apollo before he entered on the war, and that he had begun

operations with full confidence of victory, relying on the promise of

the god. The Greek mind loved to dwell on this topic, and elaborated it

with creative fancy, so that the truth is almost hidden under the

embellishing details in the pages of Herodotus. But all the details

have only the effect (as was their intention) of making more clear and

impressive the moral lesson. To avoid over-confidence in self, to guard

against pride and arrogance, not to despise one's enemy, to bear always

in mind the slipperiness and deceitfulness of fortune--such was the

greatest part of true wisdom, as the Greeks understood it; and nowhere

could the lesson be found written in plainer and larger letters than in

the fall of Sardis.

According to the story as thus worked up by Greek imagination, Croesus

the king had been vainly warned by the wise Greek, Solon the law-giver,

when he visited Sardis, to beware of self-satisfaction and to regard no

man as really happy, until the end of life had set him free from the

danger of a sudden reverse. In preparing for his last war, Croesus

employed all possible precaution; he was thoroughly on his guard

against any possible error; and he took the gods themselves as his

counsellors and helpers. He had tried and tested all the principal

prophetic centres of the Greek world; and the Delphic Oracle alone had

passed the test, and won his confidence.

He then asked about the war against Cyrus, which he had in mind; and he

heard with delight that, if he crossed the Halys, he would destroy a

mighty Empire. He crossed the Halys, and received a crushing defeat.

But it was only a first army that had met this disaster. He returned to

prepare a greater army for the ensuing year. Cyrus followed him up with

disconcerting rapidity; and besieged him in Sardis, before any new

levies were ready. The great king, safe in his impregnable fortress,

regarded this as an incident annoying in itself, but only the beginning

of destruction for the rash enemy. The armies of Lydia were being

massed to crush the insolent invader, who should be ground between the

perpendicular rocks of the acropolis and the gathering Lydian hosts.

Such was the calculation of Croesus, when he retired one evening to

rest: he was wakened to find that the enemy was master of the acropolis

and that all was lost.

The rock of the acropolis is a coarse and friable conglomerate, which

melts away gradually under the influences of the atmosphere. It always

preserves an almost perpendicular face, but at times an oblique crack

develops in the rock-wall, and permits a bold climber to work his way

up. Such a weak point betrayed Sardis.

According to the popular tale this weak point existed from the

beginning of history n Sardis, because, when the divine consecration

and encompassing of the new fortress had been made at its foundation,

this point had been omitted; thus the tale would imply that the weak

point was known to the defenders and through mere obstinate folly left

unguarded by them. But such a legend is usually a growth after the

fact. The crumbling character of the rock on which the upper city of

Sardis stood shows what the real facts must have been. In the course of

time a weakness had developed at one point. Through want of proper care

in surveying and repairing the fortifications, this weakness had

remained unobserved and unknown to the defenders; but the assailants,

scrutinising every inch of the walls of the great fortress in search of

an opportunity, noticed it and availed themselves of it to climb up,

one at a time. On such a lofty hill, rising fully 1,500 feet above the

plain, whose sides are, and must from their nature always have been,

steep and straight and practically perpendicular, a child could guard

against an army; even a small stone dropped on the head of the most

skilful mountain-climber, would inevitably hurl him down. An attack

made by this path could succeed only if the assailants climbed up

entirely unobserved; and they could not escape observation unless they

made the attempt by night. Hence, even though this be unrecorded, a

night attack must have been the way by which Cyrus entered Sardis. He

came upon the great city "like a thief in the night."

It is right, however, to add that the account that we have given of the

way in which Sardis was captured differs from the current opinion in

one point. The usual view is that Cyrus entered Sardis by the isthmus

or neck on the south. That was the natural and necessary path in

ordinary use; the only road and gateway were there; and inevitably the

defence of the city was based on a careful guard and strong

fortification at the solitary approach. The enemy was expected to

attack there; but the point of the tale is that the ascent was made on

a side where no guard was ever stationed, because that side was

believed to be inaccessible. The misapprehension is as old as the time

of Herodotus (or rather of some old Greek glossator, who has interposed

a false explanation in the otherwise clear narrative). The character of

the rock shows that this opinion--current already among the Greeks--is

founded on a confusion between the one regular approach, where alone

attack was expected and guarded against, and the accidental,

unobserved, unguarded weak point, which had developed through the

disintegration of the rock.

There can be no doubt that the isthmus, as being the solitary regular

approach, must always have been the most strongly fortified part. At

present the plateau is said not to be accessible at any other point

except where the isthmus touches it; but there are several chinks and

clefts leading up the north and west faces, and it is probable that by

one of them a bold and practised climber could make his way up. These

clefts vary in character from century to century as the surface

disintegrates; and all of them would always be regarded by the ordinary

peaceful and unathletic oriental citizen as inaccessible. But from time

to time sometimes one, sometimes another, would offer a chance to a

daring mountaineer. By such an approach it must have been that Cyrus

captured the city.

History repeated itself. The same thing happened about 320 years later,

when Antiochus the Great captured Sardis through the exploit of Lagoras

(who had learned surefootedness on the precipitous mountains of his

native Crete). Once more the garrison in careless confidence were

content to guard the one known approach, and left the rest of the

circuit unguarded, under the belief that it could not be scaled.

The Sardian religion was the fullest expression of the character and

spirit of the city; but it has not yet been properly understood. The

coins show several remarkable scenes of a religious kind, evidently of

purely local origin and different from any subjects otherwise known in

hieratic mythology; but they remain unexplained and unintelligible. The

explanation of them, if it could be discovered, would probably

illuminate the peculiar character of the local religion; but in the

meantime, although various other deities besides Cybele and

Kora-Persephone appear on the coins, and although abundant

archaeological details might be described, no unifying idea can be

detected, which might show how the Sardians had modified, and put their

own individual character into, the general Anatolian religious forms.

The general Anatolian temper of religion is summarised in the following

words (taken from the Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia, i., p. 87):

"Its essence lies in the adoration of the life of Nature--that life

subject apparently to death, yet never dying but reproducing itself in

new forms, different and yet the same. This perpetual self-identity

under varying forms, this annihilation of death through the power of

self-reproduction, was the object of an enthusiastic worship,

characterised by remarkable self-abandonment and immersion in the

divine, by a mixture of obscene symbolism and sublime truths, by

negation of the moral distinctions and family ties that exist in a more

developed society, but do not exist in the free life of Nature. The

mystery of self-reproduction, of eternal unity amid temporary

diversity, is the key to explain all the repulsive legends and

ceremonies that cluster round that worship, and all the manifold

manifestations or diverse embodiments of the ultimate single divine

life that are carved on the rocks of Asia Minor."

The patron deity of the city was Cybele, two columns of whose temple

still protrude from the ground near the banks of the Pactolus. She was

a goddess of the regular Anatolian type; and her general character is

well known.

But the specialised character of the Sardian goddess Cybele, the

qualities and attributes which she gathered from the local conditions

and from the ideas and manners of the population, are unknown, and can

hardly even be guessed at for lack of evidence. To the Greek mind the

Sardian Cybele seemed more like the Maiden Proserpine than the Mother

Demeter; and the coins of the city often show scenes from the myth of

Proserpine. For example, the reverse of the coin in Figure 9, chapter

11, shows the familiar scene of Pluto carrying off Proserpine on his

four-horse car.

The strange and uncouth idol, under whose form the goddess was

worshipped, often appears on coins; and in alliance-coins Sardis is

often symbolised by this grotesque figure, whose half-human appearance

is quite of the Anatolian type. Thus Figure 30 shows an "alliance" or

religious agreement between Ephesus, represented by Artemis in her

usual idol with her stags at her side, and Sardis, symbolised by the

curious veiled image of her own goddess (whom numismatists usually call

in Hellenising style Kora or Persephone).

The Sardian goddess was the mother of her people. She dwelt with

nature, in the mountains of Tmolus and in the low ground by the sacred

lake of Koloe, on the north side of the Hermus. Here by the lake was

the principal necropolis of Sardis, at a distance of six or eight miles

from the city, across a broad river--a remarkable fact, which points to

some ancient historical relation between Sardis and Koloe (implying

perhaps that the people of Koloe had been moved to found the original

city of Sardis). Here the people of the goddess returned at death to

lie close to the wild sedge-encircled home of the mother who bore them.

Figure 30

Figure 30: The alliance of Ephesus and Sardis

The lion, as type of the oldest, Lydian coins, was certainly adopted,

because it was the favourite animal and the symbol of the Sardian

goddess. The Anatolian goddess, when envisaged in the form of Cybele,

was regularly associated with a pair of lions or a single lion.

Healing power was everywhere attributed to the local embodiment of the

divine idea, but in Sardis it was with exceptional emphasis magnified

into the power of restoring life to the dead. It was, doubtless,

associated specially with certain hot springs, situated about two miles

from Sardis in the front hills of Tmolus, which are still much used and

famous for their curative effect. As the hot springs are the plain

manifestation of the divine subterranean power, the god of the

underworld plays a considerable part in the religious legend of the

district. He appeared to claim and carry off as his bride the

patron-goddess of the city, in the form of Kora-Persephone, as she was

gathering the golden flower, the flower of Zeus, in the meadows near

the springs; the games celebrated in her honour were called

Chrysanthia; and it may be confidently inferred that crowns of the

flower called by that name were worn by her worshipers. The name of

"Zeus's flower" also is mentioned on the coins.

Zeus Lydios is often named on Sardian coins, embodying the claim of the

city to stand for the whole country of Lydia as its capital. He is

represented exactly like the god of Laodicea (Figure 35, chapter 29), a

standing figure, wearing a tunic and an over-garment, resting his left

hand on the sceptre, and holding forth the eagle on his right hand.

Sardis suffered greatly from an earthquake in A.D. 17, and was treated

with special liberality by the Emperor Tiberius: he remitted all its

taxation for five years, and gave it a donation of ten million

sesterces (about 400,000 pounds). In Figure 31, taken from a coin

struck by the grateful city, the veiled genius of Sardis is shown

kneeling on one knee in supplication before the Emperor, who is dressed

in the toga, the garb of peace, and graciously stretches forth his hand

towards her. The coin bears the name of Caesareian Sardis: for the city

took the epithet in honour of the Imperial benefactor and retained it

on coins for quite a year after his death, and in inscriptions for as

long as ten or fifteen years after his death.

Figure 31

Figure 31: Caesarean Sardis--suppliant to the Emperor Tiberius

The reverse of the same coin shows the Imperial mother, the deified

Empress Livia, sitting like a goddess after the fashion of Demeter,

holding in her left hand three corn-ears, the gift of the goddess to

mankind, and resting her right hand high on the sceptre. This type is a

good example of the tendency to fuse the Imperial religion with the

local worship, and to regard the Imperial gods as manifestations and

incarnations on earth of the divine figure worshipped in the district.

Livia here appears in the character of Demeter, a Hellenised form of

the Anatolian goddess.

The assumption of the epitaph Caesareia was doubtless connected with

the erection of a temple in honour of Tiberius and Livia, as the divine

pair in the common form of the mother goddess and her god-son. But

there is no reason to think that this was a Provincial temple (which

would carry with it for the city the title of Temple-Warden). It was

only a Sardian temple, and seems to have been suffered to fall into

decay soon after the death of the Imperial god.

Figure 32

Figure 32: The Empress Livia as the goddess who gives corn and plenty

to Sardis

It is plain that the greatness of Sardis under the Roman rule was

rotted in past history, not in present conditions. The acropolis ceased

during that period to be the true city; it was inconvenient and

useless; and it was doubtless regarded as a historical and

archaeological monument, rather than a really important part of the

living city. Apart from the acropolis there is nothing in the situation

of Sardis to make it a great centre of society, and it has long ceased

to be inhabited. The chief town of the district is now Salikli, about

five miles to the east, in a similar position at the foot of Tmolus,

but more conveniently situated for travellers and trade.

Thus, when the Seven Letters were written, Sardis was a city of the

past, which had no future before it. Its greatness was connected with a

barbarous and half-organised state of society, and could not survive

permanently in a more civilised age. Sardis must inevitably decay. Only

when civilisation was swept out of the Hermus Valley in fire and

bloodshed by the destroying Turks, and the age of barbarism was

reintroduced, did Sardis again become an advantageous site. The

acropolis was restored as a fortress of the kind suited for that long

period of uncertainty and war which ended in the complete triumph of

Mohammedanism and the practical extermination of the Christian

population (save at Philadelphia and Magnesia) throughout the Hermus

Valley.

