

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

## Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

---

Master of Sacred Theology Thesis

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

---

5-1-1946

### Problems in the Pauline Chronology

Christian Adam

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/stm>



Part of the [History of Christianity Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Adam, Christian, "Problems in the Pauline Chronology" (1946). *Master of Sacred Theology Thesis*. 405.  
<https://scholar.csl.edu/stm/405>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master of Sacred Theology Thesis by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact [seitzw@csl.edu](mailto:seitzw@csl.edu).

**PROBLEMS IN  
THE PAULINE CHRONOLOGY**

**A Thesis Presented to  
The Faculty of Concordia Seminary  
Department of New Testament Theology**

---

**In Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
of Master of Sacred Theology**

---

**by  
CHRISTIAN ADAM  
January 1946**

Approved by W. Lindt  
W. B. Brewster

40231

52390

BV  
4070  
C69  
M3  
1946  
NO.2  
C.2

52390

Table of Contents:

Chapter I. Preliminary Considerations	I
Chapter II. Fixing of Pivotal Dates	4
Chapter III. Birth and Life up to Conversion	16
Chapter IV. Conversion and Years of Obscurity	21
Chapter V. Coming to Antióch to Beginning of First Missionary Journey	29
Chapter VI. First Missionary Journey	35
Chapter VII. The Jerusalem Council	41
Chapter VIII. Second Missionary Journey	45
Chapter IX. Third Missionary Journey	60
Chapter X. Imprisonment at Jerusalem, Caesarea, and Rome	81
Chapter XI. Last Years	105

## Our Chronological Scheme

Conversion	32
In Arabia(Gal.I,I7)	32-34
First visit to Jerusalem(Gal.I,I8)	34
In the regions of Syria and Cilicia(Gal.I,2I)	34-44
To Antioch	44
Second visit to Jerusalem,famine visit(Gal.2,I)	45
Beginning of first missionary journey	spring of 46
Return to Antioch	summer or fall of 48
Peter's visit to Antioch(Gal.2,IIf)	early in 49
Third visit to Jerusalem,Jerusalem Council	early in 49
Beginning of second missionary journey	spring of 49
In Galatia,through Asia,in Macedonia,and to Athens	49
Arrival at Corinth	early in 50
I Thessalonians(from Corinth)	early in 50
2 Thessalonians(from Corinth)	summer of 50
Departure from Corinth	February of 52
To Ephesus,Jerusalem-fourth visit,and return to Antioch	spring and early summer of 52
Galatians(from Antioch)	summer of 52
Beginning of third missionary journey	spring of 53
Arrival at Ephesus	October of 53
I Corinthians(from Ephesus)	fall of 55
Departure from Ephesus	January of 56
2 Corinthians(from Philippi)	spring of 56
In Macedonia and Illyricum(Rom.I5,I9)	summer and fall of 56

At Corinth	winter of 56-57
Romans(from Corinth)	early in 57
Return to Jerusalem-fifth visit, arrest	spring of 57
Prisoner at Caesarea	early summer of 57 to late summer of 59
Journey to Rome	late summer of 59 to spring of 60
Prisoner at Rome	spring of 60 to spring of 62
Philemon, Colossians, Ephesians(from Rome)	summer of 61
Philippians(from Rome)	early in 62
In the East	spring of 62 to spring of 63
Journey to Spain	spring of 63 to 65
Final labors in the East	65 to 67
I Timothy(from Crete)	early summer of 66
Titus(unknown)	late summer of 66
2 Timothy(from Rome)	late in 67
Martyrdom	late in 67 or early in 68

Other Chronological Schemes

	<i>N. W. Ramsey</i>	<i>International Standard Bible Encyclopedia</i>	<i>P. S. Alexander</i>	<i>H. Rendell</i>	<i>N. S. Gallman</i>
Conversion	32	35	32 or 33	32	36
First visit to Jerusalem	34		35 or 36	35	38
To Antioch	43		43	43	42, 43
Second visit to Jerusalem, famine visit	45 or 46		44 or 45	46	45, 46
First missionary journey	<del>46 to 48</del> 47 to 49	45 to 49	46 to 48	47 to 48	47 to 49
Third visit to Jerusalem, Jerusalem Council	49 or 50	50	49	48 or 49	50
Second missionary journey	50 to 53	50 to 53	49 to 52	49 or 50 to 51	50 to 53
Third missionary journey	53 to 57	54 to 58	53 to 58	52 to 56	53 to 57
Imprisonment at Caesarea	57 to 59	58 to 60	58 to 60	56 to 58	57 to 59
Imprisonment at Rome	60 to 62	61 to 63	61 to 63	59 to 61	60 to 62
Later journeys	62 to 66	64 to 67	63 to 66	61 to 64	63 to 66
Martyrdom	67	67 or 68	67 or 68	65	66 or 70

## Chapter I. Preliminary Considerations.

From a child on we have been fascinated by the life of Paul. The more we heard of the great apostle, the more we desired to learn the complete story of his life. Our interest in the apostle to the Gentiles became intensified during our student days, as we became more closely acquainted with his life and labors. Even long before our Seminary days he became to us the most interesting of all biblical characters and our personal hero. This devotion to Paul has continued unabated during the years that we have now served in the ministry. As the intrepid confessor, the zealous missionary, and the loving pastor he has always been an example and an inspiration to us in our ministry.

During the years we have learned to know the life and the letters of the Lord's chief apostle with ever increasing intensity. Our personal library contains several lives of Paul, which are read at our own cherished volumes. We have more than once presented the biography of Paul in Bible class instruction. We have written introductory studies to most of his epistles. We have read the epistles frequently and have studied them with more or less thoroughness. Yet, despite all the assiduous attention which we have given to Paul and his epistles, we have felt that there was still something lacking in our Pauline studies—the unification of all of the biographical data available into one complete picture, and the linking of this data with a definite chronology. While we know, of course, that a Pauline chronology of the nature of one that would be found in a life of Franklin or of Lincoln was out of the question, yet the establishment of even a fragmentary and a relative chronology challenged us. We know, of course, that many such chronological schemes of Paul's life have been drawn up by scholars. But a cursory survey of some of the leading chronologies reveals the marked disagreement that exists among the compilers. This observation made us eager to examine the evidence and to study the problems in the Pauline chronology. We considered this a splendid subject for this our thesis.

A study of problems in the Pauline chronology cannot but be of the greatest benefit to the student. The fixing of even but a relative chronology will serve as nothing else can for the purpose of orientation. The determination of specific dates will aid greatly in placing and remembering the various events in the apostle's career. It is also a matter of great importance to know just when the various epistles were written by Paul. We shall endeavor, then, not only to fix pivotal dates for Paul's life, but shall also attempt to trace his exact movements year by year from his conversion on, the time of his writing his epistles being a matter of prime concern.

At this point we should record the bibliopathy which has guided us in our work. It is truly an immense literature that has grown up about St. Paul. In the file drawers of the Chicago Public Library we have found listed the titles of scores of books dealing with the apostle. Dr. Dalman in his "Paul" lists a bibliography of more than 300 books. And these are but a portion of all that have been written in modern times. From the large number of volumes available, we have selected principally the works of eminent scholars in the field, whose names have been especially recommended to us. But neither did we want to overlook the

studies of able writers of our own Church who have published studies on this subject. Accordingly, we list the following:

### Bibliography

- Abbe (The) Constant Foudré.—The Last Years of St. Paul  
 Ernst, F.—The Apostle of the Gentiles, in the Father League Messenger, Nov., 1936 to Aug.—Sept., 1938  
 Conybeare, W. J., and Howson, J. S.—The Life and Epistles of the Apostle Paul  
 Williams, W.—Paul  
 Davis, J. D.—A Dictionary of the Bible  
 Selwyn, A.—Paul  
 Lumsden, G. S.—St. Paul's Ephesian Ministry  
 Richards, J.—St. Paul  
 Farrer, F. S.—The Life and Work of St. Paul (two volumes)  
 Hastings, V.—Dictionary of the Bible  
 Hayes, E. A.—Paul and His Epistles  
 International (The) Standard Bible Encyclopedia  
 Joselyn, F.—Inquisition of the Jews  
 Probstman, F. S.—The New Testament in the Light of a Believer's Research  
 Hanson, R. L.—Pauline and Other Studies  
 Ransley, G. C.—St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen  
 Robinson, S. S.—The Life of Paul

New Testament chronology, as ancient chronology in general, is uncertain. In profane history and debate of antiquity are known to the accurate scholar to be mere approximations, but they are accepted for lack of more accurate chronological information. Dates on coins or inscriptions, fixing the number of years in a certain era, are generally the surest form of evidence in determining a chronology, but even such data can be entirely relied upon, for the era itself has to be fixed, and this can often not be done with entire certainty. The life of Paul partakes of the uncertainty that attends with all ancient chronology. And yet, and therein is the real reason, the only dates in the life of Paul can be dated with precision and certainty rare in ancient history. As will be seen, we shall be able to fix a few dates in the middle of Paul's life with all reasonable certainty, and that to the very year. On the basis of these dates we shall be enabled to build up a reliable chronology for the rest of his public life, here the greatest possible error being no more than placing of some of the epistles into the chronological scheme. It is surprising to note that whereas formerly there was a bewildering variety of opinion and assertion among scholars in regard to the sequence of events in Paul's life, there is now an increasing agreement on the dating of leading events. Yet it still remains true what Ransley writes: "No man can as yet prove his own opinion about chronology and order in the New Testament to the satisfaction of other scholars." The sources of information which we have on the life of Paul are in the Scriptures and consist of the Book of Acts and biographical references in the thirteen epistles that we have from the pen of Paul. Luke, the author of the Book of Acts and a companion of Paul, by his own claim wrote both the Gospel and the Acts from the historical viewpoint, Luke I, 1-4; Acts I, 1. And here we have inspired history, and therefore genuine and trustworthy history. Having set forth in the Gospel "all that Jesus began both to do and teach," he narrates in Acts all that Jesus continued to do through his apostles. His purpose in Acts is "to give a panoramic view of the growth and advance of Christianity from the little circle in Jerusalem to the climax in Paul's residence in Rome, the capital of the world". (Robinson). ~~Writing laboriously by hand as we did in those days, Luke did not find it feasible to give a complete account of these all important events, but had to omit~~



in Paul's residence in Rome, the capital of the world." (Robinson). Writing laboriously by hand as men did in those days, Luke did not find it feasible to give a complete account of those all-important events, but had to omit many things and greatly abbreviate others. We cannot doubt, for instance, that speeches recorded by him, which we can read in two or three minutes, occupied half an hour to an hour. And so Luke's historical narrative is also not complete. There are evident gaps in the record here and there. These may be partly occasioned by the lack of source information, for, as in Luke he employed earlier reports of eye-witnesses, so undoubtedly also in Acts. And we must not lose sight of the fact that Luke did not intend to write a history of sacred events of the type of the work of Josephus and other histories of antiquity. To develop his theme as expressed by Acts I, 8 he merely selected certain historical ~~events~~, and with that limited survey of early Christian history we shall have to content ourselves.

The picture of Paul's life gains appreciably in richness when we draw upon the historical references which we find in his own epistles. The epistles of Paul are so autobiographical in content. The frequent mention which he makes of his movements and plans helps us to fill in the gaps which we find in Acts. There are, for instance, in Galatians I and II references to his activities during the period between his conversion and his going to Antioch which at least slightly draw back the veil from this otherwise unknown period.

But even when we combine every bit of information which we can glean from the epistles with the narrative of Acts, we still do not have a continuous narrative of the apostle's life. That life is only revealed to us at intervals during its later period. Paul lived altogether about sixty-five years. The first half of his life, the period before his conversion, lies largely in obscurity. Paul's missionary career covered approximately the last thirty years of his life. About the first ten years of this period, however, he spent in retirement and obscurity in Arabia, Syria, and Cilicia, and of his activities during this time we know next to nothing. Accordingly, it is only of the last twenty years of the apostle's life that we have detailed information. His life, then, is like a manuscript of which the beginning has been irretrievably lost. And even of that portion which is known to us, how incomplete it is! That fact is abundantly brought home when we read that "Iliad of woe", the famous passage, 2 Cor. XI, 24-33, where Paul writes a summary sketch of what he had done and suffered. That enumeration was given some ten years before the apostle's end, and yet of the specific trials and sufferings mentioned no less than eleven are not once alluded to in the Acts. And even the entire classes of perils to which Paul alludes are passed over without notice by Luke. These tribulations, too, are passed over so generally and so unchronologically in the epistles that scarcely one of them can be assigned to its due order in St. Paul's biography. Any sketch of Paul's life must, then, of necessity be but fragmentary. And yet it need not for that reason be lacking in interest and inspiration. A biography which presents but the highlights in the career of a great man is more useful than one which presents the petty circumstances of his daily life. We know a man best when we see him at the greatest and noblest activity of his career. And so when Paul stands before us as the inspired and highly endowed apostle of the Lord, and when we see him laboring with a holy zeal to carry the torch of the Gospel farther and farther into the stronghold of heathenism, we see him as he stands in the light of sacred history, and seeing him thus, we have seen enough.

Aside from the Scriptural sources, there are none that we have for our task. We might have expected early Christian writers to have gathered and recorded

considerable information on Paul's life and work. But such is not the case. The Apostolic Fathers and the Apologists mention his name but rarely, and these occasional reference to the great apostle do not add to our historical knowledge. The early Christian writers, it seems, were so occupied with combating heathenism, Judaism, and Gnosticism on the one hand, and were so harassed by persecution on the other, that matters of scholarship and history that did not have a direct bearing on the propagation and defense of the faith had little attraction for them. Even Clement of Rome, who lived in the city where Paul suffered martyrdom but thirty-five years after that event (about the year 100), did not think it necessary to give us any glimpses of Paul in his still extant letter to the Corinthians. And Eusebius, writing his church history as he did after the persecutions had ceased, does not furnish us much information of Paul which is not found in the New Testament. Non-Christian men of letters of Paul's age took no notice whatever of him, so far as we know. They no doubt regarded him as the philosophers of Athens did, as nothing but a "babbling" (Acts 17, 18). We may certainly regret that both Josephus and Tacitus have not left us a word about their most eminent contemporary.

Confined, then, as we are to the New Testament sources of information, our task is to gather whatever definite chronological indications are found in the Acts and the Epistles and frame them into a system. When it comes to dating the leading events in the life of Paul, we can do that by connecting the sacred narrative to whatever events in secular history it refers. To be sure, there are but a few points where the two can be linked with positive and precise certainty, but these few points of contact will enable us to develop and date our chronology by working backwards and forwards. This, then, leads us to the next chapter:-

Chapter II. Fixing of Pivotal Dates. / In order to gain an overview of this entire period of history with which we are concerned, we append the following

Table of Contemporary Rulers

Emperors	Procurators of Judaea	Other Rulers
14 Tiberius (sole em.)		(Philip was tetrarch of Iturea and Trachonitis till his death in 33)
15	Valerius Gratus	(Herod was tetrarch of Galilee and Peraea till his banishment in 39)
37 Caligula (Mar. 16)	Pontius Pilate Marullus	Herod Agrippa I, King of Iturea, Trachonitis, and Lysania Dominion extended over Galilee
39		
41 Claudius (Jan. 24)	No procurator	Dominion extended over Judaea and Samaria
42		Death of Herod Agrippa I (in Aug.)
44	Cuspius Fadus	
46	Tiberias Alexander	
48	Vespasianus of Galilee and Claudius Felix of Samaria and Judaea	
49		Herod Agrippa II, King of Chalcis Dominion transferred to Gaulonitis, Batanea, Trachonitis, Abilene
52	Claudius Felix of Galilee	
54 Nero (Oct. 13)	Procius Festus Albinus	
59	Cassius Florus	
68		
68	Suicide of Nero-Calpa	

On this table of rulers there are two dates which we must accept only tentatively at the outset, those of Felix and Festus. The date of the recall of Felix and of the accession of Festus in particular is one of the most important dates for determining our chronological scheme. All other dates in the table are generally accepted as accurate. We proceed now to a consideration of our first pivotal date, that of:

### The Occupation of Damascus by Aretas.

In 2 Cor. XI, 32-33 we have that remarkable passage in which Paul states that the city of Damascus was kept with a garrison of king Aretas at the time when he was let down the wall in a basket. This occupation of Damascus by Aretas is nowhere else mentioned in history. It is interesting to note, though, that Roman coins of Damascus exist from the time of Augustus, Tiberias, and Nero, but not from the reigns of Caligula and Claudius. We have, moreover, historical evidence which makes it likely that such an occupation occurred. This Aretas was king of Arabia and reigned at Petra, the desert metropolis southeast of the Dead Sea. Herod Antipas became his son-in-law. When Herod became unfaithful to the daughter of the Arabian king by his shameful attachment to his brother Philip's wife, war ensued. Aretas totally defeated Herod's army in 36 A. D. The Jews generally sympathized with Aretas and declared that Herod's defeat was a judgment for the murder of John the Baptist. Herod wrote to Rome, and Vitellius, the legate of Syria, was ordered to assist him. Vitellius was marching from Antioch through Judaea toward Petra when he heard of the death of Tiberias (A. D. 37), whereupon he ceased the expedition. The relations of the neighboring powers must have been unsettled for several years and the falling of a rich border-town like Damascus from the hands of the Romans into those of Aretas would not be improbable. But some explain the occupation of Damascus by Aretas differently. They say that it is likely that Caligula, who banished Herod Antipas and in many ways contradicted the policies of his predecessor, assigned the city of Damascus to Herod as a free gift. Either supposition would explain Paul's passage that the city was garrisoned by the ethnarch of Aretas at the time of his escape. If we adopt the first assumption, we could state that Paul's escape took place about 35 or 36 A. D. If we assume that Damascus was given over to Aretas as a gift, then the escape would have occurred in 37 or 38 A. D. Paul's escape from Damascus cannot, of course, be made a fixed point of absolute chronology, but it is useful insofar as it marks the approximate time of a turning point in his life. Paul's escape is either coincident with his conversion, which occurred when he first went to Damascus, or it occurred at his second visit to Damascus some three years later, Gal. I, 18. This problem we shall take up later. Our next pivotal point is:

### The Death of Herod Agrippa I.

Here we pass from the realm of uncertainty into that of absolute certainty. All historians agree that Herod Agrippa I died in the year 44 A. D. It would be well here to briefly trace his career. Luke in Acts 12 calls him Herod the king. Josephus calls him Agrippa. Both names are now usually combined. This Herod was the grandson of Herod the Great. Educated in Rome with Claudius, he also ingratiated himself with Caius, who became the emperor Caligula. For rash words in favor of Caius, Tiberias cast him into prison. But six months later Caligula became emperor and appointed Agrippa to be king of the Tetrarchy of his late uncle Philip, and a couple of years later, upon the banishment of Herod the tetrarch, also assigned him his territory. With the accession of Claudius Judaea was also given to him, so that the king ruled over the wide territory that had been governed by his

grandfather. It was "about that time", when Herod was at the height of his power, that he began to persecute the church, killing James the brother of John and imprisoning Peter, Acts 12, 1-19. But he was not long spared to seek popularity among the Jews in this way. At Caesarea, immediately after he had accepted divine honor, he was smitten by God's angel and soon was miserably eaten up by worms and died, Acts 12, 20-23. Josephus also records his horrible end, mentioning games that were held, these being most likely held in honor of the return of Claudius from Britain in 44. His death occurred in Aug. of the year 44. The king left four children, three of whom are mentioned in Scriptures, Agrippa, Bernice, and Drusilla.