Sardis occupied a high position in the Byzantine hierarchy. It was the

capital of the Province Lydia, instituted about A.D. 295, and the

Bishop of Sardis was Metropolitan and Archbishop of Lydia, and sixth in

order of dignity of all the bishops, whether Asiatic or European, that

were subject to the Patriarch of Constantinople.

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

Chapter 26: The Letter to the Church in Sardis

These things saith he that hath the seven Spirits of God, and the

seven stars:

I know thy works, that thou hast a name that thou livest, and thou

art dead. Be thou watchful, and stablish the things that remain,

which were ready to die: for I have found no works of thine

fulfilled before my God. Remember therefore how thou hast received

and didst hear; and keep it, and repent. If therefore thou shalt not

watch, I will come as a thief, and thou shalt not know what hour I

will come upon thee. But thou hast a few names in Sardis which did

not defile their garments: and they shall walk with me in white; for

they are worthy.

He that overcometh shall thus be arrayed in white garments; and I

will in no wise blot his name out of the book of life, and I will

confess his name before my Father, and before his angels.

He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith to the

churches.

The analogy between the Ephesian and Sardian letters is close, and the

two have to be studied together. History had moved on similar lines

with the two Churches. Both had begun enthusiastically and cooled down.

Degeneration was the fact in both; but in Ephesus the degeneration had

not yet become so serious as in Sardis. Hence in the Ephesian letters

the keynote is merely change, instability and uncertainty; in the

Sardian letter the keynote is degradation, false pretension and death.

In those two letters the exordium takes a very similar form. To the

Ephesian Church "these things saith he that holdeth the seven stars in

his right hand, he that walketh between the seven golden lamps." To the

Sardian Church the letter proceeds from him "that hath the seven

spirits of God and the seven stars." The sender of both letters stands

forth as the centre, the pivot and the director of the Universal

Church, and in particular of the entire group of the Asian Churches.

Effective power exercised over the whole Church is indicated

emphatically in both cases, and especially in the Sardian address. "The

Seven Spirits of God" must certainly be taken as a symbolic or

allegorical way of expressing the full range of exercise of the Divine

power in the Seven Churches, i.e., in the Universal Church as

represented here by the Asian Churches. If one may try in inadequate

and rough terms to express the meaning, the "Spirit of God" is to be

understood as the power of God exerting itself practically in the

Church; and, since the Church is always regarded in the Revelation as

consisting of Seven parts or local Churches, the power of God is

described in its relation to those Seven parts as "the Seven Spirits of

God."

This indirect way of expression is liable to become misleading, if it

be not carefully interpreted and sympathetically understood. It is

forced on the writer by the plan of his work, which does not aim at

philosophic exposition, but attempts to shadow forth through sensuous

imagery "the deep things of God," in the style of the Jewish literary

form which he chose to imitate.

Under the phraseology, "the Seven Spirits of God," the writer of the

Revelation conceals a statement of the great problem: "how does the

Divine power make itself effective in regard to the world and mankind,

when it is entirely different in nature and character from the ordinary

world of human experience? How can a thing act on another which is

wholly different in nature, and lies on a different plane of

existence?" The Divine power has to go forth, as it were, out of itself

in order to reach mankind. The writer had evidently been occupying

himself with this problem; and, as we see, the book of the Revelation

is a vague and dim expression of the whole range of this and the

associated problems regarding the relation of God to man. But the book

is not to be taken as a solution of the problems. It is the work of a

man who has not reached an answer, i.e., who has not yet succeeded in

expressing the question in philosophic form, but who is struggling to

body forth the problems before himself and his readers in such imagery

as may make them more conceivable.

The most serious error in regard to the book of the Revelation consists

in regarding it as a statement of the solution. No solution is reached

in the book; but the writer's aim is to convey to his readers his own

perfect confidence that the Divine nature is effective on human nature

and on the world of sense, all-powerful, absolutely victorious in this

apparent contest with evil or anti-Christ; that in fact there is not

really any contest, for the victory is gained in the inception of the

conflict, and the seeming struggle is only the means whereby the Divine

power offers to man the opportunity of learning to understand its

nature.

The Spirit of God, and still more "the Seven Spirits of God," are

therefore not to be understood as a description of the method by which

the Divine activity exerts itself in its relation to the Church; for,

if looked at so, they are easily perverted and elaborated into a theory

of intermediate powers intervening between God and the world, and thus

there must arise the whole system of angels (which in human nature, as

ideas and custom then tended, inevitably degenerated into a worship of

angels, according to Colossians 2:18; just as a few centuries later the

respect for the saints and martyrs of the Church degenerated into a

worship of them as powers intervening between man and the remote

ultimate Divine nature). The "Seven Spirits" form simply an expression

suited to reach the comprehension of men at that time, and make them

image to themselves the activity of God in relation to the Seven

Churches, and to the whole Universal Church. That this is a successful

attempt to present the problem to human apprehension cannot be

maintained. The book is the first attempt of a writer struggling to

express great ideas; but the ideas have not yet been thought out

clearly in his mind and he has been led away to imitate a rather crude

model fashionable in Jewish circles at the time. He has reached an

infinitely higher level, alike in a literary and a religious view, than

any other work of that class known to us; but an ineradicable fault

clings to the whole class.

The Church of Sardis, then, is addressed by Him who controls and

directs the Divine action in the Churches as they exist in the world,

and who holds in His hand the Seven Churches, with their history and

their destiny. This expression of His power is varied from that which

occurs in the address of the Ephesian letter, of course in a way suited

to the Sardian Church, though it is not easy for us to comprehend

wherein lies the precise suitability. As everywhere throughout this

study, we can hardly hope to do more than reach a statement of the

difficulties and the problems, though often a clear statement of the

question involves the suggestion of a reply (and in so far as it does

this it involves personal opinion and hypothesis, and is liable to fall

into subjectivity and error).

We observed the peculiar suitability of the Ephesian address to the

situation of Ephesus as the centre and practical leader of the whole

group of Asian Churches. Hence the final detail in that address--"He

that walketh in the midst of the seven golden lamps"; for (as is shown

in chapter 6) the lamps symbolise the Churches on earth, as the seven

Stars symbolise the seven Churches, or their spiritual counterparts, in

heaven. Instead of this the Sardian address introduces "the Seven

Spirits of God." A more explicit and definite expression of the

activity of the Divine nature in the Churches on earth evidently

recommended itself as suitable in addressing the Sardian Church.

One cannot evade the question, what is the reason why this expression

commended itself for the Sardian letter? wherein lies its suitability?

To answer the question, it is obviously necessary to look at the

prominent point of difference between Sardis and Ephesus (which we have

already stated). Ephesus had changed and cooled, but the degeneration

had not yet become serious; restoration of its old character and

enthusiasm was still possible. As a Church Ephesus might possibly be in

the future as great as it had been in the past. But the Church of

Sardis was already dead, though it seemed to be living. Its history was

past and done with. A revivification of its former self was impossible.

There remained only a few in it for whom there was some hope. They

might survive, as they had hitherto shown themselves worthy. And they

shall survive, for the power which has hitherto sustained them will be

with them and keep them to the end. In this scanty remnant saved from

the wreck of the formerly great Church of Sardis, the Divine power will

show itself all the more conspicuous. Just as in the comparatively

humble city of Thyatira the faithful few shall be granted a strength

and authority beyond that of the Empire and its armies, so in this

small remnant at Sardis the Divine power will be most effective,

because they stand most in need of it.

It is not to be imagined that this consideration exhausts the case.

There remains much more that is at present beyond our ken. The more we

can learn about Sardis, the better we shall understand the letter.

In none of the Seven Letters is the method of the writer, and the

reason that guided him in selecting the topics, more clearly displayed

than in the letter to the Church in Sardis. The advice which he gives

to the Sardians is, in a way, universally suitable to human nature: "Be

watchful; be more careful; carry out more completely and thoroughly

what you have still to do, for hitherto you have always erred in

leaving work half done and incomplete. Try to make that eager attention

with which you at the beginning listened to the Gospel, and the

enthusiasm with which at first you accepted it, a permanent feature in

your conduct. If you are not watchful, you will not be ready at the

moment of need: my arrival will find you unprepared, because in an hour

that ye think not the Son of Man cometh'; any one can make ready for a

fixed hour, but you must be always ready for an unexpected hour."

Advice like that is, in a sense, universal. All persons, every

individual man and every body of men, constantly require the advice to

be watchful, and to carry through to completion what they once enter

upon, for all men tend more or less to slacken in their exertions and

to leave half-finished ends of work. In all men there is observable a

discrepancy between promise and performance; the first show is almost

always superior to the final result.

But why are these precise topics selected for the Sardian letter, and

not for any of the others? Why does the reference to the thief in the

night suggest itself in this letter and not in any other? It is plain

that Ephesus was suffering from the same tendency to growing slackness

as Sardis, and that its first enthusiasm had cooled down almost as

lamentably as was the case in the Sardian Church. Yet the advice to

Ephesus, though like in many respects, is expressed in very different

words.

But in almost every letter similar questions suggest themselves. There

were faithful Christians in every one of the Churches; but the word

"faithful" is used only of Smyrna. Every Church was brought into the

same conflict with the Roman State; but only in the Pergamenian letter

is the opposition between the Church and the Empire expressly

mentioned, and only in the Thyatiran letter is the superiority in

strength and might of the Church over the Empire emphasised.

In the Sardian letter the reason is unusually clear; and to this point

our attention must now be especially directed.

No city in the whole Province of Asia had a more splendid history in

past ages than Sardis. No city of Asia at that time showed such a

melancholy contrast between past splendour and present decay as Sardis.

Its history was the exact opposite of the record of Smyrna. Smyrna was

dead and yet lived. Sardis lived and yet was dead.

Sardis was the great city of ancient times and of half-historical

legend. At the beginning of the Greek memory of history in Lydia,

Sardis stood out conspicuous and alone as the capital of the great

Oriental Empire with which the Greek cities and colonies were brought

in contact. Their relations with it formed the one great question of

foreign politics for those early Greek settlers. Everything else was

secondary, or was under their own control, but in regard to Sardis they

had always to be thinking of foreign wishes, foreign rights, the

caprice of a foreign monarch and the convenience of foreign traders,

who were too powerful to be disregarded or treated with disrespect.

That ancient and deep impression the Asiatic Greeks, with their

tenacious historical memory, never entirely lost. Sardis was always to

them the capital where Croesus, richest of kings, had ruled--the city

which Solon, wisest of men, had visited, and where he had rightly

augured ruin because he had rightly mistrusted material wealth and

luxury as necessarily hollow and treacherous--the fortress of many

warlike kings, like Gyges, whose power was so great that legend

credited him with the possession of the gold ring of supernatural

power, or Alyattes, whose vast tomb rose like a mountain above the

Hermus Valley beside the sacred lake of the Mother Goddess.

But to those Greeks of the coast colonies, Ephesus and Smyrna and the

rest, Sardis was also the city of failure, the city whose history was

marked by the ruin of great kings and the downfall of great military

strength apparently in mid-career, when it seemed to be at its highest

development. It was the city whose history conspicuously and

pre-eminently blazoned forth the uncertainty of human fortunes, the

weakness of human strength, and the shortness of the step that

separates over-confident might from sudden and irreparable disaster. It

was the city whose name was almost synonymous with pretensions

unjustified, promise unfulfilled, appearance without reality,

confidence that heralded ruin. Reputed an impregnable fortress, it had

repeatedly fallen short of its reputation, and ruined those who trusted

in it. Croesus had fancied he could sit safe in the great fortress, but

his enemy advanced straight upon it and carried it by assault before

the strength of the Lydian land was collected.

Carelessness and failure to keep proper watch, arising from

over-confidence in the apparent strength of the fortress, had been the

cause of this disaster, which ruined the dynasty and brought to an end

the Lydian Empire and the dominance of Sardis. The walls and gates were

all as strong as art and nature combined could make them. The hill on

which the upper city stood was steep and lofty. The one approach to the

upper city was too carefully fortified to offer any chance to an

assailant. But there was one weak point: in one place it was possible

for an active enemy to make his way up the perpendicular sides of the

lofty hill, if the defenders stood idle and permitted him to climb

unhindered.