Here, then, we have one of those lines of intersection between the sacred history and world history. This year, 44 A. D., is the most reliable chronological pivot for the apostolic history. Using this year as a starting point, we can roughly trace Paul's steps, for we note from Acts 12, 24-25 that the return of Saul and Barnabas from Jerusalem, the famine visit, evidently connects rather closely with Herod's death. But here again, due to the uncertainty of the exact time between the two events, we can only roughly say that this return occurred about in the year 44 or 45. But the next pivotal date will help us to fix this return more firmly, that of

#### The Famine Under Claudius

We have the account of the famine and of the relief expedition of Barnabas and Saul in Acts 11, 27-30. Then in Acts 12, 24-25 we have the conclusion of the account. In the midst of this narrative Luke digresses to relate the state of the Church at Jerusalem immediately before and after the death of Herod Agrippa, Acts 12, 1-24. From 12, 1 we note that the previously mentioned famine occurred in fairly close proximity to Herod's persecution and death—"about that time". But it must not be supposed that they were concurrent. Some suppose that Luke conceives of the events of chapter 12 as happening while Barnabas and Saul were in Jerusalem. To support this view, they have to place the famine in the year 44, the same as that of Herod's death. The only authority for doing so is Orosius, who, as we shall see, was evidently in error by a year in this period of his chronology. A careful survey of the narrative of Acts reveals that Luke indicates that Barnabas and Saul went up to Jerusalem some short time after the death of Herod Agrippa. Luke first records the prophecy of Agabus, which evidently occurred about a year before the famine. For it was on the strength of this prophecy that the Christians began to gather funds for the relief of their brethren in Jerusalem. The collection of an ample fund must have taken some time, a full year we hold. The manner of supplying relief must, of course, have been by purchasing and distributing corn. Now it must have taken some time for extra shipments of grain to be brought in from such countries as were not affected by the famine. Nor is it precluded to suppose that Barnabas and Saul remained at Jerusalem for quite a while and superintended the purchase and distribution of food to emphasize to the poor but proud Jews in Jerusalem the bond of fellowship which existed between them and their Antiochian brethren. This is suggested by the author, who does not fail to assure us that the two delegates "fulfilled their ministry" before they returned to Antioch. We note that Luke, before describing the actual distribution of relief in Jerusalem first digresses to tell about that which occurred near the time when Agabus prophesied and then at last he records the execution of the relief plan and the return of the delegates to their own city. As thus interpreted, Luke's chronology harmonizes well with Josephus.

Josephus speaks of the famine having occurred during the government of the procurators Cuspius and Tiberias Alexander. Now, Cuspius Fadus was sent as procurator from Rome on the death of Herod Agrippa I, who had ruled also over Judaea and Samaria, this in the year 44. He was succeeded in 46 by Tiberias Alexander. Since Josephus states (Ant. XX, 5, 2) that the famine raged under both, we are led to think of a two-year period, the years 45 and 46. It is probable that in 45 the harvest was poor and provisions grew very scarce and that in 46 the harvest failed again, which brought even more acute famine. Josephus also relates (Ant. XX, 2, 6) that under Fadus Queen Helena, the mother of Isates, king of Adiabene, a Jewish proselyte, came to Jerusalem, most likely in 45. She bought corn from Egypt and figs from Cyprus and distributed them to the needy in Jerusalem. She had a palace there and stayed through the famine. That the famine could not have occurred in 44 is attested by Acts 12, 20 which states that the motive of the Phoenicians in making peace was that their country was supplied with food from Judaea—a situation which could not have existed if there had been famine in Judaea. To be sure, Orosius (VII, 6) places the famine in the fourth year of Claudius, which began Jan, 25, 44. Concerning this dating by Orosius we quote Hensley's "St. Paul the Traveller", p. 68: "But Orosius's dates at this point are put one year too early owing to a mistake in adapting to Claudius's years a series of events arranged in his authority according to a different system of chronology; this kind of mistake is known to have been frequently made by ancient chroniclers, and is proved in Orosius's case by the fact that he assigns to the tenth year of Claudius a famine at Rome which Tacitus (Ann. XII, 43) places in A. D. 51. We therefore take Orosius as an authority for dating the commencement of the famine in 45." So from the evidence which we have, we conclude that the famine occurred either in 45 or in 46, or, what is more probable, that it existed over both 45 and 46. In which of these two years Paul's visit to Jerusalem occurred and over how long a period of time it extended we have no way of knowing.

#### The Expulsion of the Jews from Rome.

In Acts 18, 2 we have another historical note which connects the sacred history with the secular. The statement is made that Aquila and Priscilla were lately come from Italy (to Corinth), and the significant explanation is given: "Because that Claudius had commanded all Jews to depart from Rome." First a few words on the reason for the expulsion decree. During the reign of Claudius the relations of Judaea to Rome became more and more unsettled. Suetonius reports (Claudius 25) that Claudius drove the Jews from Rome because they were incessantly raising tumults at the instigation of a certain Chrestus. Much has been written concerning this statement of the biographer of the Caesars. Some have held that there really was a Jew by the name of Chrestus who had excited political disturbances. Others hold that the name was used by mistake for Christus. It is possible that these incessant riots may have arisen in disputes about the Messiah. We know that Christianity was very early introduced into Rome, and that wherever it was introduced, Jewish tumults followed. But whatever the reason of the riots, the Jews were ordered to leave Rome. Yet the decree does not seem to have been strictly enforced, for Dion Cassius corrects Suetonius, who says that the Jews were so numerous that they could not be expelled without danger, and that Claudius therefore contented himself with closing their synagogues (Dion IX, 6). So the measure of Claudius soon became a dead letter. But among those who left Rome because of the decree were Aquila and Priscilla. This may not have entailed any extreme hardship for them since the nature of their trade was such that they could successfully carry it on in any

large city. From Rom. 16, 3-5 we note that this worthy Christian couple had gone to Rome from Ephesus (where they had moved from Corinth), while in 2 Tim. III, 19 it is indicated that they were again in Ephesus. The probable explanation is that they had returned to Rome merely to wind up their affairs.

Now, as to the time of the expulsion of the Jews from Rome and the subsequent coming of Paul to Corinth. Basing his remarks on an account of Josephus which has been lost, Orosius states (VII, 6, 15) that the edict occurred in Claudius's ninth year (41 was his first year, beginning with Jan. 25th), which would be the year 49. Concerning this date of Orosius Ramsay writes (in St. Paul the Traveller and Roman Citizen, p. 234): "I believe that this date is a year wrong, like that of the famine (p. 63) and for the same reason: the edict must be placed in the end of 50, and thus Aquila arrived in Corinth six or seven months before Paul came in Sept., 51." In opposition to this view DeLantern writes in his "Paul", p. 233: "Ramsay, it is true, maintains that Orosius is always a year behind in his chronology of Claudius; but that does not dispose of the remarkable coincidence between our calculation (in the matter of dating the beginning of the proconsulship of Gallio in the summer of 51) and Orosius, for in this case Orosius is giving not his own chronology but that of his authority, 'Josephus', and (this is very important to observe) without attaching such importance to Josephus. In our texts of Flavius Josephus the statement, it must be admitted, is wanting. It is possible that Orosius means some other 'Josephus', or that he has made a mistake in the name of his authority; but the statement for which he does not profess any particular respect 'cannot be his own invention' (Schuerer); that I take to be obvious." So here we have the years 49 and 50 given on the basis of Orosius by two great scholars. Which is more apt to be correct? We prefer to take the year 49 because it stands in better relation to the proconsulship of Gallio, which can now be very definitely determined. On the basis of the expulsion of the Jews from Rome in 49 the time of Paul's entry into Corinth can readily be fixed. Since this was an expulsion, it is evident that Aquila and Priscilla made the removal from Rome to Corinth in short time, quite likely by fall (in winter navigation was impossible). Since Paul entered their house when they had "lately" come from Rome, his entrance into Corinth occurred the early part of the year 50. A little more time, however, could be allowed for this sequence of events so that his coming to Corinth could be placed into the latter part of the year 50. But let us see what can be determined concerning the time of Paul's stay in Corinth from:

#### The Proconsulship of Gallio.

The dates that we have advanced so far are no doubt approximately correct, but we would like to place our chronology on a firmer basis and for that purpose need a date that can be considered absolutely correct. Such a date we have in the proconsulship of Gallio. It is from this date that we gain a starting-point of special importance, because clear statements of Luke make it possible to make further calculations backwards and forwards from this point.

It is in Luke 18, 12 that the reference is made to the proconsulship of Gallio. The insurrection against Paul was made after he had labored in Corinth for eighteen months and evidently at the time of the arrival of a new proconsul. The Jews thought this an opportune time for a determined effort to stop the new movement which was becoming such a formidable rival to the synagogue. The relative position of different sections of the population was indeed affected and sometimes changed by the coming of a new governor.

Now what does history report to us concerning this man Gallio? His original name was Annaeus Novatus, and he was the brother of Annaeus Seneca the philosopher. His name was changed due to his adoption into the family of Junius Gallio, the rhetorician. There is no information on the date of his proconsulship by any of the historians of the imperial period, but there are some incidental notices of his life. Pliny says that after his consulship he had a serious illness, for the cure of which he tried a sea-voyage; and from Seneca we learn that it was in Achaia that his brother went on shipboard for the benefit of his health. We are informed by Tacitus and Dio that he died in the year 65. His promotion to the consulship was no doubt due to the influence of his brother Seneca who returned from exile in Corsica in the year 49, at which time the youthful Nero was placed under his tutelage. From these historical sources we conclude that his proconsulship must have been between 49 and 65. As regards his character, his brother Seneca speaks of him with great affection, not only as a man of integrity and honesty, but also as one who won universal regard by his amiable temper. His conduct on the occasion of the tumult is quite in accord with this description of his personal character.

We might never have known anything more definite about the date of his proconsulship if it had not been for the discovery of an inscription found on four broken pieces of stone which were discovered at Delphi in Greece. The inscription from one of these pieces was published in 1895 and in 1903 an account of all four pieces was published. The four pieces, when brought together, have been found to contain parts of an imperial letter of the time of Claudius Caesar Augustus Germanicus, Pontifex Maximus, of tribunician authority for the 12th time, imperator the 26th time, father of the country, consul for the 5th time, honorable, greets the city of the Delphians. Having long been well disposed to the city of the Delphians...I have had success. I have observed the religious ceremonies of the Pythian Apollo...now it is said also of the citizens...as Lucius Junius Gallio, my friend and the proconsul of Achaia, wrote....on this account I accede to you still to have the first..." It is quite evident that we have here a copy of a letter from the Emperor Claudius to the city of Delphi. We furthermore note that the contents of the letter was something favorable to the Delphians, as is also evident from the fact that the letter was carved into stone and set up in the temple of Apollo as a monument. The importance of the inscription to us lies, first, in the fact that it mentions Gallio as proconsul of Achaia, and, secondly, in the reference to the twelfth tribunician year and to the twenty-sixth imperatorship of Claudius. The 12th year of Claudius's tribunician power ran from Jan. 25th, 52, to the same date in 53. The 26th year of his imperatorship narrows the writing of his letter to Delphi down to a period of time between the beginning of 52 and August, 52. If Gallio was then in office and had been in office long enough to send information to Claudius which would move him to write his letter to the Delphians, Gallio must have arrived in Corinth not later than in the year 51. It should be noted that he was the governor of one of the senatorial provinces. In the year 44 the province of Achaia had been given back to the Senate by Claudius. Now the proconsuls who ruled the senatorial provinces were appointed by the Senate, and, unlike the procurators who ruled the imperial provinces by appointment from the emperor, held office for only one year. True, there are instances from the reign of Claudius of a proconsulship lasting two years. But it is not likely in the case of Gallio. There is the fact that he fell ill in Achaia and himself attributed the disease to the climate; it is therefore hardly credible that he should have remained there longer than necessary. We are quite safe in assuming that his proconsulship lasted but a year and that it began sometime in 51. But when? Tiberias in A. D. 15 had decreed that all officials should leave home within

the new moon of the month of June, which would point to July 1st as the day of entry upon office. But because the time was not ample for reaching some provinces, Claudius decreed that they must start for the provinces by the middle of April. We may therefore say that the date of the entry upon office was about the middle of the calendar year, at any rate sometime in summer. Gallio, then, entered upon his proconsulship in the summer of A. D. 51.

This having been established, the date of Paul's entrance into Corinth may easily be deduced. The accusation against Paul by the Jews took place soon after Gallio arrived from Rome in the summer of 51. We are distinctly told that at that time Paul had been working in Corinth for approximately eighteen months. Accordingly he must have come to Corinth at the beginning of the year 50. Since in Acts 18, 18 it is stated that he "tarried there yet a good while," and in 18, 21 Paul states, <sup>according to many manuscripts</sup> that he wished to attend a coming feast in Jerusalem, evidently the Passover, he did not leave Corinth till sometime early in the year 52, say in February. Thus Paul's sojourn in Corinth can be definitely dated by the proconsulship of Gallio. A pivotal date of equal importance is:

#### The Recall of Felix and the Accession of Festus.

We know that Paul sailed for Rome from prison at Caesarea in the autumn, Acts 27, 9, and that he arrived in Rome in the following spring, Acts 28, 1, 11, 14. He was sent to Rome by Festus upon his appeal to Caesar, Acts 25, 11, and his hearing before Festus had taken place about two weeks after the arrival of Festus in the province, Acts 25, 1-6. Since some time, a couple months or so, evidently elapsed after Paul's appeal to Caesar before arrangements could be made for a party to set sail for Italy, we conclude that Festus must have come to Judaea sometime in the summer. This is corroborated by Acts 24, 27, which tells us that Paul had been in prison two complete years (*δωδεκὰ ἔτη ἀποπέμψεως*) at the time of Felix's recall, and we know that he had been imprisoned at a Pentecost, Acts 20, 16, so that again we see that the season of Felix's recall must have been the summer. This confirms our supposition that Roman governors invariably entered upon their offices sometime in the summer season. But in which summer did Felix leave and did Festus come to Judaea?

The date of the recall of Felix and the accession of Festus has been the subject of much discussion, and it is still disputed, although the majority are inclined to place it in the year 60 or a year or two earlier. But before examining the evidence in the case, we do well to have a short sketch of the procuratorships of the non-Felix and Festus.

Felix and his brother Pallas had been slaves in the family of Claudius at Rome. Tacitus says that even when ruling a province he did it "in the spirit of a slave". The first wife of this freedman was a daughter of Anthony and Cleopatra. His later wife, Drusilla, mentioned in Acts 24, 24, a Jewess renowned for her beauty, had been alienated from her former husband by Felix. The date of his appointment to the procuratorship is disputed. Josephus makes Gumanus governor of Palestine from 48 to 52, and states that shortly before Claudius transferred and enlarged the dominion of Agrippa "when he had already completed the twelfth year of his reign," so early in the thirteenth year of his reign or in 53, he sent Felix to be governor of Judaea. (Ant. XX, 7, 1) This is, then, generally assumed to be in the year 52. But according to Tacitus, Gumanus governed Galilee, and Felix ruled Samaria (and possibly Judaea) until Gumanus was disgraced



in 52, and Felix acquitted and honored at the same trial, whereupon he was appointed procurator of the whole province by Quadratus, governor of Syria. Most students of Roman history will agree that Tacitus is the better authority on such a matter. Hence, we may assume that Felix became governor of Samaria and possibly of Judaea in 48 and of Galilee in addition in 52 (maybe also of Judaea at this time). He seems to have secured these appointments partly through the influence of his brother Pallas, who stood high in favor with the emperor Claudius, as he did also for some years with Nero. Felix was one of the least able of the governors of Judaea. Not only did he accept bribes whenever he could get them, but also showed himself to be cruel and tyrannical in his reign. Josephus states that Jonathan, the high priest, was murdered by the Assassins at the encouragement of Felix. These Sicarii became the terror of Judaea, robbing everywhere. Felix undertook to suppress them. He captured and crucified many of them and sent their leader, Eleazer, to Rome. For the purpose of our chronology it is important to note the number and nature of the events which Josephus reports as having occurred after Nero's accession, Oct. 13, 54 (Ant. XIII, 6), namely: 1. The rise and suppression of the Assassins, as already reported; 2. The deceptions practised by the impostors and their punishment, culmination in the insurrection of the Egyptian and the defeat of his followers; 3. The sedition at Caesarea which was occasioned by the dispute between the Jews and the Syrians and resulted in the slaying of many of the Jews by the soldiers of Felix. It is at this point in the history that Josephus tells us that "Porcius Festus was sent as successor to Felix by Nero", whereupon the leading Jews of Caesarea followed him to Rome to lodge a complaint about his action in the recent riots between the Jews and the Syrians. He would quite likely have been punished by Nero had it not been for the intercession of his powerful brother Pallas. Festus fell on troublous times. Josephus relates the following happenings as having occurred during his reign: 1. A renewed wave of murdering and pillaging by the Assassins followed by the destruction of a large band of them with their chief leader in the wilderness; 2. The building of a large, high dining-room in the palace by King Agrippa for the purpose of overlooking the temple; 3. The raising of the temple wall by the Jews to intercept the view; 4. The sending of a deputation to Rome to obtain leave to keep the wall; 5. The success of their suit at Rome because of the intercession of Poppaea, Nero's wife, with the retention of Ishmael, the high-priest; 6. Upon their return the appointment of a new high priest by Agrippa, Joseph, whose tenure of office is not stated. About this time Festus died at his post. Caesar, upon hearing of his death, sent Albinus to Judaea as procurator. But before Albinus arrived there, other happenings are recorded by Josephus. In the interval King Agrippa deposed Joseph and appointed Ananus high-priest in his place. While Albinus was still on the road from Rome, Ananus hailed James the Just, the head of the church at Jerusalem, and some others before the Sanhedrin and had them condemned and stoned. This roused strong disapproval among many of the Jews who protested against such conduct before King Agrippa. They also sent messengers to meet Albinus at Alexandria, having learned of his appointment by this time, and denounced the action of Ananus as illegal. When Albinus wrote a threatening letter to Ananus, King Agrippa took the high-priesthood from him, when he had held it but three months, and made Jesus, the son of Damneus, high priest. While he was still high-priest, Agrippa enlarged Caesarea Philippi and named it *Neronias* in honor of Nero. This is as far as we need carry the history. Now let us see what deductions we can make from these and other related facts.

First it would be well to examine the force of Paul's words to Felix that he had been "many years a judge unto this nation", Acts 24, 10. We note that he does not specifically say that Felix had been governor of Judaea for many years; so we may have a corroboration here of the fact that before being made procurator of all of

Palastine he had ruled over a part of the country for some years under or concurrently with Sumanus. The term "many years is, of course, elastic. Conybeare and Howson write (p. 750): " 'Many years' could not be less than five years; therefore Felix had governed Judaea at least (5+2=)7 years at the time of his recall". Assuming the expression "many years" to represent a minimum of five years, what results do we get? If we suppose the procuratorship of Felix to have begun in 52, as so many do, that would give us the year 59 as the earliest year for Felix's recall. If we accept the more probable assumption that his rule began in 48, then we would have the year 55 as the earliest for his recall. Now there are some who accept such an early date. Harnack, for instance, places the coming of Festus in 56. But placing the accession of Festus in 55 or 56 results in placing other important events in the life of Paul, notably his imprisonment at Rome four or five years earlier than the date generally accepted by leading investigators. Let us now see that such an early date is not permissible.

On the top of page 11 we have summarized the three important series of events which Josephus records as having taken place during the later part of Felix's rule after the accession of Nero on Oct. 13, 54. Regarding these events Conybeare and Howson draw the conclusion (p. 752): "This series of events could not well have occupied less than three years." Three years from the accession of Nero would take us to the fall of 57, so that on this basis the accession of Festus could not have been before the summer of 57 or of 58. But those events could just as probably have extended over a period of five years, which would place the accession of Festus in 59 or 60. It is significant to note from Acts 21, 38 that when Paul was arrested in the temple he was at first mistaken for the Egyptian false prophet who led his followers out upon the Mount of Olives with the promise that he would cause the walls of Jerusalem to fall down and who later escaped out of the fight when his followers were defeated and dispersed. The phrase "which before those days madest an uproar" is an expression which would be naturally used if the Egyptian's insurrection had occurred in the preceding year. If we estimate on the basis of Josephus that the Egyptian's insurrection occurred about three or four years after the accession of Nero, that would put Paul's arrest in the year 57 or 58 and the accession of Festus in the year 59 or 60.