The sudden ruin of that great Empire and the wealthiest king of all the

world was an event of that character which most impressed the Greek

mind, emphasising a moral lesson by a great national disaster. A little

carelessness was shown; a watchman was wanting at the necessary point,

or a sentinel slept at his post for an hour; and the greatest power on

the earth was hurled to destruction. The great king trusted to Sardis,

and Sardis failed him at the critical moment. Promise was unfulfilled;

the appearance of strength proved the mask of weakness; the

fortification was incomplete; work which had been begun with great

energy was not pushed through to its conclusion with the same

determination.

More than three centuries later another case of exactly the same kind

occurred. Achaeus and Antiochus the Great were fighting for the command

of Lydia and the whole Seleucid Empire. Antiochus besieged his rival in

Sardis, and the city again was captured by a surprise of the same

nature: a Cretan mercenary led the way, climbing up the hill and

stealing unobserved within the fortifications. The lesson of old days

had not been learned; experience had been forgotten; men were too slack

and careless; and when the moment of need came, Sardis was unprepared.

A State cannot survive which is guarded with such carelessness; a

people at once so slack and so confident cannot continue an imperial

power. Sardis, as a great and ruling city, was dead. It had sunk to be

a second-rate city in a Province. Yet it still retained the name and

the historical memory of a capital city. It had great pretensions,

which it had vainly tried to establish in A.D. 26 before the tribunal

of the Roman Senate in the contention among the Asian cities recorded

by Tacitus, Annals, iv., 55. When in that year the Asian States in the

provincial Council (called the Commune of Asia) resolved to erect a

temple to Tiberius and Livia his mother and the Senate, as a token of

gratitude for the punishment of an oppressive and grasping

administrator, eleven cities of the Province contended for the honour

of being the seat of the Temple. Nine were quickly set aside, some as

too unimportant, Pergamum as already the seat of a Temple to Augustus,

Ephesus and Miletus as taken up with the ritual of Artemis and of

Apollo; but there was much hesitation between the claims of Smyrna and

of Sardis. Envoys of Sardis pleaded the cause of their city before the

Senate. They rested their claim on the mythical or historical glory of

the city as the capital of the Lydians, who were a sister-race to the

Etruscans, and had sent colonists to the Peloponnesus, and as honoured

by letters from Roman generals and by a special treaty which Rome had

concluded with Sardis in 171-168 B.C.: in conclusion, they boasted of

the rivers, the climate, and the rich territory around the city. The

case, however, was decided in favour of Smyrna.

No one can doubt that this Sardian letter took its form in part through

the memory of that ancient history. It was impossible for the Sardians

to miss the allusion, and therefore the writer must have intended it

and calculated on it. Phrase after phrase is chosen for the evident

purpose of recalling that ancient memory, which was undoubtedly still

strong and living among the Sardians, for the Hellenic cities had a

retentive historical recollection, and we know that Sardis, in the

great pleading in A.D. 26, rested its case on a careful selection of

facts from its past history, though omitting the facts on which we have

here laid stress, because they were not favourable to its argument. "I

know thy works, that thou hast a name that thou livest, and thou art

dead. Be thou watchful, and stablish the things that remain, which were

ready to die: for I have found no works of thine fulfilled before my

God . . . If therefore thou shalt not watch, I will come as a thief,

and thou shalt not know what hour I will come upon thee."

It seems therefore undeniable that the writer has selected topics which

rise out of and stand in close relation to the past history of Sardis

as a city. In view of this evident plan and guiding purpose, are we to

understand that he preferred the older historical reference, and left

aside the actual fortunes of the Church as secondary, when he was

sketching out the order of his letter? Such a supposition is

impossible. The writer is in those words drawing a picture of the

history and degeneration of the Sardian Church; but he draws it in such

a way as to set before his readers the continuity of Sardian history.

The story of the Church is a repetition of past experience; the

character of the people remains unchanged; their faults are still the

same; and their fate must be the same.

If this view be correct--and it seems forced on us unavoidably by the

facts of the case--then another inference must inevitably follow: the

writer, so far from separating the Church of Sardis from the city of

Sardis, emphasises strongly the closeness of the connection between

them. The Church of Sardis is not merely in the city of Sardis, it is

in a sense the city; and the Christians are the people of the city.

There is not in his mind the slightest idea that Christians are to keep

out of the world--as might perhaps be suggested from a too exclusive

contemplation of some parts of the Revelation; the Church here is

addressed, apparently with the set purpose of suggesting that the

fortunes of ancient Sardis had been its own fortunes, that it had

endured those sieges, committed those faults of carelessness and blind

confidence, and sunk into the same decay and death as the city.

That this is intentional and deliberate cannot be questioned for a

moment. What this writer said he meant. There is no accident or

unintended significance in those carefully chosen and well-weighed

words. In regard to this letter the same reflections arise as were

already suggested in the case of the other letters, and especially the

Smyrnaean and Pergamenian. In his conflict with the Nicolaitans the

writer was never betrayed into mere blind opposition to them; he never

rejected their views from mere hatred of those who held them; he took

the wider view which embraced everything that was right and true in the

principles of the Nicolaitans--and there was a good deal that was

rightly thought and well said by them--together with a whole world of

thought which they had no eyes to see. In the Seven Letters he

repeatedly gives marked emphasis to the principle, which the

Nicolaitans rightly maintained, that the Christians should be a force

in the world, moulding it gradually to a Christian model. Here and

everywhere throughout the Letters the writer is found to be reiterating

one thought, "See how much better the true eternal Church does

everything than any of the false pretenders and opponents can do them."

In regard to one detail after another he points out how far superior is

the Christian form to that in which it is tendered by the Imperial

State, by the cities, or by false teachers. If Laodicea clothes its

citizens with the glossy black woollen garments of its famous industry,

he offers white garments to clothe the true Laodiceans. If the State

has its mighty military strength and its imperial authority, he points

out to the true remnant among the Thyatirans that a more crushing and

irresistible might shall be placed in their hands, and offers to the

Pergamenian victors a wider authority over worlds seen and unseen. If

the Nicolaitans emphasise the intimate relation between the life of the

Church and the organisation of the State and the society amid which the

Church exists, he states with equal emphasis, but with the proper

additions, that the Church is so closely connected with the State and

the City that it can be regarded as sharing in a way their life,

fortunes and powers.

It is not fanciful to trace here, as in other cases, a connection

between the spirit of the advice tendered and the permanent features of

nature amid which the city stood and by which it was insensibly

moulded. Sardis stood, or rather the upper and the only fortified city

stood, on a lofty hill, a spur projecting north from Mount Tmolus and

dominating the Hermus Valley. The hill has still, in its dilapidated

and diminished extent, an imposing appearance; but it undoubtedly

offered a far more splendid show two or three thousand years ago, when

the top must have been a high plateau of moderate extent, the sides of

which were almost perpendicular walls of rock, except where a narrow

isthmus connected the hill with the mountains behind it on the south.

Towards the plain on the north, towards the glens on east and west, it

presented the most imposing show, a city with walls and towers,

temples, houses and palaces, filling the elevated plateau so completely

that on all sides it looked as if one could drop a stone 1,500 feet

straight into the plain from the outer buildings.

The rock, however, on which Sardis was built was only nominally a rock.

In reality, as you go nearer it, you see that it is only mud slightly

compacted, and easily dissolved by rain. It is, however, so constituted

that it wears away with a very steep, almost perpendicular face; but

rain and frost continually diminish it, so that little now remains of

the upper plateau on which the city stood; and in one place the top has

been worn to an extremely narrow neck with steep descents of the usual

kind on both sides, so that the visitor needs a fairly cool head and

steady nerve to walk across it. The isthmus connecting the plateau with

the mountains of Tmolus on the south has been worn away in a lesser

degree.

The crumbling, poor character of the rock must always have been a

feature that impressed the thinking mind, and led it to associate the

character of the inhabitants with this feature of the situation.

Instability, untrustworthiness, inefficiency, deterioration--such is

the impression that the rock gives, and such was the character of

Sardian history and of the Sardian Church.

But Sardis was not entirely degenerate and unworthy. Even in it there

were a few persons who maintained their Christian character and "did

not defile their garments." This strong expression shows wherein lay

the guilt of Sardis. It was different essentially from the fault of

Thyatira, the city which comes next to Sardis in the severity of its

condemnation. Thyatira was in many ways distinguished by excellence of

conduct, and the corporate life of its Church was vigorous and

improving, so that its "last works were more than the first"; but a

false theory of life and a false conception of what was right action

were leading it astray. Sardis was not Christian enough to entertain a

heresy or be led astray by a false system; it had lost all vigour and

life, and had sunk back to the ordinary pagan level of conduct, which

from the Christian point of view was essentially vicious and immoral in

principle.

The Sardian Church fell under the condemnation pronounced by St. Paul

(1 Cor 5:10) against those who, having become Christians and learned

the principles of morality, relapsed into the vices which were commonly

practised in pagan society. These were to be treated far more severely

than the pagans, though the pagans lived after the same fashion; for

the pagans lived so on principle, knowingly and intentionally, because

they held it to be right, whereas the Christians had learned that it

was wrong, and yet from weakness of will and character slipped back

into the evil. With them the true Christians were not to keep company,

but were to put them out of their society and their meetings. With

pagans who lived after the same fashion, however, it was allowable to

associate (though it lies in the nature of the case, and needs no

formal statement, that the association between Christians and pagans

could never be so intimate as that of Christians with one another).

A peculiarly kind and loving tone is perceptible in this part of the

letter. There is a certain reaction after the abhorrence and disgust

with which the weak degeneracy of Sardis has been described; and in

this reaction the deserts of the faithful few are painted with a loving

touch. They have kept themselves pure and true, and "they shall walk

with me in white, for they are worthy." Their reward shall be to

continue to the end white and pure, as they have kept themselves in

Sardis.

This warm and affectionate tone is marked by the form of the final

promise, which begins by simply repeating what has been already said in

the letter. In most of the other letters the final promise comes as an

addition; but here the love that speaks in the letter has already

uttered the promise, and there is nothing left in the conclusion except

to say it again, and to add explicitly what is already implied in it,

life. "He that overcometh shall thus be arrayed in white garments; and

I will in no wise blot his name out of the Book of Life, and I will

confess his name before my Father and before his angels." The reward of

all victors shall be the reward just promised to the few faithful in

Sardis, purity and life--to have their name standing always in the

Book, openly acknowledged and emblazoned before God.

In the Smyrnaean letter also the concluding promise is to a certain

extent anticipated in the body of the letter, as here; and the tone of

that letter is throughout warm and appreciative, beyond the rest of the

Seven Letters. Where this letter rises to the tone of love and

admiration, it approximates to the character of the Smyrnaean letter,

and like it ends with the promise of life.

The "Book of Life" is here evidently understood as an official list (so

to say) of the citizens of the heavenly city, the true Jerusalem, the

Elect City, peopled by the true Christians of all cities and provinces

and nations. As in all Greek and Roman cities of that time there was

kept a list of citizens, according to their class or tribe or deme, in

which new citizens were entered and from which degraded citizens were

expunged, so the writer of this letter figuratively mentions the Book

of Life. There is a remnant in Sardis whose names shall never be

deleted from the Book, from which most Sardians have been expunged

already.

That undoubtedly is the meaning which would be taken from the words

here by Asian readers. Mr. Anderson Scott points out that in the Jewish

Apocalyptic literature a wider sense is given to the term, and the

"Book of Life" is regarded as a record of exploits, a history of the

life and works of God's people. That this second sense was in the

writer's mind elsewhere is certain; but it is certain that he speaks

and thinks of two distinct kinds of books: one is a series of books of

record: the other is the Book of Life. This is clear from the words of

20:12: I saw the dead great and small, standing before the Throne; and

books were opened: and another book was opened, which is (the Book) of

Life: and the dead were judged out of the things which were written in

the books, according to their works. With this passage 13:8, 17:8,

20:15 should be compared, and from it they should be interpreted. The

wider sense could not be gathered by the Asian readers from this

reference, and was assuredly not intended by the writer of the letter.

This is one of many points of difference which strongly mark off the

Apocalypse of John from the common Apocalyptic literature of that age

and earlier times; and this immense difference ought never to be

forgotten (though it is perhaps not always remembered clearly enough)

by those scholars who, in studying the great influence exerted by the

older literature of this class on our Apocalypse, have seen in it an

enlarged Christian edition of an originally Jewish Apocalypse.

White was widely considered among the ancient nations as the colour of

innocence and purity. On this account it was appropriate for those who

were engaged in the worship of the gods, for purity was prescribed as a

condition of engaging in divine service though usually the purity was

understood in a merely ceremonial sense. All Roman citizens wore the

pure white toga on holidays and at religious ceremonies, whether or not

they wore it on ordinary days; in fact, the great majority of them did

not ordinarily wear that heavy and cumbrous garment; and hence the city

on festivals and holidays is called "candida urbs," the city in white.

Especially on the day of a Triumph white was the universal

colour-though the soldiers, of course, wore not the toga, the garb of

peace, but their full-dress military attire with all their

decorations--and there can hardly be any doubt that the idea of walking

in a Triumph similar to that celebrated by a victorious Roman general

is here present in the mind of the writer when he uses the words, "they

shall walk with me in white." A dirty and dark-coloured toga, on the

other hand, was the appropriate dress of sorrow and of guilt. Hence it

was worn by mourners and by persons accused of crimes.

The Asian readers could know of a Roman Triumph only from literature

and report, for in the strictest sense Triumphs could be celebrated

only in Rome, and only by an Emperor in person; but, in proportion as

the Triumph in the strict old Roman sense became rare, the splendour

and pomp which had originally been appropriated to it alone were more

widely employed; as, for example, in the procession escorting the

presiding magistrate, the Praetor, to the games in the Roman Circus;

and there is no doubt that the great provincial festivals and shows,

which were celebrated in the chief Asian cities according to Imperial

policy as a means of diffusing Roman ideas and ways, were inaugurated

with a procession modelled after the stately Roman procession in which

the Praetor was escorted in triumph to the circus, as Juvenal describes

it:--

What! had he seen, in his triumphant car,

Amid the dusty Cirque, conspicuous far,

The Praetor perched aloft, superbly drest

In Jove's proud tunic with a trailing vest

Of Tyrian tapestry, and o'er him spread

A crown too bulky for a human head:

Add now the Imperial Eagle, raised on high,

With golden beak, the mark of majesty,

Trumpets before, and on the left and right

A cavalcade of nobles, all in white.

Thus though the Triumph itself could never have been seen by the

readers of this letter, they knew it as the most typical celebration of

complete and final victory, partly from report and literature, partly

from frequently seeing ceremonies in the great Imperial festivals which

were modelled after the Triumph. Hence, St. Paul in writing to the

Colossians, 2:15, uses a similar metaphor: "he made a show of the

principalities and the powers, openly triumphing over them in it,"

which (as Lightfoot and scholars generally recognise) means that the

powers of the world were treated as a general treats his conquered

foes, stripped of their honours, and paraded in the Triumph as a show

to please the citizens and to glorify the conqueror.

The Triumph was in origin a religious ceremonial. The victorious

general who celebrated it played for the moment the part of the Roman

god Jupiter; he wore the god's dress and insignia, and resigned them

again when he reached the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus on the

Capitoline Mount. But it need not be thought strange that St. John and

St. Paul should use this pagan ceremonial to express metaphorically the

decisive triumph of Christ over all opposing powers in the world, when

we have seen that Ignatius describes the life of the true Christian as

a long religious procession similar to those which were celebrated in

the pagan ritual.

The warm and loving tone in the latter part of the Sardian letter need

cause no wonder. There is always something peculiarly admirable and

affecting in the contemplation of a pure and high life which maintains

unspotted rectitude amid surrounding degradation and vileness. No

characters stand out in clearer relief and more striking beauty than

the small bands of high-minded Romans who preserved their nobility of

spirit and life amid the degeneracy and servility of the early Empire.

The same distinction marks this remnant of purity amid the decaying and

already dead Church of Sardis. Even the thought of it rouses a warm

interest in the modern reader's mind and we understand how it inspires

this part of the letter with an unusual warmth of emotion, which

contrasts with the coldness that we observed in the Ephesian letter.

Hence also we see how the analogy between these two letters, the

Sardian and the Ephesian, ceases towards the end of the letter. The

standard of conduct throughout the Ephesian Church had been uniform;

the whole Church had acted correctly and admirably in the past; the

whole Church was now cooling down and beginning to degenerate. No

exception is made; no remnant is described that had not lost heart and

enthusiasm. The changeable nature of Ephesus had affected all alike.

And therefore the penalty is pronounced, that the Church shall be moved

out of its place. It is a conditional penalty; but there is no

suggestion that any portion of the Church has escaped or may escape it.

The Church as a whole must revivify itself, or suffer the penalty; and

Ephesus cannot alter its nature; changeableness is the law of its

being. There is no real hope held out that the penalty may be avoided;

and the promise at the conclusion is couched in the most general terms;

this Church is cooling and degenerating, but to him that overcometh

vigour and life shall be given.

On the other hand, the Sardian Church has not been uniform in its

conduct, and it shall not all suffer the same fate. The Church as a

whole is dead; but a few, who form bright and inspiring exceptions,

shall live as citizens of the heavenly city. There is no hint that

Sardis shall be spared, or the Church survive it. Its doom is sealed

irrevocably; and yet a remnant shall live.

Sardis today is a wilderness of ruins and thorns, pastures and

wild-flowers, where the only habitations are a few huts of Yuruk nomads

beside the temple of Cybele in the low ground by the Pactolus, and at

the distance of a mile two modern houses by the railway station. And

yet in a sense a remnant has escaped and still survives, which does not

indeed excite the same loving tenderness as makes itself felt in the

latter part of this letter, yet assuredly merits our sympathy and

interest. In the plain of the Hermus, which Sardis once dominated there

are a few scattered villages whose inhabitants, though nominally

Mohammedans, are clearly marked off by certain customs from the Turkish

population around. Their women (according to the account given us at

Sardis) usually bear Christian names, though the men's names are of the

ordinary Mohammedan class; they have a kind of priests, who wear black

head-dress, not the white turban of the Mohammedan hodjas and imams;

the villages hold private assemblies when these "black-heads"

(Kara-Bash) pay them visits; they practise strict monogamy, and divorce

(which is so easy for true Mohammedans) is not permitted; they drink

wine and violate other Mohammedan rules and prohibitions; and it is

believed by some persons who have mixed with them that they would

become Christians forthwith, if it did not mean death to do so. At the

same time they are not at all like the strange people called Takhtaji

or Woodmen: the latter are apparently a survival of ancient paganism,

pre-Christian in origin.

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

Chapter 27: Philadelphia: The Missionary City

Philadelphia was the only Pergamenian foundation among the Seven

Cities. It derived its name from Attalus II, 159-138 B.C., whose truth

and loyalty to his brother Eumenes won him the epithet Philadelphus.

The district where it was situated, the valley of the Cogamis, a

tributary of the Hermus, came into the possession of the Pergamenian

King Eumenes at the treaty of 189. From that time onward the district

was in the heart of the Pergamenian realm; and therefore the new city

could not have been founded as a military colony to guard a frontier,

like Thyatira. Military strength was, of course, never entirely

neglected in those foundations of the Greek kings; and especially a

city founded, like Philadelphia, on an important road, was charged with

the duty of guarding the road. But military strength and defence

against invasion were required chiefly near the eastern frontier, far

away on the other side of Phrygia, where an enemy should be prevented

from entering the realm. Philadelphia was founded more for

consolidating and regulating and educating the central regions subject

to the Pergamenian kings. The intention of its founder was to make it a

centre of the Graeco-Asiatic civilisation and a means of spreading the

Greek language and manners in the eastern parts of Lydia and in

Phrygia. It was a missionary city from the beginning, founded to

promote a certain unity of spirit, customs, and loyalty within the

realm, the apostle of Hellenism in an Oriental land. It was a

successful teacher. Before A.D. 19 the Lydian tongue had ceased to be

spoken in Lydia, and Greek was the only language of the country.

If sufficient information had been preserved about the religion of

Thyatira and Philadelphia, it would have been possible to understand

and describe the nature of those two Graeco-Asiatic cities and to

specify the difference in character between a Seleucid and a

Pergamenian foundation. From the religious establishment of each city,

it would have been easy to distinguish what elements in each were

native Anatolian, what were introduced from Europe, and what were

brought in by colonists from Oriental lands, and how these were blended

to produce a composite Graeco-Asiatic religion corresponding to the

purposes which the new cities were intended to serve. This would be an

object-lesson in practical government and religion, for those two

cities are types of the fusion of Greek and Asiatic thought and custom,

as attempted by the two chief Hellenising kingdoms in the Asiatic

continent. But literary sources are silent, and the information

furnished by coins and inscriptions is too scanty, sporadic, and

superficial to be of much value.

The coins, as a rule, were much more Hellenised than the actual cults.

Hellenised ideas about the gods, being more anthropomorphic, were more

easily adapted to the small types which coins admitted; and, moreover,

they belonged to the higher education, and obtained on that account

more than their relative share of notice in such public and official

monuments as coins. Philadelphia, also, was a centre for the diffusion

of Greek language and letters in a peaceful land by peaceful means.

Figure 33

Figure 33: The alliance of Philadelphia and Ephesus

A subject like that which appears in Figure 33 represents Philadelphia

in a purely Greek and an entirely non-religious fashion by two men

exactly similar in attitude and dress, standing and looking upon the

genius of Ephesus as she carries the idol of her own Artemis towards a

temple built in the Roman style. The two men are two brothers, and

their identity of outward form is symbolical of their unanimity and

mutual affection, and makes them a suitable envisagement of the nature

of a city, whose name means brotherly love. This coin commemorates an

"alliance," or agreement as to common religious and festal

arrangements, between the two cities. Apparently the temple is to be

understood as Philadelphian; and the Ephesian goddess is being

introduced into established Philadelphian ritual in the presence of the

twin Hellenised founders of the city.

Thoroughly Graeco-Roman in character, too, is the coin type shown in

Figure 34. Here the front of a temple is represented as open, to show a

statue of the sun-god, with head surrounded by rays: he holds out the

globe of the sun (or is it the solid earth?) in his right hand, and

carries a sceptre in his left.

More indicative of Anatolian religious character is a type which occurs

more than once, a coiled serpent with raised head and protruding tongue

riding on the back of a horse. The serpent is, without doubt, the

representative of Asklepios, as in Figure 23, chapter 21, but it is

probable that the type is not in a further sense religious: it does not

indicate any connection in myth or cult between Asklepios and the

horse, but merely that a horse-race was a prominent feature in the

games celebrated under the name Asklepieia.

Figure 34

Figure 34: The Sun-god of Philadelphia

Inscriptions give some information, which the Hellenised coins refuse,

about the cults practised in the city, and prove that the Anatolian

character was strongly marked. In those Graeco-Asiatic cities there is

no sign that the Greek spirit in religion took the place of the

Anatolian to any great extent. The Greek character in religion was

confined to superficial show and festivals: in heart the religion was

thoroughly Anatolian. Many of the formulae characteristic of the

religion practised in the Katakekaumene (a district described below),

confession of sin, punishment of sin by the god, thanks to the god,

publication of the circumstances on a stele erected as a testimony,

etc., occur in inscriptions found at Philadelphia.

The Pergamenian king selected an excellent situation for the new city.

A long vale runs up southeast from the Hermus Valley into the flank of

the central plateau: this is the vale down which comes the river

Cogamis to join the Hermus. The vale offers the best path to make the

ascent from the middle Hermus Valley, 500 feet or less above the sea,

to the main plateau: the plateau is over 3,000 feet above sea-level,

and its outer rim is even higher. It is not easy for a road to make so

high a step, and even by the Cogamis vale there is a very steep and

long climb to the top of the hills which form the rim of the plateau.

But this is the path by which trade and communication from the harbour

of Smyrna and from Lydia and the northwest regions are maintained with

Phrygia and the East. It was at that time an important road, rivalling

even the great trade-route from Ephesus to the East; and in later

Byzantine and medieval times it was the greatest trade-route of the

whole country. Its importance is now continued by the railway, which

connects Smyrna with the interior.

Moreover, the Imperial Post-Road of the first century, coming from Rome

by Troas, Pergamum and Sardis passed through Philadelphia and went on

to the East; and thus Philadelphia was a stage on the main line of

Imperial communication. This ceased to be the case when the later

overland route by Constantinople (Byzantium, as it was then called) and

Ancyra was organised in the second century.