But we can also show that the recall of Felix could not have occurred after A. D. 60. When Felix went to Rome, he was followed by a delegation of the principal inhabitants of Caesarea, who accused him of misgovernment in connection with the riots at Caesarea. As we have heard, he was saved from punishment by the intercession of his brother Pallas with Nero, "who", as Josephus reports (Ant. XI, VIII, 3), "was at that time held in the greatest honor by him". Now Pallas was put to death by Nero in the year 62. So it is improbable that at any part of that or even of the preceding year he should have had such influence with Nero. Hence Felix's recall was certainly not after 61, and probably not after A. D. 60. A similar line of evidence is secured from the date of the death of Burrus. Burrus was the general of the army as also Nero's tutor. He died not later than February of the year 62. Now he was still living at the time when Felix's accusers reached Rome. Josephus relates (in the same paragraph as above) that two of the principal Syrians from Caesarea, who had also gone to Rome, bribed Burrus to use his influence with the king to disannul the equality of the privileges which the Jewish citizens had hitherto enjoyed with the Syrians. The edict which Nero issued to this effect "because the occasion of the following miseries that befall our nation; for, when the Jews of Caesarea were informed of the contents of this epistle to the Syrians, they were more disorderly than before, till a war was kindled" (Josephus, same paragraph). So Burrus was living when the contending parties arrived from Caesarea. Since he died at the beginning of 62, or even before, they could not have reached Rome after the autumn of 61. Now a third piece of evidence. When Paul arrived at

Rome, he was delivered according to Acts 23, 16 "to the captain of the guard". The singular is used, not So there was but one perfect in command of the praetorian guard at that time. However this was not the case after the death of Burrus, for then Rufus and Tigellius were made joint prefects. Since Burrus died around the beginning of 62, Paul could not have arrived in Rome after 61. Felix's recall was in the year before Paul arrived in Rome, hence could not have been after A. D. 60. So we are quite definitely and certainly narrowed down to about a two year period for the date of the recall, viz., the summer of 58 to the summer of 60. Which of the three summers was it?

Most scholars accept the year 60 as the date for the accession of Festus. They confess, however, that it is only an approximate date, selected for want of any decisive evidence. Ramsay in his "Pauline and Other Studies", p. 349ff, argues for the year 59. Concerning the year 60 he says, "we shall prove that it is entirely impossible". He has two lines of reasoning, one a direct inference from Acts, which we shall reproduce later, and the other based on Josephus, which we shall now present. He says: "Some coins of Agrippa II are dated by an era, which has been recognized by numismatists as the foundation and naming of Heronias (evidently a great event in the career of that King). The coins show that the foundation occurred in 61-62. Now Josephus says that the foundation nearly synchronised with a feast in Jerusalem, some time after Albinus had succeeded Festus as governor of Palestine. "The feast at which Heronias was founded, therefore, fell in the year beginning in spring 61 and ending in spring 62 (the year customarily began in the spring-time in Southern Syria); and therefore it was either the Feast of Tabernacles, in autumn 61, or the Passover, in spring 62..... Several reasons combine to give the preference to the former." "Now, as to the time of Year when Albinus came, that is certain. In the first place, it was usual for officials to arrive to take up office at this season. In the second place, our argument has placed Ananus's three months' tenure of the high-priesthood between March and the end of May, 61. Soon after his deposition Albinus arrived; and after his arrival the tithes were collected (stolen) from the threshing-floors, as Josephus tells. That would take place about late June or July, and confirms our dating of Ananus's high-priesthood....If Albinus came in the early summer, he must have come in A. D. 61, not in A. D. 62." "Now Festus had died suddenly in office; news had to be carried to Rome; (by couriers over the land route, which took about 52 days according to Ramsay); Albinus was appointed to succeed him; his appointment was made known to the Jews in Jerusalem some time before he arrived again by couriers, so that they could send messengers to Alexandria to meet him (the usual way of travelling from Rome to Syria was by the corn-ships returning from Puteoli to Alexandria, and thence by coasting-vessel to Caesarea on the coast of Palestine or Berytus (Beirut) on the Syrian coast); all this occurred in the winter season, when communication was slow; this carries back the death of Festus to the end of". Having now established the end of Festus's procuratorship, we have to fix the beginning, which nearly coincides with the end of Paul's imprisonment. It is certain and agreed that Festus came to Palestine in the course of the summer in some year. The date commonly accepted in modern times is A. D. 60. But between his coming and his death events had occurred implying a much greater lapse of time than between midsummer and December, 60. Not to mention his successful operations against the assassins, he had been involved in an envenomed dispute between his friend, King Agrippa, and the priests at Jerusalem about the King's action in building a tower overlooking the holy precinct of the Temple. After considerable quarrelling Festus allowed the Jews to send an embassy to Rome, including the high-priest, who certainly would not be able to go away from Jerusalem on such a long journey within a few months before a Passover, as he must necessarily be present at that feast. Taking that fact

in conjunction with the necessities of ancient navigation, we have a moral certainty that the embassy would start in late April or in May, for the season of thoroughly safe navigation began only on the 15th of May. The voyage and the negotiations in Rome must have occupied several months. At last the embassy gained its cause; but the High-priest was detained in Rome, when the rest were allowed to depart. The news reached Jerusalem; a new High-priest was needed, and Joseph was appointed.

Now these events would occupy the whole summer and part of the autumn; the voyage to Rome, the negotiations, the voyage back to Judaea (a more rapid journey, as was always the case), the proceedings in the election of a new High-priest. The appointment of Joseph may be confidently placed about October. He did not retain office long, but was deposed after a brief tenure. Josephus places the death of Festus after the appointment and before the deposition of Joseph; and, as we have seen, the death of Festus occurred in the end of A. D. 60. Thus the concluding events in the administration of Festus lasted from May to the end of the year 60; and his government cannot have begun later than A. D. 59, as it had been going on for at least several months before the embassy sailed for Rome. As Festus came in summer, we must place his arrival either in 59 or in some earlier year; and his arrival was quickly followed by Paul's trial, his appeal to Caesar, and his voyage to Rome, which began in the autumn. Thus the commonly accepted date in A. D. 60 is absolutely excluded, if Albinus came in A. D. 61.

Ramsay has what he considers even a stronger line of argumentation for selecting the year 59 as the year of the recall of Felix and of the accession of Festus. Here again we shall quote him directly: "A direct inference from Acts XX, 5ff. Paul celebrated the Passover of 57, Thursday, 7th April, in Philippi. He remained there through the days of unleavened bread, 7th to 14th April, and then started for Jerusalem. He 'was hastening, if it were possible for him, to be at Jerusalem the day of Pentecost'; and Luke is clear that, with the chances of the long journey before him, he stayed only till the feast was ended, and forthwith started on the morning of Friday, 15th April. The journey to Troas lasted 'until the fifth day; the time is long (only three days were needed in Acts XVI. 11), but the company had to find a boat in Neapolis. They reached Troas on Tuesday, 19th April, and stayed seven days there. Now the regular custom in ancient reckoning is to include both the day of arrival and the day of departure, even though both were incomplete. The company, therefore, stayed from Tuesday, 19th April, to Monday, 25th April, in Troas, and sailed very early on the Monday morning, as Luke describes. The year which our ancient authority assigned agrees exactly with Luke's precise statement of days. On the other hand, if we suppose that Paul travelled in 58, Passover in that year fell on Monday, 27th March; and Luke's statement of numbers and days is inconsistent with that. Similarly, the other years around 57 are excluded. We come, then, to the conclusion that if Luke is accurate, Paul's journey to Jerusalem was made in 57." The author of the article on Chronology of the New Testament in Hastings Dictionary of the Bible criticises several of Ramsay's assumptions in this reckoning in the following paragraph: "11. The Passover at Philippi. Ramsay (St. Paul, p. 289f) considers that Paul left Philippi on a Friday. He traces back the journey from the departure from Troas (v 7), on the assumption that the sermon and Eucharistic celebration at Troas were on what we call Sunday night. But would any Eastern call this 'the first day of the week'? If Ramsay's calculation is accepted, the further assumption is that St. Paul, who was in haste to reach Jerusalem, left Philippi on the morrow of the Passover, which therefore fell on Thursday. But in A. D. 57 it is calculated that it did so fall (April 7), and this therefore is Ramsay's date for St. Paul's fifth visit to Jerusalem and his arrest there. There is a triple element of doubt in this calculation—(a) as to the day on which Troas was left, (b) whether St. Paul started from

Phillipi on the day after the Passover, (c) as to the calculation of the Passover. We must therefore probably discard this element in calculating the years, though Ramsay's date is for other reasons quite probable."

That weight, if any, attaches to these counterarguments we are not prepared to say. But we are of the opinion that, all things considered, Ramsay's date is highly probable, and therefore we accept the year 59 as the year of the recall of Felix and the accession of Festus.

### The Burning of Rome

There is only one other date of secular history which throws any light on the chronology of Paul's life, and that only in a negative way, so that we shall only refer to it in passing. That is the burning of Rome in 64, and the consequent persecution of the Christians at Rome by the government. The universally recognized date of the burning of Rome is in the year 64. In fact, it was on July 19th that the fire broke out. Now this date is of limited value in that it shows that Paul was not in prison at Rome at that time. If he had been, he too would certainly have perished in the persecution. Furthermore, it seems evident that he could not have been condemned and executed after the suicide of Nero in June, 68. When Alba succeeded Nero, the trials of the Christians must have ceased. So we must decide upon one of the years 65, 66, 67 or early in 68, as the time of Paul's martyrdom. This determination will be made later.

Let us now summarize this chapter by setting down our pivotal dates and the inferences we have drawn from them:

1. The occupation of Damascus by Aretas sometime between 35 to 33—Paul's escape from Damascus within the same bounds.
2. The death of Herod Agrippa I, August, 44—Paul's return from the second visit to Jerusalem, the famine visit, about a year later, in 45.
3. The famine under Claudius, 45 and 46—Paul's return from Jerusalem, end of 45.
4. The expulsion of the Jews from Rome, 49 or 50—Paul's coming to Corinth, 50 or 51.
5. The proconsulship of Gallio, begun in summer of 51—Paul's coming to Corinth, the beginning of 50.
6. The recall of Felix and the accession of Festus, summer of 59—Paul's imprisonment at Caesarea, Pentecost of 57 to autumn of 59.
7. The burning of Rome, 64—Paul's death sometime later, but not after the middle of 68.

It is obvious that not all of these dates are of equal value. The first is of very little worth. It serves to only roughly set the time when Paul was in Damascus either the first or the second time and effected his escape. The year of the death of Herod Agrippa I is a date which is fixed with absolute certainty. But it is of none too much value in determining the Pauline chronology, for it does not tie up with the later events of Paul's life which are set forth with more precise order and relationship to time than are the earlier ones. Yet, as we shall see, the date of Herod's death and the approximate one of the famine are very helpful, yes, and indispensable, for dating the earlier events of Paul's career. The important dates for our purpose are the accessions of Gallio and of Festus. Without these, the construction of a Pauline chronology would at the best be only a slipshod affair. But on the basis of these we can at least determine a relative chronology, which for the entire period of Paul's life from the point of the Jerusalem Council on will perhaps never be wrong by more than a year, or two years at most, though the end of Paul's life is clothed in such uncertainty.

In constructing such a relative chronology we shall meet with special problems at every turn. Some few of them we shall not even be able to solve entirely to our own satisfaction, such, less, then, to that of others. But we shall find that with the majority of these problems there is a sufficient weight of evidence to point to a certain conclusion. Our plan of procedure will be to start at the beginning of Paul's life and work forward step by step. At times we shall have to work not only forward, but also backward from our pivotal dates. But our aim will be to present an ordered survey of the successive periods in Paul's life, giving the relative dates of all events. We shall, of course, also concern ourselves with assigning the epistles to the proper years. Moreover, in tracing and dating the sequence of events in Paul's life, we shall endeavor to place them in the proper historical perspective by making occasional reference to contemporaneous persons and happenings.

### Chapter III. Birth and Life up to Conversion.

In raising the question as to the year of Paul's birth we run into our first insurmountable problem. We cannot state with any certainty the year of the apostle's birth. Yet it may be inferred within a narrow limit. When Paul is first mentioned in Acts 7, 58 in connection with Stephen's martyrdom, he is called "a young man". To be sure, there is nothing at all definite about such an epithet, especially when we are told that in ancient times the term was used even more vaguely than it is now and might be applied to a person up to the age of 40. On the basis of Acts 26, 10, where Paul says, "I gave my voice against thee" (the prisoners), it has been claimed that Paul was at that time a member of the Sanhedrin and as such voted for the execution of the captive saints. Since the members of the Sanhedrin had to be at least thirty years old, this passage is taken as implying that Paul was no younger than thirty at this time. And even if the assumption that Paul was himself a member of the Sanhedrin be not true, nevertheless it is fairly certain that when Saul was entrusted by the high-priest with the important mission to Damascus, as reported Acts 9, 2, that he was at least thirty years old, for it was not until that age that the Jews entered upon public life.

In searching the writings of Paul himself for a clue as to his age we find another indefinite note in Philomen 9, where he refers to himself as "Paul the aged". But the reference to "aged" is as indeterminate as that to "youth". Lightfoot points out in his commentary on Philomen that Roger Bacon and Sir Walter Scott called themselves old men when their respective ages were but 52 and 58. Paul, too, because of all the enervating hardships and persecutions through which he had passed, might well have felt himself an old and worn out man at the age of threescore years. In the chronology which we shall establish the span of time from Paul's conversion to his death is 33 years. Eusebius places Paul's death in 67. If we accept that date and subtract our 33 years, that gives us the year 34 as the year of Paul's conversion and the turning point of his career. For these dates we have a fairly close corroboration in a fourth- or fifth-century homily, wrongly ascribed to Chrysostome. It states that St. Paul served God thirty-five years, and died at the age of sixty-eight. This statement probably embodies an early tradition, which would agree fairly well with our estimate that Paul labored in the Gospel cause for 33 years. If the reference to thirty-five years of service be accepted at face value and the year 67 be taken for Paul's death, as is done by Kampay (Pauline and Other Studies, 363), then the year 32 would be the year of conversion and 1 B. C. that of Paul's birth. But due to various factors we believe it preferable to place the conversion later. And since we have a two-year variance between our 33 years of service and the 35 years mentioned in the homily, it is only consistent to subtract

two years also from the life span of 68 years mentioned. Subtracting 66 years from the year 67 gives us the year 1 A. D. as our closest, though uncertain, estimate of the year of Paul's birth.

Happily we are left in no uncertainty as to the place of Paul's birth, for he himself states to the infuriated mob on the steps of the Tower of Antonio that he was "born in Tarsus", Acts 22, 3. His rearing and training there in Tarsus would be similar to that of any other Jewish boy of the Dispersion. The educational maxim of the Jews at a later period was: "At five years of age let children begin the Scripture; at ten, the Mishna; at thirteen, let them be subjects of the Law." The general practice before the Mishna was brought together (200 A. D.) was doubt along similar lines. In the home the child Saul would learn to speak Aramaic and on the streets Greek. At an early age he began his schooling. The school was connected with the synagogue. He would learn to read the Scriptures in the Greek Septuagint version, perhaps also in the ancient Hebrew. Much emphasis was placed on memorizing sections of the Law and the Prophets. When thirteen, Saul became a "Son of the Law". He was confirmed, as we would say.

It must have been about this period of his life that he was taught the trade of tent-making which more than once stood him in good stead, (Acts 18, 3). Tent-making was one of the main occupations of Tarsus, for on the Taurus Mountains close by great herds of goats were to be found, whose hair was used for the making of tent-cloth. We do not know whether Paul's trade consisted in weaving the coarse tent-cloth, or whether he was engaged in the manufacture of finished tents. Since this trade involved unskilled labor of the commonest sort, it was one that was poorly paid, 2 Thess. 3, 8. From this, however, we need not draw the conclusion that Saul's parents were poor. The contrary is suggested, for if they had not been of some means, they could not have sent their son to Jerusalem to study. Paul's father may very well not have been a tent-maker himself, but may have followed some other occupation, as that of a merchant. Every Jewish boy, irrespective of his plans and prospects, was expected to learn a trade, and that of tent-making was suggested for Saul because of local conditions. The wisdom of the rule became apparent in the case of Paul, because later, though he might have assumed support from the churches he founded, yet he preferred not to jeopardize the faith of his converts, 1 Cor. 9, 12. At times he did accept gifts from churches, 2 Cor. 12, 9. His was a trade that had one great advantage for the Gospel ministry—it was so mechanical that it left the thoughts free, giving the apostle time for reflection and to hold converse with his coworkers and converts.

We must pause to inquire what can be discovered about Paul's family. But little. As to what time the parents of Saul left Palestine and why, or whether they too were born in the Dispersion, we cannot even conjecture. Not once does Paul refer to his mother in his epistles. We may take for granted, however, that as Eunice, the mother of Timothy, so Saul's mother brought him to know the Scriptures from a child on. In Acts 23, 6 Paul mentions his father, saying that he is the son of a Pharisee. Thus in his father the youthful Saul had before him the constant example of a member of the strictest sect of the Jews. From Acts 22, 25-28 we learn that Paul's father was a Roman citizen and that he had thus inherited the boon of Roman citizenship. How his father obtained this much coveted position we do not know. It must not be supposed that his being a citizen of Tarsus automatically made him a citizen of Rome. Tarsus was indeed a "free city", enjoying a great measure of self-government, but only a "colony" had the rare privilege of having its born free citizens regarded as citizens of Rome. Roman citizenship was sometimes bought for a great sum. We can hardly suppose Paul's father to have obtained it in that way. It must have been conferred upon him then at one time for some distinguished service to the government. Though Paul several times availed himself of the privileges which his Roman citizenship afforded

him, yet in his epistles he seems utterly oblivious of the high civic rank which was his. Paul's relatives seem to have been scattered abroad. From Acts 23, 16 we note that he had a ~~sister and~~ nephew living in Jerusalem at the time when he was taken captive. From Rom. 16, 7, 11 and 21 we see that he had no less than six relatives living in Rome, ~~and note that all of these kinsmen bear Greek or Latin names.~~ It was not uncommon for the Jews to bear a second name by which they would be known in the Gentile world. Thus Paul himself had two names. His real name "Saul" was given him by his parents partly because it means "asked" (of God), and partly because it was the name of that unfortunate king of their tribe of Benjamin, one of the two tribes that had remained loyal to the covenant. "Saul" was the name which was used in the Hebrew home, and "Paul" was that which was used in the Gentile world. "Paul" means little. The name quite likely refers to Paul's small stature and may well have been applied to him as a nickname in early childhood.

Now we must leave the home in Tarsus and follow Paul to Jerusalem, where he went for higher education. The words "brought up in this city" in Acts 22, 3 indicate that Paul went to the Holy City while still comparatively young. Many think that he went already at the age of thirteen, though it is certainly not precluded by this text that he stayed home yet a few years beyond that age. If his sister was a resident of Jerusalem at this time, he certainly made his home with her. Daily he attended the "House of Interpretation", or the "Temple College", as we might call it. There he was instructed daily by the great temple rabbis, one of the greatest of whom was Gamaliel, Acts 22, 3; 5, 34. Gamaliel was the grandson of Hillel, who had founded the more liberal of the two temple schools, the other being that of Shammai. The whole instruction in both schools was concerned with the tradition and interpretations which the elders had placed on the law, though Gamaliel was not averse to letting his students read Greek books. Paul was an apt student and soon outdistanced many of his classmates, as he hints at in Gal. 1, 14. Here it was that he became deeply steeped in the Pharasaic spirit of self-righteousness, Phi. 3, 5. During these years too, his red-hot patriotic zeal for the Jewish religion, which was later to direct itself against the Christians, Acts 8, 3; 9, 1, 2, must have developed. One lasting benefit which Saul derived from his theological studies in Jerusalem and which he was able to later use to good effect was the intimate familiarity which he obtained with the Old Testament. So well was he grounded in the Scriptures that his quotations in his epistles are in all probability from memory. The profusion of these quotations is astonishing, for he quotes from 141 chapters and over 200 verses. How long Paul continued his studies under Gamaliel, whether for only a few years or for a longer time, we have no way of knowing.

But finally he finished his course and was graduated. Some think that he was made a rabbi at this time, but we think that he was too immature for that. We hold that it was to fulfill his ambition of becoming a rabbi that he later returned to Jerusalem. The question is often raised whether Paul was in Jerusalem at the same time that Jesus was? One thing is certain, that if he was, he never saw Jesus. When his enemies at Corinth discredited his apostleship on the ground that he had never seen Jesus, Paul's answer was a reference to the appearance of the risen Christ to him, 1 Cor. 9, 1; 15, 8, which is an indication that this was the first and only time that he saw Jesus. The possibility, however, is not precluded that they may have been in Jerusalem at the same time since it is fairly certain that Jesus continued to go to Jerusalem annually to attend the Passover from the age of twelve years on, Luke 2, 41. But we are quite certain in assuming that by the time that the Lord entered upon his public ministry early in 37 A. D. Paul was no longer in Palestine.



If Paul was born in 1 A. D., he was at this time about 26 years old. That was quite likely too young an age for him to claim the title of Rabbi. It may be that already long before the Lord's ministry began he had left Jerusalem and returned to his native Tarsus.

In Tarsus he would earn his bread by working at his craft of tent-making. We can imagine how active he was in the local synagogue. It is not impossible that he made some trips into other districts and provinces as part of his education. The men of Tarsus were travelers, and later at least Paul traveled extensively. Paul may very well have gone a number of times to Jerusalem to attend the Passover. If so, he would not only have resorted daily to the temple, but would also have visited the synagogue of the Cilicians, Acts 6, 9. Whether he ever was in Jerusalem at this time or not he was bound to have heard much of Jesus of Nazareth.

It may very well be that during this period in his life Paul established some contact with the so-called University of Tarsus. Now we recall that an ancient seat of learning consisted not of a campus and many imposing buildings, but only of teachers and students, and that the curricula consisted not so much of prescribed courses of studies as of lectures which any man from the street might attend, we can well imagine that Paul with all the mental alertness that was his would avail himself of the opportunity of listening now and then to the lectures of some famous teacher on literary or philosophical subjects. We may also have learned something about the art of effective public speaking from the teachers at Tarsus. Among the Greeks and Romans of that age fluent and forceful speech was considered an essential aptitude for anyone aspiring to any public office. And Paul, both in his speeches as recorded in the Book of Acts as well as in his epistles, exhibits such definiteness and clearness in his logical development and withal such power and grace in his expository style, that this skill of his argues for the correctness of our surmise that he attended lectures at the school at Tarsus.

Was Paul married during these years? The question cannot be positively answered one way or the other. We think that there is a good degree of probability that he was married in his earlier school and then lost his wife by death. To be sure, Paul never alludes to having been married. But if his wife was dead, this is no stronger than the fact that he never once refers to his mother. Dallmann says: "It was natural for Paul at the age of sixteen (so stipulated in the Mishna) to marry, a sacred obligation." That he had a high regard of marriage is indicated especially by his referring to the church as the bride of Christ. Moreover, the Old Testament reflects the importance that the Jews attached to marriage. So the natural inference is that Paul did marry. In 1 Cor. 9, 5 he asserts his right both to marry and to take a wife with him on his missionary journeys. This passage is inconclusive. Of greater force is 1 Cor. 7, 8 if by "the unmarried" we assume that he means widowers, for which there is no special Greek work. It seems to be a correct inference that he here classed himself with the widowers, for in the first seven verses of the chapter he had already spoken to those who had never been married. Though in all probability Paul had been married, it is just as improbable that he ever had a child who grew up. Had this been the case, his natural affection could hardly have denied itself some expressions of love, nor would he be so apt to regard Timothy so exclusively as his "own son in the faith".

We think that it is quite certain that Paul was not in Jerusalem during the years of the Lord's ministry, but had quite likely returned to his native Tarsus. It is equally obvious that sometime not so long after the Lord's resurrection he returned to Palestine. His purpose must have been to achieve his ambition of becoming

a rabbi and to take his place among the great teachers and leaders of the church at Jerusalem to which his extraordinary gifts and zeal entitled him. We can imagine his consternation at seeing a strong religious party springing up which to him seemed to be opposed to the faith of his fathers. The rapid and stupendous growth of the Christian church aroused the anger of the Jewish leaders. It was at Pentecost in the year 30 (this date now commonly accepted) that the followers of Jesus had formed a congregation at Jerusalem. How long a time elapsed between the founding of the church and the outbreak of the first persecution which began with the death of Stephen is not easy to determine. Some place the conversion of Saul, which followed soon after the martyrdom of Stephen, as late as the year 37. But this is evidently entirely too late, for the course of events seem to have been too rapid to extend over a period of seven years. The main happenings in the history of the infant church are recorded by Luke in the first five and a half chapters of Acts. True, Luke gives no clear evidence of the time that elapsed before the election of the seven deacons, nor between the election and the death of Stephen. But we are given to understand that in a short time the congregation had grown from 3,000 to 5,000, Acts 2, 41 and 4, 4. According to 5, 14 and 6, 7 this rapid growth continued, so that finally even a great number of priests embraced the Gospel. Now the difficulties which the primitive Church had to meet by appointing the seven forced it from the very first, so that this step was probably forced on it very soon. Furthermore, the Jewish leaders, who had put Jesus to death to stop the spread of his doctrine and influence, were not likely to allow his followers to multiply so rapidly without an effort to stop the movement. We note that two attempts were made to silence the apostles. First Peter and John were hailed before the Council and exhorted to desist from teaching in the name of Jesus, Acts 4, 5f. A little later the whole body of apostles were thrown into prison, from which they were released by divine intervention, Acts 5, 17f. When they were subsequently made to appear before the Council and had made their defense, the rulers "took counsel to slay them" (v 33), and might have done so had it not been for the intervention of Gamaliel. The failure of these two warnings and threats goaded the Jewish leaders on to more effective measures. The stoning of Stephen became the signal for a widespread attack at coercion. We are not wrong in assuming that those persecutory events followed upon one another in fairly close proximity. Haysay says (St. Paul the Traveller, p. 377): "It is therefore quite fair to date Stephen's death about two and a half or three years after the great Pentecost." Some have been content to allow but a year or two for this period of time. Haysay himself along with many others dates the conversion of Saul in 32, which would allow only about a year and three quarters if the traditional date for the conversion of Jan. 25th is accepted (Haysay says: "the traditional day may certainly be accepted). We are quite ready to agree with those who maintain that the events before the conversion of Saul can not be compressed into the narrow space of two years or less and who therefore place Saul's conversion into the years 33 to 35. This vexing question as to the year of Saul's conversion, until we shortly take it up in the next chapter as one of our special problems.

Now yet we must record Saul's part in the persecution which swept over the church shortly before his conversion. The gathering of the storm clouds is recorded in Acts 6, 9. Saul must have attended the services of the synagogues serving people from Cilicia. It was with worshippers from this and other Hellenistic synagogues that Stephen; who, as his Greek name indicates, was himself a Hellenistic Jew, debated. We can imagine Saul, who had received a theological training, entering into these disputations. If so, he too was one of those who "were not able to resist the wisdom and the spirit by which he spoke", v 10. But he was too blind and too bigotted to yield to the truth. He need not dwell on the trial and stoning of Stephen. Justice

it to say that the first mention we have of Saul in the Scriptures is in connection with Stephen's death, Acts 7, 58 and 8, 1. This testimony Luke would have received from Paul himself, as he might have painted the whole scene of Stephen's trial and especially of his glowing vision from the palette of Paul's vivid memories. The words "Saul was consenting unto his death" are almost identical with Paul's declaration in Acts 22, 20. Luke had heard this confession made with deep sorrow and contrition by Paul more than once and here introduces it as a dramatic touch. In the persecution which now broke over the Church Saul was evidently one of the leaders, if not the prime instigator and director, Acts 8, 1-3. He sees that what had started as a mere sporadic outburst of fury, Paul systematized into a regular campaign of persecution. Still more details of his relentless and cruel campaign of persecution are given by him in his two speeches in which he tells of his conversion and of what went before it, Acts 22, 4.19; 26, 10.11. What was most atrocious in Paul's measures was that by cruel threats and punishments he undertook to make Christians blaspheme the name of Christ. Later he realized that he it was who, in denying that Jesus was the Son of God and the Christ, was the blasphemer, 1 Tim. 1, 13. Paul's statement in this passage, "I did it ignorantly", shows that his motives in this diabolical business were upright. He thought that the Christians, in regarding Jesus as the Son Of God, were blasphemers who were undermining the faith of the fathers, and that therefore in destroying this false religion he was doing God the greatest possible service. Later he learned that the proper method in dealing with error is not that of violence, but of separation.

#### Chapter IV. Conversion and Years of Obscurity.

It is not our intention to dwell much on the conversion of Saul from any other than a chronological angle. The slight variations in the three accounts which we have of this remarkable event in Acts 9, 3-18; 22, 6-16; and 26, 12-18, are not of any consequence and only serve to complement one another. It would be difficult to overestimate this event in the life of Saul. For one thing, it brought into the Christian camp a man of extraordinary gifts and zeal, which he now eagerly placed into the service of the Gospel. From having been the great persecutor of the Christian Church, Saul now became its greatest propagator. Nor must we fail to fully estimate the significance of the heavenly vision to Saul himself. First of all, it snail his conversion. Next in the light of heavenly glory he saw Jesus of Nazareth, the Lord has revealed unto him as the Son of God, Gal. 1, 15.16. This realization was overwhelming and revolutionary. He was "as one born out of due time", 1 Cor. 15, 8. He regarded his experience near the gates of Damascus not as an ignominious defeat, but as an act of rescue performed by Christ from purest grace alone, 1 Tim. 1, 15.16. But Saul's conversion was of further significance. God's purpose in revealing his Son in him, he writes in Gal. 1, 16, was "that I might preach him among the Gentiles". And this divine purpose Jesus himself declared to the prostrate Saul according to fuller account of the conversion given in Acts 26—see v 17.18. That he was destined to be an instrument in God's hand was again declared unto Ananias by the Lord, Acts 9, 15.16, and by him no doubt unto Saul. In the change which took place in Saul's heart there was a conviction that the truth which he had learned was for all nations. Pharisaic exclusiveness was gone. In its place was a vision of the world-wide scope of the Gospel. He himself was destined to carry it from province to province and would see it triumph over both Gentile idolatry and Jewish exclusiveness.

It will now be of special interest to survey the first movements of the new convert to Christianity, which followed upon his conversion. Following the blinding vision from heaven, his followers had brought him into the city of Damascus to the house of one Judas, who lived on a street called Straight, whereupon they were immediately dismissed, Acts 9, 8.9.11. There is still in Damascus a street called Straight, a thoroughfare two miles long. Little wonder that blinded Saul in his lonely seclusion stretched forth his hands in prayer for divine guidance. Both

boldly sight and, we need not doubt, further spiritual illumination were given him by the visit of Ananias, Acts 9, 10-19. Having recovered his sight, we next see Saul going about in Damascus from one synagogue to another, utilizing the Sabbath days for this blessed work, and testifying of his new-found faith in Christ. His name had been frequently mentioned in recent reports from Jerusalem: We can imagine the amazement both of the Jews and Christians in Damascus over the fact that he who had been such a bitter reviler and persecutor of the Christian faith now so suddenly and boldly champions the Christian cause, Acts 9, 20-22. As the weeks rolled by, the wrath of the Jews of Damascus was kindled against Saul. All attempts to persuade him to return to his original purpose failed. The growing animosity convinced Saul that under prevailing conditions his further efforts at Damascus would be in vain.

There was he to go? To return to Jerusalem was inadvisable, for his adversaries would immediately report the happenings at the Syrian capital to the Sanhedrin. Nor was he prepared in his present mood to go back to his native city to face the reproaches of his parents and friends. What he did, he reports to us in Gal. 1, 16, 17. This statement contains all the information we have concerning this Arabian sojourn. We are not told what part of Arabia Saul went to. Arabia was a vast territory, including then not only all the country east of the Dead Sea, but the desert east of Syria and Palestine as well. Since it included also the vicinity immediately east of Damascus, Paul may not have travelled very far. The question as to why Saul went to Arabia is also shrouded in some mystery, but we think that we can surmise the reason with a considerable show of right. He needed to adjust himself to the new situation and to do that did what many a man has done before and after him, turned to the solitudes of the desert. Jesus, too, went away into the wilderness immediately after his baptism. Moses and Elijah knew that it meant to go away for a while into retirement. Paul had to prepare himself for his future ministry. Since that day no such staggering burden had been laid on the shoulders of any man. Paul would want time to formulate the terms in which he might preach the truth of the Gospel both to the Jewish and the Gentile world. We are not saying that there was any development of his doctrine during this time, but we feel we are safe in asserting that he wanted time for meditation and study. We ask, why does not Luke say anything about the Arabian sojourn? Because it was not suited to his purpose of showing the rise of Christianity in the world. It was a personal episode in Paul's life, and as such he presents it in Galatians. Here, for the purpose of reconstructing Paul's life immediately after his conversion, the accounts of Galatians and Acts supplement each other. In fact, if it were not for the Galatian passage, we would suppose that Luke's narrative, in Acts 9, 19-25, is continuous. But from Galatians 1, 17 we learn that Saul left Damascus after his first preaching experience and then after a sojourn in Arabia returned again to the city. So either after v. 21 or after v. 22 we must make a division in Luke's narrative. Soon after Saul's return and resumption of preaching, the rage of the rabbis turned the streets of Damascus into a roaring sea clamoring for a victim. At this time Rome, under the control of the city, and it was under the rule of the Arabian king Aretas. The Jews persuaded the governor in charge to patrol the city in search of him and to watch the gates day and night lest he should escape. But the Christians, remembering the cunning plan of Rahab and the faithful act of Michal, lowered Saul in a wicker basket from a window overlooking the wall, so that he was able to effect an escape. *See Gal. 1, v. 23.*

How long the two brief periods of preaching in Damascus and the Arabian sojourn lasted and what followed upon the escape from Damascus, Paul tells us Gal. 1, 18, 19. These three years, as we shall hear later, need not be reckoned as three complete years, but may have been only two. In the third year after his conversion he returned

to Jerusalem, which he may have imagined would be the scene of his future labors. Never and nowhere did Saul feel so lonely and forsaken as when he re-entered the thronged streets of the Holy City. Though he was not a stranger in Jerusalem, he had no one to whom he could turn. From the last Galatian passage we learn that it was one of Saul's objects in going up to Jerusalem to meet Peter. This desire was a very natural one. Peter was one of the pillar apostles who had been very close to the Lord. From him he could obtain an eye-witness account of the Lord's words and deeds. But the establishment of such a contact was not an easy matter, because the Christians in Jerusalem still looked upon him with suspicion, as we see from the continuation of Luke's narrative which begins Acts 9, 25. And now a person appears in the narrative of whom we shall hear much for a while, Barnabas, who was born on the island of Cyprus and hence like Saul was a Jew of the dispersion, Acts 4, 36. Some think that Saul had been acquainted with Barnabas before; indeed, the account of Luke rather favors this assumption, though it is not positively implied. At any rate, Barnabas did not doubt Saul's sincerity, as other disciples did, when he perhaps knocked on the door of the house of Mark's mother, Mary, Acts 12, 12-13, introduced him to Peter and James, the Lord's brother, the only apostles Paul says he met on this visit, Gal. 1, 18-19. Here some might point to a discrepancy between this passage and Acts 9, 27-28, but there is none. Luke merely refers to "the apostles" in a loose manner, without implying how many of them Paul had actual contact with. It is quite likely that not all of them were present in Jerusalem at this time. But the two main leaders were present, Peter and James, and especially with Peter, with whom he apparently lodged, he spent fifteen blessed days there in Jerusalem.

But Paul did not merely visit with his friends Peter and Barnabas, but he began to proclaim the name of Jesus among the Grecians in synagogues of the Greek-speaking Jews from the dispersion and thus endeavored to continue the work of Stephen, Acts 9, 29. But again his life was in danger, for he had deserted his former friends and they would feel toward him an implacable hatred. They soon decided to silence him with the assassin's dagger or in some other way, Acts 9, 29b. The Christians at Jerusalem in some way heard of the plot that had been formed against Paul, Acts 9, 30, and no doubt counseled him to immediately leave Jerusalem. Paul was reluctant to go. Twice already he had been frustrated in his attempt to inaugurate a successful ministry. Was it the Lord's will that he should now flee a third time? While considering the matter, he took it to the Lord in prayer in the temple. Then it was that Paul saw Jesus for the second time in a heavenly vision and heard His voice telling him to leave Jerusalem quickly since his testimony would not be received there, Acts 22, 17-18. But Paul remonstrated, Acts 21, 19-20. It seemed incredible to him that his testimony, continued over a sufficient length of time, could be resisted. Having been such a rabid persecutor of the Christians and now having been transformed into such an ardent supporter, he felt that this marvelous change in him would also be recognized by his opponents as an act of God and hence they would be led to accept the Gospel. But however ardent may have been his hopes, they were brushed aside by the peremptory command, "Get! For I will send thee far hence to the Gentiles", Acts 22, 21. Now this important revelation is usually assigned to Paul's first visit to Jerusalem. Ransay, however, assigns it to the second, the second visit. To be sure, Paul in his speech in Acts 22 does not distinctly state on which visit to Jerusalem the heavenly revelation was given him. Yet v. 17 seems to imply that it was on the first visit following his conversion at Damascus, which he just related. Ransay refers to the discrepancy between Luke's account and that of Galatians 2, pointing out that Luke says nothing about Paul's leaving as a result of a divine revelation, but attributes it solely to the prudence of the brethren. But we feel that there is no discrepancy here, but simply different facts which are related in the respective passages, which may be joined very readily and coherently as we have

done above. Barnaby's other arguments for identifying the Temple vision with the former visit may also readily be met. Above all we hold that the words of Paul in Acts 22, 19-20 would apply with much greater force if spoken at his first visit to Jerusalem rather than at his second, which occurs many years later, when they would not be nearly as applicable as shortly after the time when the persecution occurred.

But we must again take up the thread of the narrative. From Acts 9, 30, we note that some of the brethren at Jerusalem escorted Paul to the capital and port of Judaea, Caesarea, from where they sent him to his home-city of Tarsus, presumably by ship. In the hurried autobiographical sketch which Paul gives of his early ministry in Galatians I, he tells us first of all in verses 21-24 that he came into the regions of Syria and Cilicia after leaving Jerusalem. In connection with this statement we must take the words of Paul to King Agrippa, Acts 26, 20, that the progress of his preaching had been first at Damascus, next at Jerusalem, then throughout the coasts of Judaea, and finally, Sion, to the Gentiles. "Throughout all the coasts of Judaea" would seem to indicate that Paul travelled northward by land when he left Caesarea. Most students who write a hasty sketch of Paul's life overlook this passage and suppose, on the basis of the account in Acts 9, that he sailed directly from Caesarea to Tarsus. This could hardly have been the case, if we want to do justice to both passages. It is plausible to assume that Paul left for Tarsus by the land route. It may have been winter when travel by sea even along the coast was beset with great difficulties. This does not preclude the possibility that he completed his journey to Tarsus by ship, embarking most likely at the port of Sion. To think this likely, for we know Paul's practice of easing the burden of travel by taking to ship whenever possible. It has even been suggested that one of the ship-wrecks which Paul mentions 2 Cor. 11, 25 may well have occurred when on the way to Tarsus. There is a possibility that in Acts 26, 20 Paul is not speaking throughout in a chronological sense. He may have only intended to inform the king that he started to preach the Gospel at Damascus and at Jerusalem and that he then makes the statement that he had preached both to his countrymen in Judaea and to the Gentiles outside of Judaea. So here we are in the realm of conjecture.

One thing is certain, however, namely that Paul in some manner or another went to Tarsus. Later Barnabas went to Tarsus to seek Paul, Acts 11, 25. Why did Paul go to Tarsus? Eickmann suggests that he was most likely homesick at this time and reminds us that "homesickness is often the result of disappointment, irresolution, and failure when abroad." And he continues, "There is only one cure for this secular illness: the cure for homesickness is home." Paul may well have been homesick, but aside from this consideration there was another reason which impelled him to turn his face toward his native Cilicia. There was the country he knew so well and where he hoped to have an excellent opportunity to develop his powers in preaching the Gospel. The Lord had merely told him that he was to preach to the Gentiles, but had not directed him where to begin. He was to use his own judgment. He decided to return home, and who of us under similar circumstances would not have made the same decision. What transpired immediately upon his return to Tarsus we do not know. A number of questions at once arise in our minds. Were Paul's parents still living? What did his relatives say about his having become a Christian? Did they perhaps cast him out? Or were they converted and did they form the nucleus of a Christian congregation in Tarsus? No one can tell. The sacred record does not even inform us as to whether Paul succeeded in founding a congregation in his native city. Somewhere is a church at Tarsus mentioned. Yet we know that many of the first Christian churches are not mentioned.