The Cogamis Vale is enclosed between Mount Tmolus on the left (south

and west) and the plateau proper on the right. A site for the city was

found on a broad hill, which slopes gently up from the valley towards

Tmolus. In a too close view from the plain the hill seems to merge in

the main mass of Tmolus, but when one ascends through the streets of

the modern town to the highest point, one finds that the hill is cut

off from the mountains behind. Thus the site was susceptible of being

made a very strong fortress in ancient warfare, provided it were

carefully fortified on the lower slopes and courageously defended in

the hour of trial; and its strength was proved in many long and

terrible sieges by the Mohammedans in later centuries.

From these general considerations the modern scholar has to reconstruct

in imagination the character of the city at the beginning of our era.

It was then an important place with a considerable coinage: the great

Swiss numismatist, M. Imhoof Blumer, assigns a large body of coins to

the reign of Augustus.

Then Philadelphia emerges into world-wide fame through a conspicuous

disaster. It was situated on the edge of the Katakekaumene, a district

of Lydia where volcanoes, now extinct, have been active in recent

geological time, where the traces of their eruptions in rivers of black

lava and vast cinder-heaps are very impressive, and where earthquakes

have been frequent in historical times. In A.D. 17 an unusually severe

earthquake destroyed twelve cities of the great Lydian Valley,

including Sardis and Philadelphia. Strabo, who wrote about two or three

years after this disaster, says that Sardis suffered most at the

moment, but gives a remarkable picture of the long-continued terror at

Philadelphia. Apparently frequent shocks were experienced there for a

long time afterwards. It has been the present writer's experience in

that country that the first great shock of earthquake is not so trying

to the mind as the subsequent shocks, even though less severe, when

these recur at intervals during the subsequent weeks and months, and

that people who have shown conspicuous courage at first may give way to

utter panic during some of the later shocks. This state of panic set in

at Philadelphia, and continued when Strabo wrote, A.D. 20. Many of the

inhabitants remained outside the city living in huts and booths over

the vale, and those who were foolhardy enough (as the sober-minded

thought) to remain in the city, practised various devices to support

and strengthen the walls and houses against the recurring shocks. The

memory of this disaster lived long; the very name Katakekaumene was a

perpetual warning; people lived amid ever threatening danger, in dread

always of a new disaster; and the habit of going out to the open

country had probably not disappeared when the Seven Letters were

written.

Philadelphia shared in the bounty of the Emperor Tiberius on this

occasion, and took part with the other cities in erecting in Rome a

monument commemorating their gratitude. It also founded a cult of

Germanicus, the adopted son and heir of Tiberius (according to the will

of Augustus), who was in Asia at the time, and who was probably the

channel through which the bounty was transmitted. In spite of this

liberality the city suffered severely; its prosperity was seriously

impaired; and no coins were struck by it throughout the reign of

Tiberius.

It was probably in commemoration of the kindness shown by the Emperor

on this occasion that Philadelphia assumed the name Neokaisareia: the

New Caesar was either Tiberius (as compared with Augustus) or

Germanicus (as compared with Tiberius). The name Neokaisareia is known

both from coins and epigraphy during the ensuing period. At first the

old name was disused and the new name employed alone; then the old name

recurred alongside of or alternately with the new; and finally about

A.D. 42-50 the new name disappeared from us. Philadelphia was the only

one of the Seven Cities that had voluntarily substituted a new name for

its original name: the other six were too proud of their ancient fame

to sacrifice their name, though Sardis took the epithet Caesareia for a

short time after A.D. 17.

This explanation of the name Neokaisareia differs from that given by M.

Imhoof Blumer, who says that the name was assumed in honour of

Caligula. His reason is that the name is found only on some coins of

Caligula and of his successor; but it was impossible to put it on coins

of Tiberius, for no coins were struck under that Emperor. The new name

began to fall into disuse even during the short reign of Caligula, and

disappeared entirely soon after the accession of Claudius.

Subsequently, during the reign of Vespasian, A.D. 70-79, Philadelphia

assumed another Imperial title and called itself Flavia; and the double

name remained in use occasionally on coins through the second and third

centuries.

Thus Philadelphia was distinguished from the other cities by several

characteristics: first, it was the missionary city: secondly, its

people lived always in dread of a disaster, "the day of trial":

thirdly, many of its people went out of the city to dwell: fourthly, it

took a new name from the Imperial god.

Philadelphia, during the second century and the third, more than

recovered its prosperity; and under Caracalla it was honoured with the

title Neokoros or Temple-Warden in the State religion. This implies

that a Provincial temple of the Imperial cult was built there between

A.D. 211 and 217; and henceforward the Commune of Asia met there

occasionally to hold some of its State festivals.

The history of the Philadelphian Church was distinguished by a

prophetess Ammia, who flourished apparently between A.D. 100 and 160.

She was universally recognised as ranking with Agabus and the four

daughters of Philip, as one of the few in the later time who were truly

gifted with the prophetic power. She remains a mere name to us,

preserved in Eusebius' history, v., 17, 2.

In Byzantine and in medieval times its importance increased steadily.

Civilisation of a kind became more firmly settled in the heart of Asia

Minor in the centuries following the foundation of Constantinople as

capital of the Roman Empire. The inner lands of Asia Minor became more

important. Their trade now flowed to Constantinople rather than to

Rome; and the coast-towns on the Aegean Sea became less important in

consequence. The centre of gravity of the world, and the moving forces

of civilisation, had shifted towards the East; and the connection of

Asia Minor with the West was no longer of such pre-eminent importance

as in the Roman time. The Empire of Rome had been strongly orientalised

and transformed into a Roman-Asiatic Empire, on whose throne sat

successively Phrygians, Isaurians, Cappadocians, and Armenians. In that

period the situation of Philadelphia made it a great city, as a centre

of wide influence, and the guardian of a doorway in the system of

communication.

In the last stages of the struggle between the decaying Empire and the

growing power of the Turks, Philadelphia played a noble part, and rose

to a lofty pitch of heroism. Long after all the country round had

passed finally under Turkish power, Philadelphia held up the banner of

Christendom. It displayed all the noble qualities of endurance, truth

and steadfastness, which are attributed to it in the letter of St.

John, amid the ever threatening danger of Turkish attack; and its story

rouses even Gibbon to admiration.

During the fourteenth century it stood practically alone against the

entire Turkish power as a free, self-governing Christian city amid a

Turkish land. Twice it was besieged by great Turkish armies, and its

people reduced to the verge of starvation; but they had learned to

defend themselves and to trust to no king or external government; and

they resisted successfully to the end. Philadelphia was no longer a

city of the Empire; and the Emperors regarded rather with jealousy than

with sympathy its gallant struggle to maintain itself against the

Turks. At last, about 1379-1390 it succumbed to a combined Turkish and

Byzantine army; what the Turks alone had never been able to do they

achieved by availing themselves of the divisions and jealousy among the

Christians. Since that time Philadelphia has been transformed into the

Mohammedan town of Ala-Sheher, the reddish city, a name derived from

the speckled, red-brown hills around it.

In the last period of its freedom, it succeeded, as even the stubbornly

conservative and unchanging ecclesiastical lists allowed, to the

primacy among the bishoprics of Lydia, which had belonged for more than

a thousand years to Sardis.

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

Chapter 28: The Letter to the Church in Philadelphia

These things saith he that is holy, he that is true, he that hath

the key of David, he that openeth, and none shall shut, and that

shutteth, and none openeth.

I know thy works: behold I have given before thee an opened door,

which none can shut, because thou hast little strength, and didst

keep my word, and didst not deny my name. Behold, I give of the

synagogue of Satan, of them which say they are Jews, and they are

not, but do lie; behold I will make them to come and worship before

thy feet, and to know that I have loved thee. Because thou didst

keep the word of my patience, I also will keep thee from the hour of

trial, that hour which is to come upon the whole world, to try them

that dwell upon the earth. I come quickly: hold fast that which thou

hast, that no one take thy crown.

He that overcometh, I will make him a pillar in the temple of my

God, and he shall go out thence no more: and I will write upon him

the name of my God, and the name of the city of my God, the new

Jerusalem, which cometh down out of heaven from my God, and mine own

new name.

He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith to the

churches.

The address of the Philadelphian letter is conceived with evident

reference to the topics mentioned in the body of the letter, and to the

character and past history of the Church. The writer is "he that hath

the key of David, that openeth and none shall shut"; and the history of

Philadelphia and its Church has been determined in the past, and will

in the future be determined, mainly by the fact that "I have set before

thee a door opened, which none can shut."

The writer of the letter is "he that is true"; and the Philadelphian

Church "kept my word and did not deny my name," but confessed the

truth, whereas its enemies are they "which say they are Jews, and they

are not, but do lie." The writer of the letter is, "he that is holy";

and the picture of Philadelphia that is given in the letter marks it

beyond all others of the Seven as the holy city, which "I have loved,"

which kept my word and my injunction of endurance (a commendation twice

repeated).

It may fairly be considered a complimentary form of address when the

writer invests himself with the same character that he praises in the

Church addressed. That is also the case in the Smyrnaean letter: there

he "which was dead and lived" addresses the Church which, as he

anticipates, will suffer to death and thereby gain the crown of life.

But it is hardly the case in any other letter. In addressing Ephesus

and Pergamum and Thyatira the writer speaks as holding that position

and authority and power, which they are by their conduct losing. The

writer to Sardis occupies the honourable position which Sardis has lost

beyond hope of recovery. The writer to Laodicea is faithful and true,

addressing a Church which is reproached for its irresolution and want

of genuineness.

In this respect, then, the letters to Smyrna and Philadelphia form a

class by themselves; and the analogy extends to other characteristics.

These two Churches are praised with far more cordiality and less

reserve than any of the others. They have both had to contend with

serious difficulties. The Smyrnaean Church was poor and oppressed, the

Philadelphian Church had but little power. Before both there is held

forth a prospect of suffering and trial; but in both cases a triumphant

issue is confidently anticipated. Life for Smyrna, honour and dignity

for Philadelphia, are promised--not for a residue amid the unfaithful,

as at Thyatira or Sardis, but for the Church in both cities. It is an

interesting coincidence that those are the two cities which have been

the bulwark and the glory of Christian power in the country since it

became Mohammedan; they are the two places where the Christian flag

floated latest over a free and powerful city, and where even in slavery

the Christians preserved cohesion among themselves and real influence

among the Turkish conquerors.

Another analogy is that in those two letters alone is the Jewish

Nationalist party mentioned. Now in every city where there was a body

of Jews settled, either as resident strangers or as citizens of the

town, the Nationalist party existed; and there can hardly be any doubt

that in every important commercial centre in the Province Asia there

was a body of Jews settled. In every one of the Seven Cities, we may be

sure, there was a Nationalist Jewish party, opposing, hating, and

annoying the Jewish Christians and with them the whole Church in the

city. If that difficulty is mentioned only in those two cities, Smyrna

and Philadelphia, the natural inference is that it had been more

serious in them than in the others; and that can only be because the

Jews were, for some reason or other, specially influential there.

Doubtless the reason lay in their numbers and their wealth; and hence

the weakness and poverty of the Christian party is specially mentioned

in those two Churches, and in none of the other five.

The body of the letter begins with the usual statement that the writer

is familiar with the history and activity of the Philadelphian Church:

"I know thy works." Then follows, as usual, an outline of the past

achievements and conduct of that Church; but this outline is couched in

an unusual form. "See, I have given before thee a door opened, which no

one is able to shut." There can be no doubt what the "opened door"

means. It is a Pauline metaphor, which had passed into ordinary usage

in the early Church. At Ephesus "a great door and effectual was opened"

to him (1 Cor 16:9). At Troas also "a door was opened" for him (2 Cor

2:12). He asked the Colossians to pray "that God may open unto us a

door for the word, to speak the mystery of Christ" (Col 4:3). In these

three Pauline expressions the meaning is clearly explained by the

context: a "door opened" means a good opportunity for missionary work.

In the Revelation this usage has become fixed, and the word "door" is

almost a technical term, so that no explanation in the context is

thought necessary; unless the Pauline use had become familiar and

almost stereotyped, the expression in this letter would hardly have

been possible.

The history of Philadelphian activity had been determined by its unique

opportunity for missionary work; there had been given to it a door

opened before it. The expression is strong: it is not merely "I have

set before thee a door"; it is "I have given thee (the opportunity of)

a door (which I have) opened before thee." This opportunity was a

special gift and privilege and favour bestowed upon Philadelphia.