A little more light is shed upon the apostle's subsequent activity in the Galatian passage, Gal. 1, 21-24. So he preached the Christian faith in the two Roman provinces

of Cilicia and Syria, and here already the implication is that it was a successful ministry. That he did not labor in vain seems to be certain from two allusions in the book of Acts, 15, 23-41, which prove that some years later there were congregations in Syria and Cilicia. We need not doubt that Paul was the founder of these. We are justified then in picturing him to ourselves as continuously active during this period, preaching and teaching, and then organizing and superintending the established churches in a way similar to the one later presented in Acts. It must have been a source of great joy to him to find, when he again visited these congregations after his so-called first missionary journey, that they were still thriving and needed only to be confirmed in the faith. To be sure, the work which Paul carried on during those years in Syria and Cilicia was not as yet work of monumental importance. These were his formative years. He was not working in any of the great metropolises of the world as later, but rather in remote regions. This was pioneer missionary work. These were years of patient preparation for greater things, of apprenticeship. Paul was trying and developing his powers. But at the same time he was already actively engaged in the great work that the Lord had entrusted to him, for at this time already he preached not only among the Jews, but among Gentiles as well, which we see from the fact that the letter of the Jerusalem council, declaring that the yoke of the ceremonial law was not to be placed on the necks of the Gentiles, was sent specifically to the Gentiles in Antioch, Syria, and Cilicia, 15, 23f. And yet in contrast to his later labors among the Gentiles, when he carried the Gospel from Asia into Europe and was universally recognized as the great apostle to the Gentiles, these early years of work in and around Tarsus were years of more humble effort. Luke passes them over in silence. They have therefore appropriately been called the silent years in the life of Paul. In our chronology we shall refer to them as the years of obscurity. From them Dr. Arndt draws the following lesson (*Messenger*, May '37, 558): "We recall that our Savior's earthly life had a similar period, extending from His twelfth to His thirtieth year. Let no one of us then be disturbed by the observation that his work goes on year after year without much of stir or commotion or public acclaim and recognition in the circle of those that are benefited." To which we may add: If Paul could spend a substantial part of his ministry (about a third) in a sphere of comparatively humble accomplishment, then surely any young pastor to-day can be content to labor for a like length of time in his obscure field before being called to a more prominent parish.

In connection with this obscure portion of Paul's ministry we must not overlook the catalog of hardships which Paul enumerates as having been endured by him in 2 Cor. 11, 23-27. This "Iliad of woes" is one of the most remarkable passages which we have from the pen of Paul and shows how incomplete is our knowledge of his labors and sufferings. This enumeration is given long before the end of his career, when he was on his third missionary journey. He recounts these experiences with passionate brevity, for he was driven to this recital against his will by the calumnies of his enemies. Of the specific sufferings listed in verses 24 and 25, only one of the three beatings with Roman rods and the stoning are mentioned in Acts. Also most of the classes of perils listed are in no wise alluded to by the writer of Acts. When did all of these sufferings take place? They can be assigned to but two periods in Paul's life, either to the one that we are treating in this chapter or to his Ephesian ministry. As we shall see later, during the three year sojourn in Ephesus Paul experienced a great amount of persecution and suffering, though this is not indicated by Luke. He may very well have suffered imprisonment, too, and some think that some of the prison epistles were written from Ephesus rather than from Rome. But even granting that some of the experiences enumerated in 2 Cor. 11 were not with ~~at~~ Ephesus, there is still a high degree of probability that a portion of them are to be

placed into the period of Paul's ministry in Syria and Cilicia. It may, for instance, almost certainly be taken for granted that it was during those years that Paul received some of the five beatings that he received at the hands of the Jews. At a comparatively early age his body may have become covered with the scars of frequent mistreatment. We are told that not every victim had the physical resistance to bear the Jewish beating of thirty-nine stripes, and that therefore the number was in some cases reduced. It was the duty of the synagogue attendant who did the scourging to carry it out "with all his strength" (Mishna), and we are told that when the cruel punishment was completed, the back had been slashed into a bloody mass. And if we add to the eight bloody scourgings all the other privations and hardships and sufferings which Paul enumerates, we can well see that his body could not but become enfeebled by what he went through. Unfortunately, these sufferings listed in 2 Cor. are mentioned only so cursorily and so unchronologically that they cannot be assigned to any due order nor even to one particular period in Paul's life. But we repeat, some of them are bound to have occurred in Syria and Cilicia.

Another event which definitely belongs to this period is the special revelation which Paul reports in 2 Cor. 12, 2-4. This was undoubtedly the most profound and sublime revelation which Paul experienced. But all speculation on its nature is barred by the statement, that he "heard unspeakable words which it is not lawful for man to utter". The brief description of this vision precludes our identifying it with the former one which he had received just before leaving Jerusalem, for evident purpose of the latter one was to send him away from Jerusalem. But we are not altogether in the dark when it comes to the time when this revelation was received, for Paul tells us that it occurred fourteen years before the time in which he was writing. Our chronology will show that Paul quite likely wrote 2 Cor. in the year 66. Fourteen years prior to that would be the year 52, or better, computing time as the Jews did, the year 53. Now that would be shortly before Agabus and Paul himself came to Antioch. It was therefore near the end of the years of obscurity, at a time when he was soon to enter upon a new and more prominent phase of his missionary career, for which God may have wanted to prepare him in some way by this special revelation. One certain conclusion we may draw from the entire period of obscurity, that, though they were busy years of blessed activity, they were yet formative years for Paul, preparatory for his entering upon a sphere of enlarged and much more important service.

Now we must concern ourselves with determining as definitely as possible the year of Saul's conversion and in that connection with fixing the period of obscurity in our chronological scheme. We have already seen (p. 19, 20) that it is not feasible to date the conversion by figuring forward from the date of Christ's resurrection in 30 A. D., for the amount of time that elapsed between the two events is so indetermined that we can only roughly say that the conversion of Saul must have taken place between 32 and 35 A. D. If we now look to the first of our pivotal dates, the occupation of Damascus by Aretas, we note that the first positive date that we have in this matter is the year 36, in which Aretas defeated the forces of Herod. Now how long before this event Damascus was occupied by Aretas we do not know, but it may very well have been a year or two, so in 35 or 34 A. D. Now from Galatians 1, 17, 18 compared with Acts 9, 23-26 we note that Paul's conversion took place some three years prior to his escape from Damascus. We doubt that when Paul says "after three years" he means three full years. It is better, as we shall see, to figure only two full years as the closest approximation for this period of time. Subtracting two from the year 35 or 34 gives us 33 or 32 as the year of the conversion.

This dating can be verified if we now take into consideration the fourteen years mentioned in Gal. 2, 1. Before making use of this fourteen year period which Paul mentions in our chronology there are two problems which arise in connection with it to



which we must first turn our attention. The first is this question, are those fourteen years mentioned by Paul, as well as the three years he had previously mentioned in Gal. 1, 18, to be reckoned exclusively at their full face value, that is, as fourteen and three full years, or inclusively, that is, with parts of years being included in designations, the total number of years therefore being less than indicated. We favor the latter view, as it is most in accordance with Hebrew custom to reckon inclusively. Conybeare and Howson explain this practice in the following Note (B) in the Appendix of their life of Paul (p. 749): "We have remarked that the interval of fourteen years (Gal. 2,1) between the flight from Damascus and the Council at Jerusalem might be supposed to be either fourteen full years, or thirteen, or even twelve years, Judaically reckoned. It must not be imagined that the Jews arbitrarily called the same interval of time, fourteen, thirteen, or twelve years, but the denomination of the interval depended on the time when it began and ended, as follows: If it began on September 1st, A. D. 38, and ended October 1st, A. D. 50, it would be called fourteen years, though really only 12 years and one month, because it began before the 1st of Tisri, and ended after the 1st of Tisri; and as the Jewish civil year began on the 1st of Tisri, the interval was contained in fourteen different civil years. On the other hand, if it began October 1st, A. D. 38, and ended September 1st, A. D. 50, it would only be called twelve years, although really only two months less than the former interval, which was called fourteen years." From this we see that a period of time expressed in a certain number of years could hardly ever be taken at its full value according to the Jewish manner of reckoning, but in actual value would be on the average a year less. Thus fourteen years should be figured as thirteen, and three years as two. This is confirmed by Acts 24, 27, which tells us that Paul had been in prison two complete years (*δωδεκάμηνας*) at the time of Felix's departure, thus indicating that here we are to allow the full value of the time designated. To have a fine illustration of inclusive reckoning of time in the mention by Paul to the Ephesian elders of "the space of three years" that he labored at Ephesus, Acts 20, 31. If we look to the time indications that we have of the Ephesian sojourn in Acts 19, 8, 10, 22; 16, 8 (Paul was forced to change his plans and shorten his stay because of the riot), we see that Paul could not have been in Ephesus more than two years and six months at the longest. So in making use of Paul's references in Galatians to three years and to fourteen years, we ought to figure inclusively. And since we do not know the months when these intervals began and ended (except that it might be taken for granted that the conversion occurred on Jan. 25th), it is best to strike an average and figure them as being roughly two years and thirteen years respectively.

But now before making use of these periods of time we also have to decide whether the respective periods are consecutive or concurrent. As far as the first period is concerned, Paul is evidently figuring from the time of his conversion—all are agreed as to that. But as far as the fourteen years are concerned, the question is whether he is again figuring from the year of his conversion, or whether he means that the fourteen years came after the three years that he had previously mentioned. We admit that that is a question that is not only hard to decide, but which cannot be determined with absolute certainty. The majority of scholars, as Lightfoot, seem to figure consecutively, which gives them a total period of 17 years, or 15 years figuring inclusively, from the conversion to Paul's second visit to Jerusalem mentioned in Gal. 2, 1. Others, as Rausay, Turno, and Harnack, hold that the two terms are to be figured concurrently. Concerning this problem Rausay writes (St. Paul the Traveller, p. 382): "The difficulty with regard to the interval between Paul's first

and second visit to Jerusalem (which we consider to have been only eleven years, whereas many take it as fourteen, Gal. 2, 1) disappears when we take the Greek in its real sense. Paul says to the Galatians, "Then, in the third year, I went up to Jerusalem....then, when the fourteenth year was ending." "The two reckonings go together, and are estimated from the same starting-point." If this be so, the second visit to Jerusalem mentioned by Paul in Gal. would have taken place 13 years after his conversion. We have decided to adopt this mode of reckoning for our chronology as it seems to best satisfy other facts that will be taken into consideration. But we repeat that we cannot prove conclusively that the fourteen years must be figured concurrently with the threes. We only think that it should since the results of such reckoning work out more satisfactorily.

Let us now see what results we get. In Gal. 2, 1 Paul states that he again went to Jerusalem after an interval of fourteen years. Can we identify that visit with a visit to Jerusalem mentioned in Acts? We can, at least to the extent of stating that it was one of two visits which are mentioned among others by Luke. Altogether Luke relates that Paul made five visits to Jerusalem after his conversion. The first occurred after his escape from Damascus. This was evidently the visit referred to in Gal. 1, when Paul stayed with Peter. The second visit recorded in the Acts was when Paul took the collection from Antioch with Barnabas in the time of the famine. The third was the time he attended the council in Jerusalem as one of the delegates from the church at Antioch. The fourth visit occurred in the interval between his second and third missionary journeys, and the fifth was the one at which the uproar was made in the temple and he was taken prisoner. Now when Paul in Galatians makes mention of two journeys to Jerusalem, the last two of those enumerated in Acts are at once ruled out for consideration. And while we have no difficulty in stating that the first journey of the one account is the first journey of the other, theologians have been variously divided in opinion as to whether the second journey of the epistle is the second or third journey of Acts. Now we are not going to discuss the problem here, for its consideration belongs more properly to a later period in the life of Paul and will be treated in the next chapter, but we have stated it here since it must be taken into consideration with our chronology of this period. If we assume that the visit to which Paul refers in Galatians 2 was the third visit of Luke, that would throw the conversion some years later than if we assume that it was the second visit mentioned by Luke. Let us view some of the various results that can be established for the date of the conversion by reckoning, as it is possible, in various ways. Here we will have to take the dates for the second and third Jerusalem visits for granted for the time being, remembering that they will be substantiated later. In our chronology we place the famine visit in the year 45 and the council visit in the year 49. If we subtract 13 years from the year 49 we get the year 36 as the year of Paul's conversion. This would satisfy some. But most students would consider that year too late. Consequently most of those who think that the second visit of Galatians is to be identified with the Jerusalem council of Acts 15 figure the three years of Gal. 1 consecutively and subtract another two years from 36, which gives the year 34 as the conversion year. Or, if they prefer to figure exclusively, they subtract 17 full years from 49, which gives them the year 32 for the conversion. So Dr. Kretzmann reckons in his chronology. (Dr. Arndt figures exclusively and concurrently from the famine visit in 46: 46-11=32). We not only prefer to figure inclusively, but also identify Paul's visit to Jerusalem after fourteen years with his second visit to Jerusalem, the famine visit. Now we place this visit in the year 45. Subtracting 13 from 45 gives us the year 32 as the year of Paul's conversion. Thus we have the same year for the conversion as Dr. Kretzmann and Dr. Arndt have.

but we have arrived at the year by an entirely divergent computation. In the next chapter we shall show why we figure from the year 45, that is, from the second Jerusalem visit, and not from the third. We have to see yet how the period of 13 full years from the conversion in 32 to the famine visit in 45 is to be divided into the several periods indicated. We count the Arabian sojourn together with the two short periods of activity in Damascus as covering two years. We see from Acts 11, 26 that Saul spent one year in Antioch before leaving on the relief visit to Jerusalem. Hence three years of the thirteen are accounted for, leaving 10 as the approximate time for the labors in Syria and Cilicia (2+10+1=13). We note in passing that if one figures from the year 45 (or 46), he will have to take the three years and the fourteen years of Galatians as running concurrently, and figure inclusively, whereas if he reckons from the year 49 (or 50), he will have to regard these periods as being consecutive and will have to figure exclusively, unless one is willing to accept a later date for the conversion. Our manner of reckoning agrees very nicely with the pivotal dates of the death of Herod Agrippa in 44 and the famine under Claudius in the year following, as well as with the accepted date of the resurrection in 30 A. D. We know that but a comparatively short time elapsed in the early church before the conversion of Saul, which is satisfied by the year 32 as the year of his conversion, and we thus have thirteen full years from then up to the relief visit at Jerusalem, which harmonizes with our pivotal dates.

#### Chapter V. Coming to Antioch to Beginning of First Missionary Journey.

We had stopped in our consideration of the narrative of Acts with the statement that Saul was sent forth to Tarsus by the brethren, and then, on the basis of the Galatian passages, had traced his further activities through the years of obscurity. To properly lead up to Paul's coming to Antioch, we should rapidly trace the sequence of events in the early church from the martyrdom of Stephen on. The death of Stephen was the signal for a general wave of persecution to break over the church, for itinerant missionaries "went everywhere preaching the word". Apparently the first city in which a new congregation was organized was Samaria, Acts 8, 5f. But congregations were also formed in many other places, Acts 8, 25.40; 9, 31.32.35.42. It became necessary, if these were to be kept in relation to the central body in Jerusalem, that visitations should be made by delegates from Jerusalem. The first of these was made by Peter and John, who were sent to Samaria, when the news that a congregation had been established there by Philip reached the mother-church, 8, 14. This may be taken as a specimen of many similar journeys, one of which is recorded in detail on account of the important development that took place in its course, 9, 32f; 10. When Peter returned to Jerusalem after his visit at the home of Cornelius, the first great question in the development of the Church was thrust upon him by a portion of the Jewish section of the Church, whether circumcision was not essential for acceptance into the Christian Church. Cornelius was in all probability a "proselite of the gate", such being referred to in Acts as "one that fears God", 10, 35. Such were not circumcised and entered into only partial relations with the Jews. The other class of converts were the "proselites of the sanctuary", or proselytes of righteousness", those who came under the full law and could enter the Jewish community on an equal footing. The God-fearing proselytes were bound to observe certain ceremonial regulations of purity in order to be permitted to come into any relations with the Jews, these probably being the four prohibitions enumerated in Acts 15, 28, which stand in close relation to the principles laid down in Lev. 17 and 18 for the conduct of strangers dwelling among the Israelites, and it would appear that they had become the recognized rule for admission to the synagogue and for the first stage of approximation to the Jewish community. Now, while

the attempt was made at first, as seen from the disputation at Jerusalem, to make the door of the Church as narrow as that of the synagogue by insisting on circumcision as a necessary prerequisite for admission, yet Peter's defense was approved by general consent, v. 13. We might think that that would have settled the question once and for all, but, on the contrary, we find this question coming up again and again. A party arose from within the church at Jerusalem, generally termed the Judaists, which maintained that non-Jews who were to be admitted to the Christian communion should be required to conform to the ceremonial law and necessarily had to be circumcised. These were the champions of circumcision, *thes eis vaparapn* Gal. 2, 12 with Acts 11, 2 and 15, 5. This party was silenced at the outset by Peter's explanation in the case of Cornelius, for the preliminary vision and the subsequent gift of grace could not be denied. But the question did not stay settled; only an exceptional case was condoned.

In Acts 11, 19-21, we have an account of how the congregation at Antioch came to be founded and how it came to include Gentiles in its membership. When the Christians were scattered abroad through the persecution that set in with the stoning of Stephen, some of them traveled north as far as Phoenicia, the famous country of traders and navigators, furthermore to the island of Cyprus, lying northwest of Phoenicia, and finally as far north as Antioch in Syria. These are the three first localities outside of Palestine, then, where Christian congregations were established. The witnesses who first testified in these places, however, followed the policy which had prevailed up to that time of addressing themselves only to the Jews. In Antioch, however, some of the refugees from Jerusalem, men whose homes had originally been in Cyprus or the city of Cyrene on the African coast of the Mediterranean, began to testify of Christ to the Gentiles also. The correct text has not "spoke unto the Grecians" (Hollandists), but "unto the Greeks" (Gentiles). How tremendous the import of this statement! In Antioch one could see people of pure "ryan stock" who had in no way submitted to Jewish ceremonial laws worshipping side by side with the children of Abraham.

When tidings reached the church in Jerusalem that in Antioch a church had been founded which was partly Gentile, the mother church did what it had formerly been in the practice of doing, it decided to send an official representative who would assist in placing the new congregation on a sound foundation, Acts 11, 22-24. It is not impossible that such an adviser was asked for. And in sending such a man it is not implied that the mother church was assuming official control, for their thought was evidently merely to guide and help. Barnabas was chosen for this most responsible task, and Luke adds that he was well qualified for the task and was most successful in its prosecution.

And now we finally come to Saul's arrival in this fertile, promising field, Acts 11, 25. The report of Barnabas going to seek Saul at Tarsus seems harsh until one takes it as the continuation of what was reported in 9, 30. Here we note a point in Luke's style—he frequently breaks into his narrative with a digression. So here he again takes up the thread from the point where he had dropped it and implies that the reader must understand Saul to have been in the vicinity of Tarsus all the intervening time. We have seen how Luke and Paul complement each other and how it must have been a long period of his life (10 years) that Saul spent with Tarsus as his headquarters. From v. 26 of this chapter we see that Saul readily accepted the invitation which Barnabas brought to him to work with him in the Antiochian field. The reason why Barnabas desired Paul's help as a coworker was no doubt mainly the fact that by this time the work at Antioch had reached such overwhelming proportions that additional leadership of the highest caliber was needed. Antioch was a huge city of half a million

inhabitants, the third largest metropolis in the Roman empire, being surpassed only by Rome and Alexandria. It was located fourteen miles from Seleucia, its port at the mouth of the Orontes River. In Antioch the proselytes of righteousness may have been quite numerous and it was perhaps among them that Paul did his chief work. Barnabas had met Paul many years before at his first visit to Jerusalem, and had no doubt heard from him the story of his conversion and of the divine revelations he had received concerning his life's work. He had furthermore, no doubt, kept in touch with him to some extent during the years, or how would he have known where he was or how to find him? And knowing something of his successful work among the Gentiles, he considered him just the man for the strategic post at Antioch, where the believers were first called Christians. This last little, but important historical note which Luke attached to v. 25 shows that the labors of Barnabas and Paul must have been tremendous to attract the attention of the whole city and cause the pagan population to attach a name to them by which to identify them as a separate religious group. In v. 26 we have a direct chronological statement, that Paul and Barnabas worked together at Antioch for "a whole year". The meaning of St. Luke hardly is that the whole stay of Paul and Barnabas did not last longer than a year. He evidently means to say that a year elapsed till the next event related by him took place, the departure of Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem.

In Acts 11, 27, 30 we have a new paragraph from the pen of Luke in which he tells of the prophecy by which the coming of famine was known in advance to the Christians at Antioch and of what the church there did to send relief to the church in Judea. The famine would be felt particularly at Jerusalem, for we know that the church there contained many poor from the very start, 6, 11. The act of extending brotherly help paved the way for good feeling between the churches of Antioch and Jerusalem. It was a sort of internationalizing of the fund which was first ministered by the seven deacons. It was a harbinger of other similar charitable offerings to come, especially of that large collection for the poor which was gathered by Paul during the time of his third journey and taken by him and deputies of the churches to Jerusalem, 2 Cor. 9, 1. It was particularly propitious at this time since it established friendly relations between Gentile and Jewish Christians. It served to postpone the difficult day of Acts 15 when the question of the relation of Jew and Gentile in Christ became so acute that a council had to be held to adjudicate the differences.

And now we come to the consideration of the important question: was Paul's visit of Galatians 2, 1 the same as his famine visit to Jerusalem or was it coincident with the Jerusalem council visit? This is one of the most difficult problems which we shall have to solve in our chronological study, and it is not surprising therefore that we find a variance of opinion. To be sure, the older accepted view had quite generally identified the Galatian visit with the Jerusalem council visit, but the other view has rapidly been gaining favor and is now the favorite one in England. We ourselves have accepted this later view and were pleased to note that Dr. Arndt also adopts it in his Messenger biography of Paul (July '37, 492).

We shall begin by setting forth the arguments which are advanced in favor with connecting Paul's Galatian visit with his third to Jerusalem. Conybeare and Howson present them quite extensively in their Note beginning on Page 97 of "Life and Epistles of the Apostle Paul". They take up the possibility of identifying the Galatian visit with each of the five visits of Acts in turn and by the process of elimination endeavor to show that none but the third fits the case. We need, of

course, consider only what they say of the second and third visits. Let us note and answer a few of the objections which they raise against favorable consideration of the second visit. They say, "a further objection is that at the time of the Galatian visit Paul and Barnabas are described as having been already extensively useful as missionaries to the heathen, but this they had not been in the time of Visit 2". To that we answer that Paul makes no extravagant claim in Gal. 2,2 when speaking of his work among the Gentiles and, furthermore, that he and Barnabas had indeed already been extensively useful as missionaries to the heathen during the year that they so successfully labored among the Gentiles at Antioch, Acts 11,26. To quote, "Again, Visit 2 could not have been so long as fourteen years after Visit 1. For Visit 2 was certainly not later than 45 A. D., and if it was the same as the Galatian visit, visit 1 must have been not later than from 31 to 33 A. D. (allowing the inclusive Jewish mode of reckoning to be possibly employed). But Aretas was not in possession of Damascus till about 37". Here the writers are assuming that the two visits of Galatians are to be considered as having occurred consecutively. It is true that if you figure thus and place the famine visit into the year 45 (as we have done) that you get into hot water with the date of the first visit and also with the date of the conversion, both of which are placed too early. But we have shown that it is preferable to figure the two visits concurrently, in fact that one must if he accepts visit 2 as the Galatian visit. And as to putting the occupation of Damascus in the year 37, that is only a surmise, and our surmise that it occurred some several years earlier is just as probable. A third objection advanced is this, "Again, if Visit 2 were fourteen years after Visit 1, we must suppose nearly all this time spent by Paul at Tarsus, and yet that all his long residence there is unrecorded by Luke, who merely says that he went to Tarsus and from thence to Antioch. This is an argument ex silentio, and it really proves nothing, for Luke, for instance, says nothing of the sufferings listed 2 Cor. 11, and yet we know they occurred. From Paul's sketch of his early ministry in Galatians we must conclude that he spent many years in and around Tarsus. We have thus seen that the objections raised are inconclusive. On the positive side the reasons for identifying the Galatian visit with the Jerusalem conference is well summarized by Robinson on Page 99 of his "The Life of Paul". He writes: "The conference of Gal., chap. 2, is almost certainly to be identified with the one described in Acts, chap. 15. There is fundamental and general agreement in the situation portrayed. Both agree that a council was held at which gentile Christianity was freely recognized. Both agree that the circumcision of gentile converts was declared to be unnecessary. They agree in assuming that Jewish Christians were to keep the Mosaic law afterward as before. The public meeting which is described at length in Acts, chap. 15, is probably implied by contrast in the word "privately" in Gal. 2,2. Both state that Paul's personal program of evangelizing the Gentiles was heartily indorsed. Finally both accounts mention James and Peter as having leading parts in the approval." But immediately after setting forth these reasons for making this identification, Robinson goes on to admit that there are divergent statements between Gal. 2 and Acts 15 and goes on to point out at considerable length what difficulties are raised by them.

We shall now proceed to set down some of the difficulties which are created by assuming that the Galatian visit is identical with the third to Jerusalem, and at the same time will show how these difficulties vanish when we identify the visit of Gal. 2 with visit 2 to Jerusalem. Paul in Galatians mentions this journey as if it had been the next visit to Jerusalem after the previous one which he had just reported. This looks as though he were speaking of the journey which he took with Barnabas to convey relief to the Jewish Christians in the famine. If he had been speaking of the third visit to Jerusalem, he would hardly have passed by an intermediate visit to Jerusalem without a word of mention. We must remember why Paul was writing of his visits to Jerusalem. His purpose was to refute the charges made against his apostleship.

His opponents had told his converts that Paul was no true apostle, that he had received his knowledge of the Gospel and his authority from the apostles at Jerusalem. Paul refutes these false statements by declaring first that his commission was not from men but, from Jesus Christ; secondly, that after his conversion he had preached the Gospel for three years without having yet seen any of the apostles; thirdly, that at the end of that time he had spent only one fortnight at Jerusalem, during which time he saw only Peter and James; fourthly, that he had then spent a good number of years in Syria and Cilicia, during which time he was personally unknown to the churches in Judaea; and fifthly, that fourteen years after his conversion he had again undertaken a journey to Jerusalem and had then obtained an acknowledgment of his independent mission from the apostles. So Paul's argument is founded on the rarity of his visits. To be truthful, then, he could not have left out the middle visit. Why, then, it may be objected, does Paul not mention his third visit? Because his point is that at the time when he first came to them (on the first missionary journey), he had never received any charge from the older apostles. His whole point is: "Cleave to my first message, which came direct from God." The third visit did not take place till after the Galatian churches had been founded, and therefore it had no place in the biographical sketch of Gal. 1 and 2.

Another difficulty which arises when we think of visit 3 rather than visit 2 is that in Acts 15 a public assembly of the church in Jerusalem is described, while in Galatians only private interviews with the leading apostles are spoken of. It will be countered that interviews spoken of in the Epistle do not exclude the supposition of public meetings having also taken place. We hold they are definitely excluded by Paul when he states that he conferred privately with the leaders at Jerusalem. Another contrast between the second and the third visit must be observed. In Acts 15 Paul and Barnabas were the only delegates. Now in the visit mentioned in Galatians 2, Barnabas is referred to as having gone along on an equal footing with the apostle, and Titus is mentioned as having occupied the position of a subordinate. The supporters of the opposing view will say that Titus was one of the delegates mentioned in Acts 15, 2. But he is quite evidently referred to as a subordinate in Gal. 2, 1, and we have no reason to think that any subordinates went up to the council, whereas it was necessary to the work of the second visit to use assistants. Moreover, as Wesley points out in this connection (p. 170 of Paul the Traveller): "We may be certain that, if Paul did take any subordinates with him to the Council, he was too prudent and diplomatic to encounter a situation already serious and difficult by taking an uncircumcised Greek with him. It was different on a later visit, when the authoritative decree had decided against circumcision, or on an earlier visit, before the question was raised; but when that question was under discussion, it would have been a harsh and heedless hint to the susceptibilities of the other party to take Titus with him; and Paul never was guilty of such an act. The example of Timothy shows how far he went about this time in avoiding any chance of hurting Jewish feeling." The question arises then why Luke does not mention Titus as having accompanied Paul on the relief visit. But nowhere does Luke mention Titus in Acts, important though he apparently was as a companion of Paul. This omission is difficult to understand. Wesley advances the suggestion (p. 390) that Titus was perhaps a relative of Luke's and that Luke therefore thought that his name should be omitted from the narrative, as he did his own name.

Another point which we would raise, and we feel this is a most important one, is this: In the narrative in the epistle Paul says that the leaders at Jerusalem gave him no instruction and no advice, except to remember the poverty of the brethren there; but on the third ~~visit~~, the delegates bring a question for settlement, and receive an authoritative response, giving a weighty decision. Therefore Paul could not have

been referring to the third Jerusalem visit. At his second visit the difficulty could be foreseen, and that it was which prompted Paul to seek a private approval of his work and policy among the Gentiles. But despite the attempt of "false brethren" to create trouble over the presence of uncircumcised Titus, it did not come out into the open. Between the second and the third visit this question of the relation of the Gentile convert to the ceremonial law became acute, and at the Jerusalem council it was settled in a way which was a complete triumph for the proponents of full freedom from ceremonial observances for the Gentile converts. But though the Judaizing party had received a distinct rebuff, they soon again resumed their activity, although along more subtle lines. Such was obviously the course of the development of the controversy that we witness in the early Church. When we build solidly on the plain foundation, the history rises before us in order and symmetry. Placing the Jerusalem council into the picture of Galatians 2 distorts the facts, whereas by identifying Paul's second visit to Jerusalem with the Galatian visit we place things into the right perspective. The one account supplements the other. Thus Luke tells us that Paul was sent to Jerusalem as one of the delegates to convey the relief gift to the elders. And Paul tells us that he went up by special revelation. There was thus a double motive for his going, to bring the gift of charity, and to confer with the apostles at God's behest regarding the policy to be followed with the Gentiles. Perfect agreement was found to prevail between all parties. This gave Paul additional courage to later withstand Peter when he compromised the liberty of the Gospel at his visit at Antioch and also to oppose the men from Judaea who came up to Antioch and taught the necessity of circumcision.

So we have seen that our view best satisfies all the conditions contained in the accounts in Acts and Galatians. Accordingly it was a momentous visit, giving Paul and Barnabas an opportunity of acquainting the Jerusalem apostles with the work they had done among the Gentiles and assuring them that these apostles fully approved of the Gospel of freedom which they proclaimed. It was at this visit that it was amicably decided to divide the territory to be worked by letting Peter continue to labor among the Jews, while Paul and Barnabas should go primarily to the Gentiles, Gal. 2, 7-9.

Just how long Paul and Barnabas remained in Jerusalem is hard to tell. Jessay holds that the service there must have occupied a considerable time. He takes the view that the work of Paul and Barnabas in bringing relief is to be compared with the work of the first seven deacons in "the daily ministrations" of food to the poor, Acts 6, 1 (St. Paul the Traveller, p. 51). He says, "the Antiochian delegates did not merely act as carriers of money; they stayed in Jerusalem through the famine and acted as providers and distributors, using all the opportunity of encouraging and comforting the distressed that was thus afforded." He believes that this view is a little too extreme, however. If we accept it, it would mean that Paul and Barnabas remained in Jerusalem through the entire period of scarcity in 45 and 46. This long a stay does not seem to be suggested by Luke's narrative and seems to be definitely precluded by the parallel account of Galatians 2, where Paul makes the point that he had very little contact with the apostles at Jerusalem. We do agree with Jessay to the extent of affirming that Paul and Barnabas quite likely did more than merely convey a shipment of gold to the Church in Jerusalem, and that they may very well have made provisions for relieving the distress by purchasing shipments of corn and placing them at the disposal of the elders of the Jerusalem church. But we doubt if their ministry went beyond that or that it was necessary for them to remain in Jerusalem more than a few months.

When it comes to deciding whether the famine visit was made in the year 45 or 46, there is no evidence that could lead one to positively select one year or the other. In making this determination, one will be guided largely by the dating of other related events. Thus Dr. Arndt places the beginning of the first missionary journey in the



spring of 47 and logically enough puts the second visit to Jerusalem in the year 46. Dr. Kretzmann, in his chronology, has one first visit to Jerusalem in 44, not a second visit in 44 or 45. Their eagerness to do so arises from a mistake as to the meaning and order of the narrative of Acts. Between 11, 30 and 12, 25 Luke interposes an account of Herod's persecution and his miserable death, events which belong to the year 44, and it has been supposed that Luke conceives these events as having happened while Barnabas and Saul were in Jerusalem. But that is not the case. If Luke had completed the narrative of the famine visit, and had then reported the nefarious activity of Herod, the reader would have concluded that Herod's persecution and death occurred after the famine visit, which is contrary to history. So to obviate this misunderstanding, he brings down the general narrative of events to the point where the famine began and relief measures were inaugurated. But there he drops the thread of the narrative and digresses to show what had been happening at Jerusalem and in Judaea while the previously related development at Antioch had been taking place. Then at last he mentions the execution of Antiochian plan and the return of the delegates to their own city. So the death of Herod clearly antedates the famine visit. But by how much time—one year or two years? We think by one year, so that the famine visit was made in 45. We note from Acts 12, 1 that Luke connects the closing days of Herod with something that he had shortly before mentioned, and that can only be the coming of Agabus to Antioch. So the prophecy of Agabus was uttered sometime during the year 44. How we think that Saul came to Antioch in the same year. We are told by Luke that he and Barnabas labored together there "a whole year", 11, 26, Luke evidently meaning to say that a year elapsed before something happened which for the time terminated their work at Antioch. What that was he goes on to relate, namely the departure of the two to Jerusalem. We may take it for granted that the collection for the poor was not conducted as an instantaneous offering. It was probably collected by weekly contributions, as we gather from the analogy of the later Pauline collection, and from the fact that the famine was still in the future and there was no necessity for haste. So for about a year relief moneys were gathered and set aside. Then, when during the growing season of 45 the crops were very poor and by fall famine set in, the church at Antioch decided to send the relief sum to Jerusalem. We may suppose that Paul and Barnabas remained at Jerusalem till toward the close of 45 or the beginning of 46. It appears that they did not remain in Antioch very long after their return, but were soon sent forth on the first missionary journey, which we place then in the spring of 46.

## Chapter VI. First Missionary Journey.

With chapter 13 of Acts a new section evidently begins. The subject demands a fresh start, for a great step in the development of the early Church is to be narrated, "the opening of the door of faith unto the Gentiles", 14, 27. At this point Paul begins to appear as the principal character, so that the Acts of the Apostles is often divided into two main parts, the second part beginning with chapter 13 and setting forth the acts of Paul on his three missionary journeys. The first journey to the heathen is set forth in chapters 13 and 14, and it is to this account that we now direct our attention.

The history begins with the selection of Barnabas and Saul from among a larger group of five prophets and teachers for a divinely appointed mission journey. It is noteworthy that Luke often records how Paul was directed in his missionary labors by divine revelation, as here. It is, however, also evident that he in general followed a definite, well-thought-out, and prudent plan. His policy was to select the strategic cities of the empire as the places of his activity. It would not do to merely preach here and there as he found opportunity. It was adventitious to confine his preaching as much as possible to the centers of commerce. The surrounding regions could then be

reached by the congregations which he founded in these centers. Paul thought and planned largely in terms of provinces. His efforts having been begun in Syria and Cilicia were gradually extended through Asia Minor and Macedonia and Greece and finally carried him westward as far as Italy and even Spain. When Barnabas and Paul had been designated for their special task, he notes that they were first consecrated for their service before being sent forth. Here, then, we not only have the beginning of organized foreign mission work, but the first conditioning service as well.

Acts 13, 4-13 gives us the first part of the journey. The missionaries had to of necessity first go to Salamis, the port of Antioch, in order to embark for some distant land where they might begin the great task of evangelizing the Gentiles (much work had already been done in Syria and Cilicia). From this historic harbor they sailed to the island of Cyprus, about 140 miles away, and thus what Dalimann terms "Paul's Iliad and Odyssey" had begun. The start was no doubt made at the opening of the sailing season at the beginning of March (navigation was none too safe or sure for another two months), and the trip across the sea was made in a small, wooden, ancient sailing vessel. They were evidently not impeded by westerly winds, which commonly blow through the summer. The voyage to Salamis was made readily and comfortably enough, but from there on the going got tough. While we are not told how the missionaries traveled when not on board ship, it seems quite evident that they had to rely chiefly on walking. When we note that on Cyprus already there were mountains to be crossed and that later on the mainland, after the coast region had been left, there was chiefly mountainous territory, we see what arduous physical labors were connected with this first journey. - As to the manner in which the travelers maintained themselves the report is silent. Rickmann thinks Paul drew on the little money he had saved while working at his trade at Antioch. Dr. Arndt thinks it likely that the congregation in Antioch had supplied them with sufficient funds when they departed, in view of the fact that they were sent by this church. Their traveling equipment could not have been such. Rickmann suggests a heavy cloak of goat's or camel's hair, a strong cowhide wallet to carry cooking utensils and a few tools, a long heavy staff, and a small purse. It is interesting to note that the missionaries had taken a young man along who was to act as their helper, looking after the many little tasks that would necessarily arise on such a trip. This was not the first time Paul took a young companion along, for if our view is correct, he had taken Titus, whose home quite likely was at Antioch, along on the second journey to Jerusalem. And later on, we know, Paul often provided himself with young assistants. This John Mark had his home in Jerusalem, where his mother had a good-sized house which she placed at the disposal of the Church, Acts 12, 12. The last verse of chapter 12 stated that Barnabas and Saul had taken him back with them from Jerusalem to Antioch. He was related to Barnabas, being his cousin (not nephew, as translated) Col. 4, 10. The first enterprise of going to Cyprus was not in the nature of a wild experiment, but here already we see what a wise course was followed. They did not choose an unknown country far away, but the nearest province from which Barnabas himself hailed, Acts 4, 36. Moreover, Acts 11, 19 states that the Gospel had already been preached there. Here conditions for starting the great task would be most favorable.

The apostles are said to have made a preaching tour through the whole island. The addition of the word "whole" is important. It does not necessarily mean that they preached in every place, but it does no doubt mean that they made a tour of all the Jewish communities and preached in each synagogue. Paul's clash with the scribe at Paphos is related as an outstanding experience, and is related also because the conversion of the proconsul Sergius Paulus was Paul's first victory in a purely Roman situation. The word "deputy" is to be translated as proconsul, for he was one of those governors who were at least nominally under the senate and the people. Such held office only for a year. On the north shore of the Island of Cyprus there was found an inscription dated "in the proconsulship of Paulus", no doubt the same

Paulus who played a part in the scene described by Luke. The order and style of the narrative in this incidence is noteworthy. Nothing is said of the length of the stay in Paphos, nor of what the missionaries did before their meeting up with Bar-jesus. The missionaries, after coming to Paphos, no doubt preached in the synagogue for some time before acquiring such notoriety that the report of their strange doctrines reached the governor's ears. So we must note that Luke often does not indicate the strict order of time, but is guided by the special interest felt by him.

It is significant that at the coming of the apostles to Paphos Luke refers to Paul as "Saul", but when they leave he speaks of him as "Paul". We think that Paul had both names from his boyhood, his Jewish playmates calling him Saul and his Roman playmates calling him Paul. Luke, in speaking of him in Palestine and Syria, uses the Jewish name Saul. But now he had directed his footsteps to the Roman world, and having gained his first sweeping victory therein, Luke is proud to refer to him henceforth by his Roman name of Paul. He is not to the full extent of the term the apostle to the Gentiles. This Luke also delicately hints at by changing the order of the recurring pair of names. Before it had always been Barnabas and Saul. But from here on Paul's name comes first (the only exception is at the Jerusalem Council where the setting is again Jewish). He had evidently assumed the position of leadership.