Nothing of the kind is mentioned for any other city.

The situation of the city fully explains this saying. Philadelphia lay

at the upper extremity of a long valley, which opens back from the sea.

After passing Philadelphia the road along this valley ascends to the

Phrygian land and the great Central Plateau, the main mass of Asia

Minor. This road was one which led from the harbour of Smyrna to the

northeastern parts of Asia Minor and the East in general, the one rival

to the great route connecting Ephesus with the East, and the greatest

Asian trade-route of medieval times.

The Imperial Post Road from Rome to the Provinces farther east and

southeast coincided for some considerable distance with this

trade-route. Through Troas, Pergamum, Thyatira, it reached Sardis; and

from thence it was identical with the trade-route by Philadelphia up to

the centre of Phrygia. Along this great route the new influence was

steadily moving eastwards from Philadelphia in the strong current of

communication that set from Rome across Phrygia towards the distant

East. As we have seen in chapter 15, it had not yet penetrated beyond

the centre of Phrygia into the northeast, so that there was abundant

opportunity open before it.

Philadelphia, therefore, was the keeper of the gateway to the plateau;

but the door had now been permanently opened before the Church, and the

work of Philadelphia had been to go forth through the door and carry

the gospel to the cities of the Phrygian land.

It is not stated explicitly that Philadelphia used the opportunity that

had been given it; but that is clearly implied in the context. The door

had been opened for the Philadelphia Church by Him who does nothing in

vain: He did this because the opportunity would be used.

Here alone in all the Seven Letters is there an allusion to the fact

which seems to explain why those special Seven Cities were marked out

for "the Seven Churches of Asia." But it would be wrong to infer that

Philadelphia alone among the Seven Cities had a door before it. Each of

the Seven Cities stood at the door of a district. In truth every Church

had its own opportunity; and all the Seven Churches had specially

favourable opportunities opened to them by geographical situation and

the convenience of communication. But it lies in the style and plan of

the Seven Letters to mention only in one case what was a common

characteristic of all the Seven Cities; and Philadelphia was selected,

because in its history that fact--its relation to the cities on the

near side of the Central Plateau--had been the determining factor.

Philadelphia must have been pre-eminent among the Seven Cities as the

missionary Church. We have no other evidence of this; but the situation

marks out this line of activity as natural, and the letter clearly

declares that the Philadelphian Church acted accordingly.

The construction of the following words in the Greek is obscure, and it

is possible to translate in several ways. But the rendering given in

the Authorised Version (abandoned unfortunately in the Revised Version)

must be preferred: "I know thy works; see, I have given thee the

opportunity of the opened door, because thou hast little power, and

didst keep my word and didst not deny my name." The opened door is here

explained to have been a peculiar favour granted to Philadelphia,

because in spite of its want of strength it had been loyal and true.

If the Philadelphian Church had little power, so also had the city. It

had suffered from earthquakes more than any other city of all Asia. In

A.D. 17 a great earthquake had caused very serious damage; and the

effects lasted for years after. The trembling of the earth continued

for a long time, so that the inhabitants were afraid to repair the

injured houses, or did so with careful provision against collapse. Two

or three years later, when Strabo wrote, shocks of earthquake were an

everyday occurrence. The walls of the houses were constantly gaping in

cracks; and now one part of the city, now another part, was suffering.

Few people ventured to live in the city; most spent their lives

outside, and devoted themselves to cultivating the fertile

Philadelphian territory. There is an obvious reference to this in a

later sentence of the letter, where the promise is given to the

faithful Philadelphians that they shall go out thence no more. Those

who stayed in the city had to direct their attention to the motions of

the earth, and guard against the danger of falling walls by devices of

building and propping.

Such a calamity, and the terror it had inspired, naturally hindered the

development and prosperity of Philadelphia. The Emperor Tiberius indeed

treated Philadelphia and the other eleven Asian cities, which suffered

about the same time, with great liberality; and aided them to regain

their strength both by grants of money and by remission of taxation.

Though at the moment of the great earthquake Sardis had suffered most

severely, Philadelphia (as is clear from Strabo's account) was much

slower in recovering from the effects, owing to the long-continuance of

minor shocks and the reputation of the city as dangerous. The world in

general thought, like Strabo, that Philadelphia was unsafe to enter,

that only a rash person would live in it, and only fools could have

ever founded it. No coins appear to have been struck in the city during

the twenty years that followed the earthquake; and this is attributed

by numismatists to the impoverishment and weakness caused by that

disaster.

Gradually, as time passed, people recovered confidence. Subsequent

history has shown that the situation about A.D. 17-20, as described by

Strabo, was unusual. Philadelphia has not been more subject to

earthquakes in subsequent time than other cities of Asia. So far as our

scanty knowledge goes, Smyrna has suffered more. But when the Seven

Letters were written the memory of that disastrous period was still

fresh. People remembered, and perhaps still practised, camping out in

the open country; and they appreciated the comfort implied in the

promise, verse 12, "he shall go out thence no more." They appreciated,

also, the guarantee that, as a reward for the Church's loyalty and

obedience, "I also will keep thee from the hour of trial, that hour

which is to come upon the whole world, to try them that dwell upon the

earth." The Philadelphians who had long lived in constant dread of "the

hour of trial" would appreciate the special form in which this promise

of help is expressed.

The concluding promise of the letter resumes this allusion. "He that

overcometh, I will make him a pillar in the temple of my God, and he

shall go out thence no more." The pillar is the symbol of stability, of

the firm support on which the upper part of the temple rests. The

victor shall be shaken by no disaster in the great day of trial; and

the shall never again require to go out and take refuge in the open

country. The city which had suffered so much and so long from

instability was to be rewarded with the Divine firmness and

steadfastness.

That is not the only gift that has been granted the Philadelphian

Church. "See! I am giving of the Synagogue of Satan, who profess

themselves to be Jews, and they are not, but do lie: see! I will make

them come and do reverence before thy feet and know that I have loved

thee." This statement takes us into the midst of the long conflict that

had been going on in Philadelphia. The Jews and the Jewish Christians

had been at bitter enmity; and it must be confessed that, to judge from

the spirit shown in St. John's references to the opposite party, the

provocation was not wholly on one side. The Jews boasted themselves to

be the national and patriotic party, the true Jews, the chosen people,

beloved and favoured of God, who were hereafter to be the victors and

masters of the world when the Messiah should come in His kingdom. They

upbraided and despised the Jewish Christians as traitors, unworthy of

the name of Jews, the enemies of God. But the parts shall soon be

reversed. The promise begins in the present tense, "I am giving"; but

it breaks off in an incomplete sentence, and commences afresh in the

future tense, "I will make them (who scorned you) to bow in reverence

before you, and to know that you (and not they) are the true Jews whom

I have loved."

A characteristic which distinguished Philadelphia from the rest of the

Seven Cities was that it alone abandoned its old name and took in its

place a name derived from the Imperial religion. The others were too

proud, apparently, of their own ancient and historic names to abandon

them even for an Imperial title. Sardis, indeed, which had suffered

very severely from the earthquake in A.D. 17, and had been treated with

special kindness by Tiberius, had assumed the title Caesareia then; but

Caesareia was a mere epithet, which was used along with the old name

and not in place of it; and the epithet soon fell into disuse, and is

never used on coins later than the reign of Caligula 37-41. Some other

less important cities of Asia had in like manner assumed an Imperial

name in place of their own. Thus, for example, Hierokome in Lydia had

abandoned its name, and in gratitude to Tiberius for his kindness in

A.D. 17 had taken the name Hierocaesareia, which lasted through the

subsequent history of the city. Similarly, Philadelphia assumed the

name Neokaisareia and disused its own.

Now, according to the Roman regulations, it was not permitted to a city

to assume an Imperial name when it pleased. Such a name was regarded as

highly honourable, and as binding the city closely to the Imperial

service. Permission had to be sought from the Senate, which governed

Asia through the Proconsul whom it selected and sent for the purpose;

but, of course, the Emperor's own will was decisive in the matter, and

the Senate would never grant permission without ascertaining what he

wished. Tiberius had crowned his kindness to the city by permitting it

to style itself Neokaisareia, the city of the Young Caesar, viz.,

either himself or Germanicus, who was in the East on a special mission

in A.D. 17-19, and had perhaps been the agent through whom the Imperial

bounty was bestowed. A shrine of Germanicus was erected then.

Philadelphia was thereby specially consecrated to the service, i.e. the

worship, of the Young Caesar. There can be no doubt that a shrine of

the Neos Kaisar, with a priest and a regular ritual, was established

soon after A.D. 17 and not later than 19. Philadelphia wrote on itself

the name of the Imperial god, and called itself the city of its

Imperial god present on earth to help it.

Erected in the time of Philadelphia's great poverty, immediately after

the disaster that had tried its credit and weakened its resources, yet

raised without aid from the Commune of the Province, this temple of the

Young Caesar could not have been fit to compare with the splendid

buildings for the Imperial worship in Smyrna or Pergamum or Ephesus. As

the worship of Germanicus disappears completely from notice after A.D.

50, and as the other buildings of the city seem to have been in a

perilous condition for years after the shock of A.D. 17, we may

conjecture that the humble temple at Philadelphia had not withstood the

assaults of earthquake and the slower influence of time: moreover,

there was little temptation to maintain the worship of Germanicus (who

did not rank among the regular Imperial gods) after the death of his

son Caligula and his brother Claudius.

It may therefore be fairly gathered that the new shrine was in a state

of dilapidation and decay when the Seven Letters were composed. We know

from a letter of Pliny to Trajan, that the same thing had happened to a

temple of Claudius, which stood on private ground in the wealthy city

of Prusa in Bithynia; yet the soil on which that ruined temple had

stood was declared by Trajan to be for ever exempted from profane and

common use. Accordingly there would be an opening for a telling

contrast, such as St. John so frequently aims at, between the shifting

facts of ordinary city life and the more permanent character of the

analogous institutions and promises of the Divine Author.

Here, on the one side, were the ruined temple and the obsolete worship

of the Imperial god and the disused new name which for a time the city

had been proud to bear--a name that commemorated a terrible disaster, a

period of trial and weakness, and a dole of money from the Imperial

purse: none of all these things had been permanent, and there remained

from them nothing of which the city could now feel proud.

On the other hand the letter gives the pledge of safety from the hour

of trial, of steadiness like the pillar of a temple, of everlasting

guarantee against disaster and eviction, of exaltation above the

enemies who now contemn and insult; and in token of this eternal

security it promises that the name of God and of the city of God and of

the Divine Author shall be written upon the victor. When a

Philadelphian read those words, he could not fail to discover in them

the reference to his own city's history. Like all the other cities he

read the words as an engagement that the Author will do far better for

his own everything that the enemy tries to do for the pagan city.

It is often incorrectly said that the victor receives three names--of

God, of the Church, and of Christ; but the real meaning is that a name

is written on him which has all three characters, and is at once the

name of God, the name of the Church, and the new name of Christ. What

that name shall be is a mystery, like the secret name written on the

white tessera for the Pergamenian victor.

In the times when we can catch a glimpse of its condition, Philadelphia

was living amid ceaseless dangers, of old from earthquakes, at last

from Turkish attack. It was always in dread of the last hour of trial,

and was always kept from it. It stood like a pillar, the symbol of

stability and strength. In the middle ages it struggled on, a small and

weak city against a nation of warriors, and did not deny the Name, but

was patient to the end; and there has been written on its history a

name that is imperishable, so long as heroic resistance against

overwhelming odds, and persevering self-reliance, when deserted by the

world, are held in honour and remembered.

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

Chapter 29: Laodicea: The City of Compromise

Laodicea was founded by Antiochus II (261-246 B.C.). As a Seleucid

foundation, it was probably similar to Thyatira in respect of

constitution and law; but no information has been preserved. It was

situated at a critical point in the road system of the country. The

great road from the west (from Ephesus and from Miletus) ascends the

Meander Valley due eastwards, until it enters "the Gate of Phrygia." In

the Gate are a remarkable series of hot springs, and warm mud-baths,

some in the bed of the Meander, others on its banks. "The scene before

the traveller as he traverses the Gate is a suitable introduction to

that Phrygian land, which always seemed to the Greeks something strange

and unique."