V. 13 of Acts 13 relates how Paul and his party set sail from Paphos for Perga, the capital of Pamphylia. This time the voyage was about 175 miles. The ship made for the bay of Attalia and then made up the river Caestrus for seven miles to Perga. Some scholars hold that the missionaries intended upon arriving at the mainland of Asia Minor, to follow a land route which would take them to the large cities on the eastern shore of the Aegean Sea, especially Ephesus. We know that it was Paul's plan on his second missionary journey to follow a land route which would take him to those cities, but that he was not permitted by the Spirit to carry this ambition out until several years later, Acts 16, 6; 18, 19; 19, 1. We note that Pamphylia was the first province on the Mediterranean coast west of Cilicia, where Paul had already labored quite extensively, so a logical course would have been to evangelize Pamphylia first and then to push on along the coast. But something must have gone wrong in Perga, for although it was an important city and the capital, Paul and Barnabas did not stay there long.

It is thought that the plan of Paul and Barnabas to proceed along the coast to Ephesus after a stay at Perga was thwarted by an illness of Paul which he alludes to in Gal. 4, 13-15. If we assume that Galatians was written to the churches which were founded on this journey, then we are led to conclude from the above passages that Paul was led to visit the mountainous region in which they lay because of the nature of the illness to which he had succumbed. Many think that Paul at this time suffered an attack of malaria. This supposition is indeed quite plausible, for, after coming from the strenuous work in Cyprus into the unhealthy lowlands of the Pamphylian coast, Paul might readily be seized by an attack of malarial fever. The natural and common treatment for this malady was to go to the higher ground of the interior. The attacks of fever and the chills were intermittent, so that it was possible between attacks to slowly travel away from the low country. It was no doubt for reasons of health as well as from reasons of missionary expediency that Paul resolved to push on to Antioch in the province of Galatia. Its altitude of about 3000 feet would be beneficial to his health and its commercial importance as well as its Jewish population would make it a suitable place to continue missionary work.

The question should here be raised whether the illness which befell Paul at Perga was the same affliction as the "thorn in the flesh" to which he refers 2Cor.

12, 7.8. It is thought by many that this is malaria, which was the occasion why Paul preached to the Galatians, was the same malaria which tormented him at frequent intervals. "Lindsay says" (The Traveller, p. 94): "I have suggested that this malaria was a species of chronic malaria fever... In some constitutions malaria fever tends to recur in very distressing and prostrating paroxysms, whenever one's energies are taxed for a great effort. Such an attack is for the time absolutely incapacitating; the sufferer can only lie and feel himself a shivering and helpless wretch, when he ought to be working. A strong corroboration is found in the phrase: 'a stake in the flesh,' which Paul uses about this malady. That is the peculiar headache which accompanies the paroxysms. The oldest tradition on the subject, quoted by Tertullian and others, explains the 'stake in the flesh' as headache. He clearly implies that it came later than the great revolution, when 'he was caught up even to the third heaven' about 43 A. D. The malady certainly did not begin long before this journey; and the attack in Paphlagonia may perhaps have been the first."

That the resolve to go to Antioch was a change in plans is also suggested by the departure of John Mark for Jerusalem. Just why he was not willing to continue into the interior we do not know. It may have been fear of the dangers of the robber-infested mountains, or dissatisfaction with Paul's having crowded his cousin out of the position of leader of the party, or perhaps just plain homesickness, that led Mark to desert his companions. That Paul was displeased at Mark's desertion is indicated Acts 15, 39. Indeed, his defection from the little mission band just at the time of Paul's illness was most shameful.

Acts 13, 14 to the end of the chapter gives us the account of the work at Antioch. Of the experiences of the two missionaries in crossing the Taurus mountains nothing is mentioned or Luke. Nor is this surprising since he made no mention of Paul's illness. But we doubt not that what Paul wrote to the Corinthians of having been in perils of waters, in perils of robbers, in perils of the wilderness, "refers in part at least to this journey. The winding roads over the passes led through narrow and deep gorges, which, when a cloudburst occurred, became suddenly filled with rushing torrents, which threatened death to every living being caught in their path. At Paul's time the mountains were infested by bands of robbers, which, because of the wild nature of the region, the Romans had been unable to exterminate. The journey to Antioch was nearly a hundred miles as the crow flies, but because of the twists and turns and ups and downs of the road they no doubt traveled half again as far. It must have taken them about a week to reach their destination.

Antioch was located at the north end of an extensive plain. Its extensive ruins prove its great prominence in a rustic times. It was a Roman colony which meant that its citizens had special rights. The name is rightly given as Pisidian Antioch in the great manuscripts; the form 'Antioch of Pisidia' is a corruption. At the time when Luke wrote Antioch belonged to the province of Galatia. Yet it might be termed Pisidian Antioch, for it was in the region of Pisidia and the largest and oldest part of its population was Pisidian. One must distinguish between the old regional designations and the official Roman terms which apply to provinces. Thus the region of Galatia lay north of Phrygia and Cappadocia, whereas the province of Galatia extended far southward to include parts of Phrygia, and Lycaonia and all of Pisidia. It is also to be noted that Luke in the book of Acts uses the older popular terms rather than the official ones. Paul, however, in his epistles, always uses the official Roman terms. Thus Antioch, though in the old region of Pisidia, was actually located in the southern part of the province of Galatia.

At Antioch we are given a glimpse of the manner in which the missionaries were wont to carry on their work. The Jewish synagogue was made the starting point.

Here both Jews and Jewish proselytes could be reached (note the two classes mentioned in v. 16). Visiting teachers were invited to address the assembly. This gave the missionaries the opportunity to demonstrate that Jesus is the promised Messiah. When the majority finally rose in opposition to the Gospel, the missionaries turned entirely to the Gentiles, meeting with them in private homes and perhaps other places. The usual inference from verse 14 is that Paul preached this sermon on the first Sabbath day. But that is not distinctly stated. It is more likely that Paul preached a number of successive Sabbaths before the climax recorded took place. Luke's method is to pass over the uneventful in silence and only to continue the narrative when some critical event takes place. Paul's sermon is recorded in such detail since it is typical of Paul's manner of preaching and in order to show how the great effect on the population of Antioch was brought about. Never after this could Paul doubt the power of the Gospel. Neither could the Jews fail to see its strength and the danger with which it threatened their whole ceremonial system. The Jews who followed the leadership of the Pharisees at Jerusalem would naturally create a very active opposition. So here they succeeded in expelling Paul and Barnabas from the city. But their work had been done, for "the word of the Lord was published throughout all the region" v. 49. The use of the word "region" is significant. Evidently it does not simply mean the territory immediately around the city, for the term "city" included the lands that belonged to it, but reference here is to some distinct and extended territory. From inscriptions we learn that there were a number of administrative regions in Southern Galatia, the names being given as Phrygia, Isauria, Pisidia, and Lycaonia. Ramsay says (The Traveller, p. 104): "There can be no doubt that Pisidian Antioch (strictly 'a Phrygian city towards Pisidia') was the center of the Region called Phrygia in inscriptions embracing the parts of the province, and 'the Phrygian Region' (the province) Galatia' in Acts 16, 6, or 'the Phrygian Region' 16, 23. The process by which the whole region was influenced by the Gospel must have been a gradual one. How long a period of time is covered by v. 49 we cannot tell with certainty. No surmise, however, that it could well have been from three to six months. We note yet how the Jews effected the expulsion of the missionaries by stirring up "the devout and honorable women", those who had been attracted to Judaism, as well as "the chief men of the city", the wealthy and influential merchants and the magistrates, v. 50. In this verse Luke merely mentions in passing that persecutions were raised against Paul and Barnabas. But in 2 Tim. 3, 11 Paul uses the word "afflictions" to persecutions and indicates that he suffered such at Antioch, Iconium, and Lystra. We know that Luke passes over Paul's sufferings lightly. He says therefore conclude that some of the sufferings mentioned in 2 Cor. 11 were experienced in those cities. He was three times beaten with the rods of lictors before the writing of 2 Cor. in 56. Since the Roman governors whom he met were favorable to him, these beatings must have taken place at the direction of magistrates. We know that the one beating by lictors took place at Philippi and it is not improbable that the other two occurred at Antioch and at Lystra where persecutions took place. Again it may be that some of the five occasions on which Paul received stripes from the Jews were in the Galatian cities.

The next stage of the journey is recorded in Acts 14, 1-6. The missionaries traveled eastward along one of the main highways of antiquity, which led from Ephesus and the Aegean coast over the high table-lands of the interior of Asia Minor to Syria and the far-off countries of the Euphrates and the Tigris, the Imperial Road built about B. C. by Cyrenius (Quintus) the governor of Syria. After a journey of about eighty miles, the two apostles reached the city of Iconium, which was situated on a plateau that was abundantly watered by a stream coming down from the hills. Iconium was not an important city such as Antioch was. It was rather a comparatively insignificant town near the outskirts of the same region of which Antioch was the seat. There is no

mention in the text of any influence which the Gospel had on the surrounding region and in v. 51 of chapter 13 it is intimated that the travellers were not going to a new district, but merely to an outlying city of the same district. But when they found it expedient to leave Iconium and fled to Lystra and Derbe, then the passage to a new region and to a new sphere of influence is plainly made, v. 6.

Some feel that v. 3 brings a clash into the narrative since v. 2 and 4 evidently hang together. While there is a great diversity of the text in the leading MSS. at this point, v. 3 need not be regarded as an early gloss. Luke seems to stress that just because of the opposition they "therefore" found it necessary to stay a long time. Here at Iconium we have a reference to signs and wonders being done. This was a special sign of divine favor and was no doubt granted because of the difficulty of the field. Great was the success in Iconium, but also great the opposition. Because the two factions were about equal in strength, the apostles could continue the work a "long time", v. 3, perhaps several months. Not until mob action threatened did Paul and Barnabas push on.

There has come down to us an old apocryphical romance, which has its setting in Iconium, "The Acts of Paul and Thecla". Thecla is a young betrothed girl who is moved by the teaching of Paul to choose perpetual virginity for herself, for which reason she is condemned to the stake, being rescued from death by divine intervention (see story in Pilgrim Paul, p. 104).

Once more the missionaries follow the imperial Road of Augustus, this time south, and after but eighteen miles reach the important city of Lystra. Of what transpired in that city we are told in v. 8-20. Lystra was a city worthy of Paul's efforts. It is known to have been a Roman colony. In the present site of the city there still stands the pedestal of a statue of the emperor Augustus. Possibly this was the site of emperor-worship. But Jupiter was the god who was mainly revered. There were two myths told of the gods which competed with this wild neighborhood. In one of them Jupiter and Mercury figure, they coming down to earth to pry into the affairs of men (Sickmann, p. 114), which fact gives point to the people of Lystra identifying Barnabas and Paul with Jupiter and Mercury, v. 13. These appellations may have a bearing on the personal appearance of the two men. Barnabas was quite likely a heavy man with dignified bearing. Paul like Mercury, the messenger of the gods, was not only ready of speech, but also quick of foot and quick of eye. In "The Acts of Paul and Thecla" he is described as being "of moderate stature, with curly hair and scanty, crooked legs; with blue eyes, and large eyebrows; long nose". This picture of the apostle is corroborated to some extent by the words 2 Cor. 10,10, "his bodily presence is weak". Luke gives the impression that here it was not the preaching of the Gospel, but the healing of the cripple which attracted the chief attention. But the sentiments of the mob are fickle. The adoration of the people of Lystra turned into disdain. Fanatical hatred against the messengers of God was stirred up by certain Jews which came from Iconium. And now Paul was to suffer the most serious affliction in his long list of persecutions. Foiled in their attempt to stone him at Iconium, the Jews succeeded in their endeavor at Lystra, leaving the body of Paul outside the city gate supposedly a corpse. But his time had not yet come. The Lord raised him up as the disciples had gathered around and so strengthened him that the very next day he was able to depart for Derbe.

Before leaving Lystra we recall that it was the home of Timothy of his mother Eunice, and of his grandmother Lois, Acts 16, 1. The father of Timothy was quite likely dead. This family was converted by the preaching of Paul, as were so many others. It is not improbable that the missionaries enjoyed the hospitality of Eunice and that Paul already on this visit became deeply attached to young Timothy.

It was a journey of some thirty miles from Lystra to Derbe, the Imperial Road running southeastward. Little is known of the history of Derbe, though it was no doubt an important Roman city. No Jewish settlement had been established there, so that Paul and Barnabas could work unhindered among the pagan population. Pronounced success followed from their work, v. 21. A casual reference in Acts 20, 4, tells us that one of Paul's trusted helpers, Gaius by name, came from this city.

The missionaries were now near the Cilician Gates and might have easily by a short trip crossed the Taurus Mountains to Tarsus, the home of Paul. But now, in mid-winter, as we think, the passes of the Taurus were blocked with deep snow. However, this was not the impelling reason for retracing their steps along the Imperial Road, but rather the work which gripped and held them. Of the four places where they had labored they had been able to carry their work to a successful conclusion only at Derbe. And so they returned to Lystra, Iconium, and Antioch in order to properly organize the congregations and to confirm the brethren in the faith, v. 21-23.

From v. 24-28 we see that they traveled the same route from Antioch to Perga, stopping this time long enough to preach the word in the latter city, and that they set sail from the port of Attalia direct for Antioch. So they did not revisit the island of Cyprus. Arrived in the city of Antioch, they eagerly related the experiences of the journey and portrayed the great new possibilities of bringing the saving Gospel to the Gentiles of the western Roman world.

And now the important question arises, How long did the first missionary journey last? In answer to this question we find quite a divergence of opinion. Some, as Farrar, hold that the first journey lasted only about a year. Others, as Hekmann, put the duration of the journey as high as four years. The majority, however, reckon about two years. We think that it could not possibly be less than that, for considerable periods of activity are indicated at the various stations. But neither can we allow much more than two years, or our whole chronological scheme would be thrown out of kilter. We have shown that the first missionary journey began quite likely in the spring of 46. We place the return to Antioch, then, sometime in the summer of 48. The travelers had covered over 1400 miles, for the most part on foot, and had passed through all sorts of harrowing and enervating experiences. They not only needed, but deserved a well-earned rest. We see that the practice of giving furloughs to foreign missionaries rests on apostolic precedent. The last verse of chapter 14 records that Paul and Barnabas abode at Antioch a "long time". Luke, as usual, states the lapse of time very vaguely. It is quite likely that his expression "long time" is meant to cover the whole period of time between the return from the first missionary journey until the departure on the second. During this time there occurred the Jerusalem council. We know that after attending the Council, Paul continued to labor at Antioch for a while. So we conclude that the "long time" extended from the summer of 48 to the spring of 49, when the second journey began. The Jerusalem Council, then, we think was held in the early part of 49, for Paul left soon afterwards on his second missionary journey, 15,36.

## Chapter VII. The Jerusalem Council

Acts 15 is the chapter which deals with the momentous Jerusalem Council. We must first of all see how what led to the Council. That is stated in verse 1. These people who came from Jerusalem to Antioch and taught falsely concerning the necessity of circumcision are known as the Judaizers, because they wanted to compel the Gentiles to live, as did the Jews, observing the ceremonial as well as the moral law. These reactionaries did not confine their activity to Antioch, but, as v. 23 indicates, they

preached their doctrine as far as Cilicia. Indeed, at a later time they worked their way through the Galatian churches and others founded by Paul. The old Antiochian converts had come into the church through the door of the synagogue and no doubt continued to observe certain Jewish prohibitions. But in time there were many who had come directly into the Church, Gentiles, and on these no conditions of compliance with Jewish rules had been imposed. At Antioch there were no scruples on the part of the Jewish members of the congregation in associating freely with their Gentile brethren. But the Jews of Jerusalem were far more rigid and narrow; and when some of them came down on a mission to Antioch, they were shocked by the state of affairs which they found there. - They could not, of course, deny that the Gentiles could be saved or admitted to the church. But they raised the question as to how they could be saved and whether there was any door which led into the Church aside from the ancient door of the law of Moses? We can readily see how these Judaizers could work on the pride and prejudices of the Jewish Christians at Antioch and cause them to deny the liberty which the Gospel brings to the Gentile Christians. That many of the Jewish members were so affected we see from the expression in v. 24, "subverting your souls". The dissension between these and the Gentiles became so great that the congregation resolved to take the question of the relation of the Gentile Christians to the law to Jerusalem for settlement. Here was a crisis of the most serious kind. The opponents, while ostensibly merely insisting on compliance with the ceremonial law, were in reality aiming their shafts at the very heart of the Gospel, for they were teaching that salvation depended upon works. Little wonder that Paul and Barnabas withstood them so vigorously, v. 2. But when they saw that many were not convinced and that the precious Gospel of freedom and of justification by faith, as well as the peace of the Church, was threatened, they thought it expedient to go with a delegation to Jerusalem about the matter. It must not be thought that Paul's idea was that it was up to the apostles at Jerusalem to arbitrarily decide the issue. Rather, convinced as he was of the divine origin of his doctrine, he knew that his position would be corroborated by the Church at Jerusalem, and that so the truth of the Gospel would be vindicated and harmony restored to the Church.

But before passing on to a consideration of the Council itself, we must raise the question, when did Peter visit Antioch? Was it at this time, before the Council, or was it after the Council? Paul rehearses this visit in Gal. 2, 11-12. To note that he does so immediately after recording his visit to Jerusalem fourteen years after his conversion. Those commentators who associate this visit with that to the Jerusalem Council draw the justifiable conclusion that it occurred after the Council and not before. Paul is evidently following chronological sequence in these first two chapters of Galatians, and there is no reason for assuming that he did not continue to do so to the end of chapter 2. But it is just the recognition of this fact which causes us difficulties. If we consider Peter's visit to Antioch and his separatistic conduct to have occurred after the Council meeting, consider how inexplicable his conduct would be. At the Council it was Peter who first rose to the defense of the manner of life of the Gentiles, declaring that God had put no difference between them and the Jews and that no ceremonial yoke should be placed on their neck, 7-11. So he appeared as the most outspoken advocate of freedom. Shortly after the Council, according to this view, Peter went to Antioch and put into practice the principle of freedom for which he had contended at the Council. But now when "certain came from James" and reopened the controversy, Peter abandoned his publicly expressed conviction and withdrew himself from the Jewish brethren. Peter had his moments of weakness, but that vacillating he was not! No longer was he the young, impulsive pupil that he had been at the time of his denial. Though still subject to human weakness, he was now in the maturity of his power, and it is simply unthinkable that he should have right after Council abrogated the principle of freedom in the Gospel which had been approved there.



How different his conduct appears when we assume that his withdrawal from the Gentile Christians occurred sometime prior to the Council and at a time when the great question of the submission of the Gentiles to the law had not as yet been officially raised and settled! Another fact to be considered is that we know that Paul left Antioch soon after the Council and embarked on his second missionary journey which would allow very little time for the visit of Peter and also for that of those who came from James a little later, but while Peter was still at Antioch.

But what becomes of the order of events of Galatians 2 by accepting this theory? The difficulty of Peter's visit at Antioch following upon the Jerusalem visit of Paul resolves itself very nicely when we assume, as we have previously done, that this visit is not that to the Jerusalem Council, in the year 49, but rather the famous visit of the year 45. There is only one slight difficulty that remains from accepting our supposition and that is the conduct of Barnabas. In Gal. 2, 13 we are told that Barnabas was carried away with the dissimulation of Peter and the other Jews, whereas in Acts 15, 2 we are told that Barnabas joined Paul in disputing with the Judaistic party. We believe that these texts can very readily be reconciled. Paul does not make it clear how far Barnabas had been carried away by the tide. Even Peter only began to withdraw and separate himself, imperfects being used, not aorists. Barnabas may only have wavered, and then been set aright by Paul's dealing with him in private. We know that Paul's public rebuke was not addressed to Barnabas, but only to Peter. We can conceive of Barnabas as having wavered at first, but soon after as having come forward as a staunch supporter of the Pauline practice, something we would expect of him who had been Paul's co-laborer on the first missionary journey. It is hardly possible, that Peter's visit to Antioch occurred before Paul set out on the first journey. But if we place Paul's account of what happened at Antioch side by side with that is reported in Acts 15, 1 and again in v. 24, we note the striking similarity of the situation. Paul says that "certain came from James". Luke speaks of "certain men which came down from Judaea" and the apostolic letter which was sent to the churches says "certain which went out from us have troubled you", the apostles here disclaiming all responsibility for the false teaching of their emissaries. These statements are so similar that we are led to believe that it is the same period that is being spoken of, Paul describing the occasion of the discussion at Antioch from one angle, and Luke describing it from another. Barnabas gives a vivid and we think altogether correct narrative of the sequence of events at Antioch in which he intertwines the two portions of the sacred narrative.