Immediately above this point lies a much broader valley, in which

Lydia, Phrygia, and Caria meet. The Meander comes into this valley from

the north, breaking through a ridge of mountains by a gorge, which,

though singularly beautiful in scenery, is useless as a roadway. The

road goes on to the east up the glen of the Lycus, which here joins the

Meander, and offers an easy roadway. The Lycus Glen is double,

containing a lower and an upper glen. Laodicea is the city of the lower

glen, Colossae of the upper. Due north of Laodicea, between the Lycus

and the Meander, stands Hierapolis, in a very conspicuous situation, on

a shelf below the northern mountains and above the valley, with a

cascade of gleaming white cliffs below it, topped by the buildings,

still wonderfully well preserved, of the old city.

The glen of the Lycus extends up like a funnel into the flank of the

main plateau of Anatolia. Between the lower and the upper glen there is

a step about 400 feet high, and again between the upper glen and the

plateau there is another step of about 850 feet; but both can be

surmounted easily by the road. The lower glen, also, slopes upwards,

rising 250 feet; and the upper glen slopes much more rapidly, rising

550 feet. In this way the rise from the Meander Valley, 550 feet above

the sea, to the plateau, 2,600 feet (an exceptionally low elevation),

is achieved far more easily by this path than at any other point. Hence

the Lycus Glen was always the most frequented path of trade from the

interior to the west throughout ancient time.

Laodicea was placed as a guard and door-keeper on this road, near the

foot of the Lycus Glen, where it opens on the main valley of the

Meander. The hills that bound the glen on the south run up northwards

to an apex, one side facing northwest, the other northeast; this apex

lies between the river Lycus (the Wolf), and its large tributary the

Kapros (the Boar), which comes in from the south and passes near the

eastern gate: the Lycus is about three miles to the north of the city.

Laodicea was placed on the apex; and the great road from the coast to

the inner country passed right through the middle of it, entering by

the "Ephesian Gates" on the east. The city was nearly square, with the

corners towards the cardinal points. One side, towards the southwest,

was washed by the small river Asopus.

The hills rise not more than one hundred feet above the glen; but they

spring sharply from the low and level ground in front; and, when

crowned by the well-built fortifications of a Seleucid city, they must

have presented a striking aspect towards the glen, and constituted an

admirably strong line of defence. Laodicea was a very strong fortress,

planted right on the line of the great road; but it had one serious

weakness. It was entirely dependent for water-supply (except in so far

as wells may have existed within the walls, of which there is now no

trace) on an aqueduct conducted from springs about six miles to the

south. The aqueduct was under the surface of the ground, but could

hardly remain unknown to a besieging army or be guarded long against

his attack. If the aqueduct was cut, the city was helpless; and this

weakness ruined the character of the city as a strong fortress, and

must have prevented the people from ever feeling secure when threatened

with attack.

Planted on the better of the two entrances from the west to the

Phrygian land, Laodicea might have been expected to be (like

Philadelphia, which commanded the other) a missionary city charged at

first with the task of spreading Greek civilisation and speech in

barbarian Phrygia, and afterwards undertaking the duty of spreading

Christianity in that country. It had, however, made little progress in

Hellenising Phrygia. As has been sated before, Phrygia was the least

Hellenised part in all the Province; as a whole, it still spoke the

native tongue, and was little affected by Greek manners, in contrast

with Eastern Lydia, which was entirely Greek-speaking and Hellenised

(at least superficially). Why it was that Laodicea had failed and

Philadelphia had succeeded in diffusing the Greek tongue in the

districts immediately around, we have no means of judging. But such was

the case.

Laodicea was a knot on the road-system. Not merely the great eastern

highway and central route of the Roman Empire, as already described,

but also the road from Pergamum and the Hermus Valley to Pisidia and

Pamphylia passed through its gates; while a road from Eastern Caria,

and at least one from Central and West Phrygia, met in the city. In

such a situation it only needed peace to become a great commercial and

financial centre. It was, as Strabo says, only a small city before the

Roman time; but after Rome kept peace in the land, it grew rapidly.

Cicero brought with him in 51 B.C. orders to be cashed in Laodicea, as

the city of banking and exchange.

It was also a manufacturing centre. There was produced in the valley a

valuable sort of wool, soft in texture and glossy black in colour,

which was widely esteemed. This wool was woven into garments of several

kinds for home use and export trade. Small and cheap upper garments,

called himatia, two kinds of birros (another sort of upper garment),

one of native style and one in imitation of the manufactures of the

Nervii, a tribe in French Flanders, and also tunics of several kinds,

were made in Laodicea; and one species of the tunics, called trimita,

was so famous that the city is styled Trimitaria in the lists of the

Council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451, and in some other late documents.

It is pointed out elsewhere that this kind of glossy black wool, as

well as the glossy violet-dark wool produced at Colossae, was probably

attained by some system of breeding and crossing. The glossy black

fleeces have now entirely disappeared; but they were known in

comparatively recent times. Pococke in the eighteenth century saw a

great many black sheep; but Chandler in the early part of the

nineteenth saw only a few black and glossy fleeces. The present writer

has seen some black-fleeced sheep, but the wool was not distinguished

by the gloss which the ancients praised and prized so much. Certain

systems of breeding animals, and improving them by careful selection

and crossing with different stocks, were known to the native Anatolian

population in early times: the rules were a matter of religious

prescription, and guarded by religious awe, like almost every useful

art in that primitive period. But the system has now been lost.

Between Laodicea and the "Gate of Phrygia" lay a famous temple, the

home of the Phrygian god Men Karou, the Carian Men. This was the

original god of the valley. His temple was the centre of society and

administration, intercourse and trade, as well as of religion,--or,

rather, that primitive religion was a system of performing those duties

and purposes in the orderly way that the god approved and taught--for

the valley in which the Lycus and the Meander meet. A market was held

under the protection of his sacred name, beside or in his own precinct,

at which the people of the valley met and traded with strangers from a

distance; and this market continued to meet weekly in the same place

until about fifty years ago, when it was moved two or three miles north

to the new village called Serai-Keui.

In connection with this temple there grew up a famous school of

medicine. The school seems to have had its seat at Laodicea, and not at

the temple (which was about thirteen miles west of Laodicea and in the

territory of the city Attoudda); and the names of the leading

physicians of the school in the time of Augustus are mentioned on

Laodicean coins. These coins bear as type either the serpent-encircled

staff of Asklepios (Figure 10, chapter 14) or the figure of Zeus

(Figure 35). The Zeus who was worshipped at Laodicea was the Hellenised

form of the old native god. Men had been the king and father of his

people. When the new seat of Hellenic civilisation and speech was

founded in the valley, the people continued to worship the god whose

power was known to be supreme in the district, but they imparted to him

something of their own character and identified him with their own god

Zeus. Thus in Sardis and elsewhere the native god became Zeus Lydios,

"the Zeus whom the Lydians worship"; and the same impersonation in

outward appearance was worshipped at Laodicea (Figure 35), though with

a different name in place of Lydios. The Laodicean god was sometimes

called Aseis, perhaps a Semitic word meaning "powerful." If that be so,

it would imply that a body of settlers from Syria were brought into the

new city at its foundation, and that they had imparted an element of

their own character to the god who was worshipped in common by the

citizens generally.

Figure 35

Figure 35: The God of Laodicea

This Laodicean school of physicians followed the teaching "of

Herophilos (330-250 B.C.), who, on the principle that compound diseases

require compound medicines, began that strange system of heterogeneous

mixtures, some of which have only lately been expelled from our own

Pharmacopoeia."

The only medicine which is expressly quoted as Laodicean seems to be an

ointment for strengthening the ears made from the spice nard; Galen

mentions it as having been originally prepared only in Laodicea, though

by the second century after Christ it was made in other cities. But a

medicine for the eyes is also described as Phrygian: Galen describes it

as having the form of a tabloid made from the Phrygian stone, while

Aristotle speaks of it as Phrygian powder; the two are probably

identical, Aristotle describes the powder to which the tabloids were

reduced when they were to be applied to the eye. There can be no doubt

that this Phrygian powder came through Laodicea into general use among

the Greeks. Laodicea was the one famous medical centre in Phrygia; and

to the Greeks "Phrygian" often stood in place of "Laodicean"; thus, for

example, the famous orator of the second century, Polemon of Laodicea

was called simply "the Phrygian." The Phrygian stone was exported after

a time to all parts of the Greek and Roman world; and as the powder had

now become common, and was prepared in all the medical centres, Galen

does not mention it as being made in any special place; but Laodicea

was probably the oldest home of its use, so far as the Greeks knew.

Jews were an important element in the population of this district in

the Graeco-Roman age. In 62 B.C. the Roman governor of Asia refused to

permit the contributions, which were regularly sent by the Asian Jews

to Jerusalem, to go out of the country; and he seized the money that

had been collected, over twenty pound weight of gold at Laodicea and a

hundred pounds at Apameia of Phrygia. Such amounts prove that Laodicea

was the centre of a district in which a large, and Apameia of one in

which a very large, Jewish population dwelt. According to the

calculation of M. Th. Reinach, the gold seized at Laodicea would amount

to 15,000 silver drachms; and as the annual tax was two drachms, this

implies a population of 7,500 adult Jewish freemen in the district (to

which must be added women and children).

Of the Jews in Laodicea itself no memorial is preserved in the few

inscriptions that have survived; but at Hierapolis they are several

times mentioned, and the Hierapolitan Jews may be taken as occupying a

similar position to the Laodicean. There were Jews in Laodicean, which

was such an important centre for financial transactions (Josephus,

Ant., xiv., 10, 20); but there is no evidence whether they were

citizens or mere resident strangers (see chapter 12). If they were

citizens, they must have been one element in the population planted in

the city by Antiochus. Thus we can detect in the original Laodicea the

following elements, some Greek or Macedonian colonists, probably some

Syrians and also some Jews, in addition to the native Phrygian, Carian

and Lydian population of the district.

To these there were added later some new classes of citizens,

introduced by Eumenes II or by Attalus II. When Phrygia was given to

Eumenes by the Romans, in 189 B.C., it was soon found to be necessary

to strengthen the loyalty of the Seleucid colonies by introducing into

them bodies of new citizens devoted to the Pergamenian interests. It is

known that a Tribe Attalis was instituted in Laodicea; and we must

infer that it contained some or all of those new Pergamenian settlers,

who were enrolled in one or more Tribes. These later colonists were

probably in part Thracian and other mercenaries in the service of the

Pergamenian kings. Thus Laodicea and the Lycus Valley generally had a

very mixed population. No better example could be found of the mixed

Graeco-Asiatic cities described in chapter 11.

The Jews at Hierapolis were organised in trade-guilds, the

purple-dyers, the carpet-makers, and perhaps others. These guilds were

recognised by the city, so that money could be left to them by will.

"The Congregation of the Jews" was empowered to prosecute persons who

had violated the sanctity of a Jewish tomb, and to receive fines from

them on conviction; and it had its own public office, "the Archives of

the Jews," in which copies of legal documents executed by or for Jews

were deposited. These rights seem to imply that there was a body of

Jewish citizens of Hierapolis.

The Jews of Hierapolis were settled there by one of the Graeco-Asiatic

kings, for their congregation is in one inscription called "the

Settlement or Katoikia of the Jews," and the term Katoikoi was

appropriated specially to the colonists planted by those kings in their

new foundations.

Hierapolis seems to have preserved its pre-Hellenic character as a

Lydian city, in which there were no Tribes, but only the freer grouping

by Trade-guilds. The feasts of Unleavened Bread and of Pentecost are

mentioned in inscriptions; and by a quaint and characteristic mixture

of Greek and Jewish customs, money is left to the two Jewish guilds

(naturally, by Jews), the interest of which is to be distributed

annually on those feasts.

Laodicean Jews may be estimated on the analogy of the Hierapolitan Jews

(chapter 12).

Laodicea was, of course, a centre of the Imperial religion, and

received the Temple-Wardenship under Commodus, A.D. 180-191. Its wide

trading connection is attested by many "alliance-coins," in company

with Ephesus, Smyrna, Pergamum, most of the neighbouring cities (except

Colossae, which was too humble), and some distant cities like Nikomedia

and Perinthus. As a specimen Figure 36 shows an agreement between

Smyrna and Laodicea: the latter being represented by its god Zeus,

while Smyrna is represented by Zeus Akraios who sits with sceptre in

left hand, holding out on his right the goddess Victory.

Figure 36

Figure 36: The alliance of Laodicea and Smyrna

There is no city whose spirit and nature are more difficult to describe

than Laodicea. There are no extremes, and hardly any very strongly

marked features. But in this even balance lies its peculiar character.

Those were the qualities that contributed to make it essentially the

successful trading city, the city of bankers and finance, which could

adapt itself to the needs and wishes of others, ever pliable and

accommodating, full of the spirit of compromise.

The Lycus Valley, in a larger sense, is a deep cleft between two lofty

mountain ridges. On the south are Salbakos and Kadmos, both slightly

over 8,000 feet above the sea; on the north is a lower ridge over 5,000

feet in height. The ridges converge towards the east, and in the apex

lies the ascent to the plateau already described. Thus the valley is

triangular, the base being the opening on the Meander Valley. Low hills

occupy the southern half of this greater valley; these hills are

drained by the Kapros and the Asopus; and Laodicea stands on their

northern apex, about half-way between the two mountain-ridges. It is

the only one of the Seven Cities in which no relation is discernible

between the natural features that surround it and its part and place in

history.

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

Chapter 30: The Letter to the Church in Laodicea

These things saith the Amen, the faithful and true witness, the

beginning of the creation of God:

I know thy works, that thou are neither cold nor hot: I would thou

wert cold or hot. So because thou art lukewarm, and neither hot nor

cold, I will spew thee out of my mouth. Because thou sayest, I am

rich, and have gotten riches, and have need of nothing; and knowest

not that thou art the wretched one and miserable and poor and blind

and naked: I counsel thee to buy of me gold refined by fire, that

thou mayest become rich; and white garments, that thou mayest clothe

thyself, and that the shame of thy nakedness be not made manifest;

and eyesalve to anoint thine eyes, that thou mayest see.

The tone of the exordium is one of thoroughness, consistency from the

beginning of the creation of God to the end of all things, a

consistency that springs from faithfulness and truth. In the letter

itself those are the qualities in which Laodicea is lacking. The

Laodicean Church is neither one thing nor another. It is given to

compromise. It cannot thoroughly reject the temptations and allurements

of the world. And therefore it shall be rejected absolutely and

inexorably by Him whose faithfulness and truth reject all

half-heartedness and compromise.

The characteristics described in the previous chapter are insufficient

to give a clear idea of the special and distinctive character of

Laodicea as a city. There is a want of definiteness and individuality

about them. They do not set before us the picture of a city

recognisable in itself and distinguishable from other cities. But may

not this be in itself a distinction? Of the Seven Cities Laodicea is

the one which is least determined in character, the one of which the

outline is least clearly and sharply defined in history. In the special

duties imposed on it as the end and aim of its foundation, to guard a

road and gateway, and to be a missionary of Greek language and culture

in the Phrygian land, it proved unsuccessful. The one respect in which

it stands forth pre-eminent is that it is the adaptable city, able to

suit itself to the needs of others, because it has no strongly

pronounced character of its own. Such a nature would be suited for the

successful commercial city, which it was. But such a nature would least

commend the city to St. John. Laodicea must appear to him undecided,

devoid of initiative, pliable, irresolute, and unsatisfactory.

The ordinary historian would probably not condemn the spirit of

Laodicea so strenuously as St. John did. In the tendency of the

Laodiceans towards a policy of compromise he would probably see a

tendency towards toleration and allowance, which indicated a certain

sound practical sense, and showed that the various constituents of the

population of Laodicea were well mixed and evenly balanced. He would

regard its somewhat featureless character and its easy regular

development as proving that it was a happy and well-ordered city, in

whose constitution "the elements were kindlier mixed" than in any other

city of Asia. He would consider probably that its success as a

commercial city was the just reward of the strong common-sense which

characterised its people. St. John, however, was not one of those who

regarded a successful career in trade and money-making as the best

proof of the higher qualities of citizenship. The very characteristics

which made Laodicea a well-ordered, energetic and pushing centre of

trade, seemed to him to evince a coldness of nature that was fatal to

the highest side of human character, the spirit of self-sacrifice and

enthusiasm.

An account which has been given elsewhere of the development of

Christianity in Eumeneia, a city in the Laodicean circuit where

Christian inscriptions are specially numerous, may be quoted here as an

illustration of the probable character of the whole district of

Laodicea. The evidence proves that Eumeneia was to a large extent a

Christian city in the third century; and there is considerable

probability that Eumeneia was the city whose fate is recorded by

Eusebius and Lactantius, two excellent authorities, practically

contemporaries of the event. In this city people and magistrates alike

were Christian in the early years of the fourth century. During the

last great persecution, A.D. 303-313, the population, when threatened,

collected at the Church (which was in itself a defiance of the Imperial

orders). They were surrounded by a ring of soldiers, and the usual

alternative was offered, compliance or death. In ordinary

circumstances, doubtless, some or even many of them would have lacked

the boldness to choose death; but it lies in human nature that the

general spirit of a crowd exercises a powerful influence on the

individuals who compose it; and even those who, taken singly, might

have compromised with their conscience, and shrunk from a terrible

death, accepted it when inspired with the courage of the whole body.

The entire people was burned with the church; and they died "calling

upon the God over all." Eusebius writes as an epitaph over their ashes

words that read like a memory of the formula by which the Christian

character of the epitaphs on the tombs of their predecessors during the

third century has been recognised.

Those inscriptions, by which we trace the character of that Christian

city about A.D. 240-300, convey the impression that there was no

violent break between Greek and Christian culture in Eumeneia, as it

existed in that period. There is no sign of bitterness. The monuments

place before us a picture of rich and generous development, of

concession, and of liberality, through which people of diverse thought

were practically reconciled in a single society; they exemplify the

accommodation of two hostile religions in a peaceful and orderly city.

This was impossible for the Christians without some sacrifice of strict

principle to the exigencies of the situation and the demands of the

Imperial government. The spirit of accommodation and even of compromise

must have been strong in Eumeneia.

The result has been told: it was, first, the practically universal

triumph of Christianity in the city, and thereafter the extermination

of the Christian population in a great massacre. In their death no

signs can be detected of the spirit of compromise which they had showed

in practical matters during their life.

In view of these facts about Eumeneia, and a somewhat similar history

in Apameia, another city of the Laodicean circuit, we may fairly regard

the spirit of compromise, which is stigmatised in the Laodicean letter,

as having been common to the district as a whole and as capable of

showing at need a finer side than is recognised in the letter.

The Laodicean letter is the only one in which we have recognised the

applicability of the letter to the district or circuit which was

connected with the city. There seemed always to the Greek mind to be a

certain homogeneity of spirit characterising Phrygia as a whole, which

they regarded with some contempt as an indication of lower

intelligence, contrasted with the strong development of individual

character in the Greek cities. A tendency to compromise in religion

was, indeed, never regarded as characteristic of the Phrygian spirit,

which was considered prone to excess in religious devotion: the

extremest examples of horrible actions under the stimulus of religion,

such as self-mutilation, were associated in the ancient mind with

Phrygia. But the tendency to excess inevitably results in failure to

reach even the mean. The Church blamed the extravagant Phrygian

provocation of martyrdom, because frequently overstrained human nature

failed in the supreme test, and the would-be martyr, overconfident in

his powers, became a renegade in the hour of trial.

It is characteristic of a city devoted to commercial interest and the

material side of life, that the Church of Laodicea is entirely

self-satisfied. It says, as the city said in A.D. 60, when it recovered

its prosperity after the great earthquake without any of that help

which the Imperial government was generally ready to bestow, and which

the greatest cities of Asia had always been ready to accept, "I have

grown rich, and have need of nothing." It has never seen its real

condition: it is poor and blind and naked.

There is only one way open to it. It must cease to trust to itself. It

must recognise that it is poor, and seek riches where the true riches

can be found. Its banks and its wealthy money changers can give it only

false money; but the Author can sell it "gold refined by fire." He does

not give this gold for nothing: it must be bought with a price, the

price of suffering and truth, fidelity and martyrdom.

The Church must recognise that it is naked, and seek to be clad. Its

manufacturers cannot help it with their fine glossy black and violet

garments, which they sell and export to the whole world. Only white

garments, such as the faithful in Sardis wear, will be of any use to

cover their shame; and those are sold only by the Author. They too must

be bought with a price.

The Laodicean Church must also learn that it is blind, but yet not

incurably blind. It is suffering from disease, and needs medical

treatment. But the physicians of its famous medical school can do

nothing for it. The tabloids which they prescribe, and which are now

used all over the civilised world, to reduce to powder and smear on the

eyes, will be useless for this kind of ophthalmia. The Laodiceans must

buy the tabloid from the Author himself, at the price of suffering and

steadfastness.

The description of the medicine here mentioned is obscured by a

mistranslation. It was not an ointment, but a kollyrium, which had the

form of small cylinders compounded of various ingredients, including

some mineral elements, and was used either by simple application or by

reduction to a powder to be smeared on the part. The term used by St.

John is the same that Galen uses to describe the preparation of the

Phrygian stone employed to strengthen weak eyes.

The Laodicean Church is the only one which is absolutely and wholly

condemned. Not even a faithful remnant is left, such as even in Sardis,

the dead Church, kept itself pure and white. No exception is allowed in

Laodicea: advice is given, but there is no appearance that it will be

taken. The weakness of the city will become apparent in the testing.

In the rest of the letter there is no recognisable allusion to the

character or circumstances of an individual Church. The conclusion is

rather an epilogue to the Seven Letters, treated as a literary whole,

than an integral part of the Laodicean letter.

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

Chapter 31: Epilogue

As many as I love, I reprove and chasten: be zealous therefore, and

repent. Behold, I stand at the door and knock: if any man hear my

voice and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with

him, and he with me.

He that overcometh, I will give to him to sit down with me in my

throne, as I also overcame, and sat down with my Father in his

throne.

He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith to the

churches.

The first sentence in what we take to be an epilogue might quite well

be regarded as part of the Laodicean letter. The words seem at first to

express naturally the reaction from the sharp censure conveyed in the

preceding sentences. But, as we read on, we become conscious that all

reference to the Laodiceans has ceased, and that the writer is drifting

farther and farther away from them. The final promise has no apparent

relation to their situation and character.

Now, when it is remembered that the Seven Letters were not real

letters, intended to be sent separately to Seven Churches, but form one

literary composition, it becomes evident that an epilogue to the whole

is needed, and that this is the epilogue. One might hesitate where the

Laodicean letter ends and the epilogue to the Seven Letters begins. The

writer passes almost insensibly from the one to the other. But it seems

best to suppose that the epilogue begins at the point where clear

reference to the circumstances and nature of Laodicea ceases. And when

the transition is placed here a difficulty is eliminated. After the

extremely sharp condemnation of Laodicea, it seems hardly consistent to

give it the honour which is awarded to the true and courageous Church

of Philadelphia alone among the Seven, and to rank it among those whom

the Author loves. We can understand why Philadelphia, the true city,

the missionary Church, in danger even yet ever enduring, should receive

that honourable mention; but we cannot understand why Philadelphia and

Laodicea should be the only two that receive it.

But, as part of the epilogue, this first sentence unites all the Seven

Churches and the entire Church of Christ in one loving waning: the

Seven Letters have conveyed much reproof and chastisement, but the

Author reproves and chastens those whom he loves. The admirable

suitability of the remainder as an epilogue is a matter of expository

interpretation rather than of the historical study at which the present

book has aimed.

In a few words the historical epilogue to this historical study is

summed up.

Among the Seven Churches two only are condemned absolutely and without

hope of pardon: Sardis is dead: Laodicea is rejected. And among the

Seven Cities two only are at the present day absolutely deserted and

uninhabited, Sardis and Laodicea. Two Churches only are praised in an

unreserved, hearty, and loving way, Smyrna and Philadelphia. And two

cities have enjoyed and earned the glory of being the champions of

Christianity in the centuries of war that ended in the Turkish

conquest, the last cities to yield long after all others had succumbed

Smyrna and Philadelphia. Other two Churches are treated with mingled

praise and blame, though on the whole the praise outweighs the blame;

for their faith, steadfastness, works, love, service and patience are

heartily praised, though they have become tainted with the false

Nicolaitan principles. These are Pergamum and Thyatira, both of which

still exist as flourishing towns. One church alone shall be moved from

its place; and Ephesus was moved to a site about three kilometres

distant, where it continued an important city until comparatively

recent time, though now it has sunk to an insignificant village.
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