Now we are ready to follow the Antiochian delegation to Jerusalem, v. 3-4. The journey to Jerusalem took some little time, for in Phoenicia and in Samaria Paul and Barnabas took the opportunity of acquainting the congregations with the remarkable success which had attended their preaching to the Gentiles. Luke omits Judaea. Perhaps that is to indicate that the Judaeen churches likewise resented Paul's free acceptance of Gentile converts. At Jerusalem there occurred first of all a meeting of the entire congregation, in which Paul first of all rehearsed all the great things that God had done in the Gentile world and then, no doubt, stated the reason for the delegation having been sent to Jerusalem. This gave occasion to the extreme members of the Judaizing party, who are described here as being Pharisees, to voice their views forthwith, v. 5. Thereafter a special meeting of the apostles and the elders was held in which a long discussion took place. Peter it was, who but a short time before had been so irascible, but who had been set aright by Paul, who now arose and made such a noble defense of the practice which Paul followed with the Gentile converts 6-11. The effect of his speech was to quiet the antagonists and to give Paul and Barnabas an opportunity to recount the proofs of divine favor upon the Gentile converts, v. 12. We note that in this verse the order of the names

is for once again reversed, for here we are on Jewish soil, where the prestige of Barnabas was greater than that of Paul. Finally James, who in a sense may be regarded as the head of the church at Jerusalem, arose to endorse the conviction by now generally held that "no trouble not them" with ceremonial observances, stipulating, however, that the Gentile Christians should be asked to observe certain fundamental regulations of purity, 13-21. James grounds his advice that the Gentiles should accept these prohibitions on the fact that the Mosaic law had already spread widely over the cities of the empire, so on the fact that these stipulations must be observed if intercourse between the Gentile Christians and Jews was to obtain. The suggestion, or we might say motion, which was placed before the assembly by James, was adopted not only by the apostles and elders, but by "the whole church", and was embodied in a letter which was to be conveyed by delegates to the churches of Syria and Cilicia, this letter containing what is often called the Apostolic Decrees, 22-29, it being incidentally the oldest Christian document.

It has often been stated that the inclusion of these decrees in the letter which otherwise granted full freedom in ceremonial matters made the resolution of the church a compromise measure. This statement, however, should be made with reservations. It is true that the action of the church calmed the troubled waters only for a brief space of time and that the controversy flared up anew. But it is equally true that the liberty of the Gentiles from circumcision and other rites was fully established, and that peace was again established in the Church. When we examine the four prohibitions imposed on the Gentiles, we note that one manifestly belongs to the moral law, that forbidding fornication. The reason for this inclusion was because of the enormous prevalence of this sin among the heathen of that time. The other three provisions all belong to the ceremonial law and were intended to make harmony between the Jewish and the Gentile sections of the Church possible. It was not wrong in itself to eat meat offered to idols or blood or things strangled. But doing what a person has a right to do is not always in keeping with the dictates of Christian wisdom and love, as St. Paul points out when he takes up the question of the eating of meat offered to idols in 1 Cor. 9-10 ("All things are lawful for me, but all things are not expedient," 10, 23).

The Jerusalem conference very wisely sent not only the letter to the Gentile churches, but a delegation consisting of Judas and Silas. Messengers from Jerusalem had troubled the church at Antioch, and now these delegates were to undo the trouble which had been created. Of the effect of their mission we are told in v. 30-31. Thus the doctrinal crisis which threatened to disrupt the Church was successfully terminated.

And now in v. 32-35 we have an historical note which shows how Silas became connected with the church at Antioch and which prepares the way for the later disclosure that he became the companion of Paul when he again set out on a new journey. The stress laid on the fact that Silas voluntarily remained when his official duty was declared to be at an end makes the choice of a man from Jerusalem more intelligible. The conclusion can be drawn from this section that Judas and Silas remained at Antioch until the completion of their work, and that the apostolic letter was carried to the other churches of Syria and Cilicia by other messengers. Antioch was the center of the Church in the province of Syria and Cilicia, as is attested by the address of this letter, 15, 23, so that Judas and Silas fulfilled their duty by carrying the letter as far as Antioch. The question is asked why this letter was not addressed also to the churches of Galatia. The answer which is most obvious is that the letter was addressed only to those who raised the question, who had been disturbed by the false teachers. But since the settlement of the question applied also to the

Gentile Christians in Galatia, we find that Paul delivered the decrees also to them, 16, 4. Significant is the fact that when Paul and Silas went through Syria and Cilicia, confirming the churches, that no mention is made of their publishing the decrees there, because they had already been received there.

### Chapter VII. Second Missionary Journey

We are told of the beginning of the second missionary journey in Acts 15, 36-41, which therefore properly should have been included in chapter 16. It is high time to again make a few strictly chronological notes. We have for some time been computing out time from the date of the first visit of Paul to Jerusalem in the Fall of 45. We have now reached the point where we can also reckon backward from the most important of our pivotal dates, that of the proscription of Gallio, which began in the summer of the year 51. We have already shown (p. 20) that Paul's coming to Corinth is to be placed in the beginning of the year 50, for ~~we are told~~ that Paul had been working at Corinth approximately eighteen months when the riot occurred shortly after the arrival of ~~Gallio~~ and since we are told that Paul remained at Corinth "yet a good while" after the riot and timed his departure so as to arrive at Jerusalem at a feast, which was in all probability the Passover of the following spring, we set his departure from Corinth early in 52. From this two-year stay at Corinth we can figure forward or backward. We conclude that Paul left Antioch on the second missionary journey in the spring of 49, making all the stops mentioned in Acts 16 and 17 in the same year, and spending the year 50 and 51 in Corinth, returning to Antioch in the early summer of 52, giving the second journey a duration of three years. As to duration our reckoning agrees with Ramsey, whom we have been able to follow pretty well so far (his "Table of Pauline Dates" differs by one year from those in "The Traveller" for the period from the first visit to the Council). But for dating this period we disagree with Ramsey by one year, for he regards the year 52 as the year of the ending of Gallio, while we have preferred to accept Holmstedt's evidence which points to the year 51. Ramsey, then, must allow over a year and a half between the first and the second journey (where we allowed three quarters of a year), and he allows no appreciable time at all between the second and the 16--see 18, 23 (where we allow a year). In our dating of the second journey we coincide exactly with Dr. Probstmann and also with Dr. Armit, except that he brings Paul back to Antioch already in the fall of 51. But at various other periods we find ourselves disagreeing with the dating of the so-called doctors and note that they disagree with each other, so that the longer we work on this subject, the more convinced we are that there can be no unanimity in the study of the Pauline chronology. And yet when we note the glaring errors in deductions and imputations as seen in some of the published studies in this field and then carefully survey and weigh the reliable evidence which we have found, we cannot but conclude that the chronology which we are setting up cannot err by more than a year or two at most.

And now we are ready to follow Paul on the momentous second missionary journey, on which the Gospel was carried into Europe. In Acts 15, 36-41, we are told of the disagreement of Paul and Barnabas over the question of giving John Mark, who had left them so ignominiously on the first journey, another chance. Mark had evidently accompanied them back to Antioch from Jerusalem. Paul had good reason to doubt whether he had as yet overcome his inordinate longing for home and ease. Barnabas, however, was persuaded that his relative would make good. And so there was a sharp contention regarding policy between the two friends and erstwhile companions with the result that they agreed to go their separate ways. Barnabas here passes out of history. Tradition has it that he remained at Cyprus the rest of his life and that he met his death by the Jews burning him at the stake at Salamis under Nero. Strangely enough, Mark did eventually make good and enters the picture later as a

co-worker of the apostles. In Col. 4, 10, Philon. 24, and 2 Tim. 4, 11 we find him helping Paul. From 1 Pet. 5, 13 we see that he was also a trusted companion of Peter. It appears that Silas took the place of Barnabas, not of Mark. A little later the position of Mark as "minister", 13, 5, was taken by Timothy. Mark's influence was evidently a growing one and culminated in his writing the inspired life of Christ. The choice of Silas was, of course, due to his special fitness and inclination for the work. In Antioch he had doubtless shown test and understanding in the questions regarding the relationship of the Gentile Christians to the Jews.

Setting out on their journey from Antioch by the land route, Paul and Silas traveled along the picturesque road up through the Syrian gates which cross the Amanus Mountains 3000 feet high. As they passed issues they no doubt recalled that it was there that Alexander fought the great battle that decided that the culture of Macedonia and Greece would penetrate Syria and Palestine. Perhaps Paul had resolved even then that the Gospel which had firmly been planted in Palestine and Syria should penetrate as far as Macedonia and Greece. As the missionaries journeyed first northward and then westward, they strengthened the churches, some of which no doubt had been founded by Paul himself during his so-called silent years. His route to the churches of Southern Galatia which he intended to visit brought him to Tarsus, 129 miles from Antioch, from which he travelled northward over the Taurus Mountains by the Cilician Gates, through which Alexander had come. Strange indeed it would have been if Paul would not have stopped at Tarsus to visit relatives and friends. There may very well have also been a Christian church, which he himself had established, in his home city.

In Acts 16, 1-5 we have a further description of the journey. Having crossed the mountains through the Cilician Gates and then traveled westward, Paul came after about a week's journey to the familiar localities at Derbe, and then at Lystra. The stop of Paul at Lystra was particularly memorable because he chose the youthful Timothy to accompany him as helper and disciple on this journey. Young as Timothy was, he had probably already been given special tasks to perform by the Christians, for he was well reported of not only at Lystra, but also at Iconium, eighteen miles away. Paul's confidence in Timothy was not misplaced, for we know that he soon developed into a valued companion and co-worker. His two soon developed a relation toward each other which was like that of father and son. In Timothy's case Paul took a course which he had refused to adopt in the case of Titus when he took him with him to Jerusalem on his second visit. He has therefore been much criticized for circumcising Timothy. But Paul circumcised Timothy because he wanted to do everything possible to make his ministry as successful as possible. Paul's policy was to approach the Jews first in every city to which he came. If he was to win some of these, his immediate helpers must be Jews. And we cannot but highly admire Timothy for being willing to forego the use of his Christian liberty in this matter. From 2 Tim. 1, 6 we note that Timothy was ordained to the church-work in a special service, which Eickmann describes so graphically, p. 133f.

The account of the continuance of the journey from Lystra, Acts 16, 6-8, has occasioned considerable debate. Already from the fact that it was stated in v. 4 and 5 that "as they went through the cities, they delivered the. the decrees for to keep", and that "so were the churches established in the faith", we conclude that Paul visited all the churches which he had established on the first journey. Iconium and Antioch are not especially mentioned, as nothing striking occurred in either one. But some conclude that Paul chose a new route after leaving Lystra and did not on this trip visit Iconium and Antioch. Their view is that he turned northward and went through Phrygia and then, coming to the ancient region of Galatia, he

labored there and founded churches in the principal cities, such as Ancyra. The proponents of this view then hold that it was to these churches that Paul later addressed his epistle "to the Galatians". This view is known as the North Galatian. Those who hold that Paul never did visit the northern part of the province of Galatia, and that his Epistle to the Galatians was addressed to the congregations which he had founded on his first missionary journey in the southern part of the province of Galatia, accept what is known as the South Galatian view.

It will be best to examine these two views and to decide which has the greater probability of being right at this place in our study rather than in connection with the writing of the epistle to the Galatians. The North Galatian view is the older, traditional one, which was held by most scholars. The proponents of this view point to the fact that the writer of the book of Acts uses geographical names in the older and the popular sense rather than in the newer and Roman one. They conclude that the name Galatia is reserved for Galatia proper, for the region of Galatia which lay in the northern part of the Roman province of Galatia. And here they seem to have the force of the text on their side, for in Acts 16, 6 it is distinctly stated "then they had gone throughout Phrygia and the region of Galatia". And now, if it be acknowledged that Luke uses the popular rather than the official nomenclature in speaking of Galatia, then it seems highly probable that Paul, whose companion Luke was, should do the same thing. Hence, when Paul writes to the Galatians, he is writing to churches which he had founded in the northern region of Galatia.

The chief difficulty with this view is the absence of any evidence that Paul founded a series of new churches on this journey. The impression of the narrative is that Paul was hastening through the region of the churches which had already been founded to reach new territory. The choice then is between believing that the epistle was written to churches which were not there in conjecture or to churches which we know that Paul founded and in which he continued to be deeply interested. Nor is the text against the South Galatian view. To the fact that South Galatia was divided into four administrative regions, one of them being the Phrygian, with Antioch as its center. Then Luke, to wit, in 16, 6 speaks of "the Phrygian and the Galatian region" (so literally, *τὴν φρυγίαν καὶ τὴν γαλιτικήν χώραν*), he naturally does not mean two regions, but only one, which was both Phrygian and Galatian. To the names in 16, 23 are also to be understood. Then Paul had visited the cities of Icone and Lystra, which were located in the Lycenonian region of Galatia, he proceeded on his intended route through the Phrygian region of the province, so to the two cities of Iconium and Antioch. Furthermore, even though it be a fact that Luke uses the popular geographical designations in Acts (he also uses Roman political divisions as Asia, Bithynia, Macedonia), that does not at all warrant the conclusion that Paul does likewise. In fact, it must be recognized that Paul uses the official Roman terms in his epistles. He frequently speaks of the Roman provinces of Macedonia, Achaia, and Asia. Now for seventy-five years the Roman Galatia had included the cities in which he organized churches on his first missionary journey, and Paul would simply be following his invariable custom when he called the churches of these cities Galatian. But there are additional considerations which strongly corroborate the South Galatian view. The country of North Galatia could hardly have attracted St. Paul. Galatia proper was and is a very wild country. Grazing was the leading occupation. The people were uneducated and spoke their own Gallic language. Three tribes of the Gauls had settled in this central part of Asia Minor some three centuries before. The only cities of any importance were Tavium, Ancyra, and Pessinus, but these cities of the Gauls were not appreciably influenced by Greek culture. We find that Paul invariably worked in the Greek-speaking cities of the empire. Furthermore, the Judaizers, against whom

Paul's epistle to the Galatians is directed, would not be so likely to reach the remote regions of North Galatia as they would be to follow Paul to the more accessible cities of South Galatia. It would have been most natural for them, moreover, to endeavor to spread their erroneous doctrines in the first churches founded by Paul in Gentile territory, in the churches of South Galatia of which they had heard from Paul's report at the Jerusalem Council. To take it that the emissaries of the Judaizing party came to the Galatians soon after Paul left them on this journey and that Paul counteracted their influence as soon as possible after hearing of the same. The indications that we have of an early date of writing; the epistle point to the congregations addressed as being in South Galatia. Then, Paul gives as the occasion of the founding of these churches some illness to which he had succumbed. No matter what the nature of the illness, there would be no point to his travelling in a weakened condition all the way through South Galatia to the distant region of North Galatia. If his illness was, as has been stated, a malarial fever contracted on the coast, then the high altitudes of the South Galatian cities, averaging over 3500 feet, would be ideal. We might mention yet the several references to Barnabas in the epistle (2, 1.9.13), as to one who was well known. Silas was Paul's companion on the second journey, and neither he nor Timothy are mentioned. So we see that we have an overwhelming amount of evidence in favor of the South Galatian view, and it is no wonder, therefore, that of late the majority of Bible students are accepting it.

We note yet from Acts 16, 6-8 that it is implied that no church had been founded on the former journey in Phrygia even though Paul had preached in Perga. From 1 Peter 1 we have an indication that there was no church in Phrygia even at a much later date. That list is clearly intended to exhaust the Church in Asia Minor, and it mentions every province except Lycia and Pamphylia, and Cilicia, which was part of Syria.

Now let us follow Paul, Silas, and Timothy as they left the region of Phrygian Galatia. Their intention evidently was to journey due west through the Roman province of Asia, which formed the westernmost part of Asia Minor, and thus take their way to its capital, Ephesus, on the Aegean Sea. But the hour of evangelization for this part of the world had not come, for the Holy Spirit forbade them in some way not indicated from preaching anywhere in the entire province of Asia at this time. They therefore went to the north, traversing the Phrygian part of Asia with the intention of entering the adjoining province of Bithynia. But when they came opposite Mysia, the Spirit again intervened, and by special revelation they were also forbidden to work in Bithynia. They therefore again turned west and traveled rapidly through Mysia, without preaching in it, for it was part of the province of Asia, until finally they came to the coast at the great harbor of Troas. They were now in the neighborhood of ancient Troy, the locality where the most famous exploits of early Greek history were said to have occurred, sung by Homer in the Iliad and dwelt on by many later poets. But it was not with the stories of Achilles and Hector that their minds were filled, but rather with the important question as to what new field of missionary enterprise the Lord would now lead them.

They had not long to wait for the answer, for in chapter 16, 9-12, we hear how the Lord led them through a vision into Macedonia. Out of "the multitude of the revelations" (2 Cor. 12, 7) granted to Paul, Luke selects only a few which have a bearing upon his purpose as historian. This vision is recorded not only because it shows Paul's progress from the one Roman province in which he was forbidden to preach to the other in which he was commanded to preach, but also for personal reasons, for it marks the point in the narrative at which Luke joined Paul as one of his companions. We note the transition from the pronoun "he" to the pronoun "we" in v. 10. This is the nearest approach to personal reference that Luke permits himself. A further study

of chapter 16 shows that the use of the pronoun "we" ceases after 16, 17 as abruptly as it began. In 20, 5 the pronoun reappears again at Philippi on the third journey. Altogether there are four of these "we" sections: 16, 10-17; 20, 5-15; 21, 1-13; 27, 1-22, 16. Everyone recognizes that in these passages Luke himself, then, entered the drama of Acts at Troas—under just what circumstances we do not know. It is clear, however, that the coming of Paul to Troas was foreseen. Therefore Luke could not have met Paul by special appointment, in response to a call to minister to him as a physician in his delicate state of health, as some suppose. No, it is highly probable that Luke was unknown to Paul before this time. He may have been converted by Paul upon meeting up with him, for the prohibition against preaching in Asia would not preclude Paul from using the opportunity to convert an individual. From the close association of the vision with the subtle way in which Luke brings himself into the picture Ramsey concludes that Luke himself was the man of Macedonia seen by Paul in the vision. He points out that there was nothing distinctive in the appearance or dress of a Macedonian to mark him out from the rest of the world, for they were dressed in the customary Greek style of the Aegean cities. The Greek *ἄνθρωπος*, a certain man (often followed by the name, as in 5, 1; 8, 9, etc.) implies that it was a certain definite person who appeared. It has, of course, been generally recognized that Luke must have had some connection with Philippi. He came to Troas on some business. Paul met him there, and—so Ramsey conjectures, in his sleep he beheld a vision of his Macedonian acquaintance beckoning him onward to his own country. But no matter what the character of the vision, through it in a supernatural way God directed his apostle into a promising new field of labor. Troas as a harbor formed the link between the province of Asia and that of Macedonia. By crossing the Aegean to Neapolis, Paul crossed from the continent of Asia to that of Europe. The Gospel was to be carried westward. Still the Macedonian call rings down through the ages to carry the Gospel ever onward.

We read of the coming of the missionary force, now numbering four persons to Philippi, in Acts 16, 12-15. Philippi was nine miles inland from its port, Neapolis. The road traversed was one of the famous Roman highways, the Via Egnatia, still recognizable after so many centuries. The city of Philippi was larger and more important than any visited by Paul on his first journey. Much important center of Paul's activity was larger than any of the preceding. Philippi, Thessalonica, Corinth, Ephesus, and Rome build up to a climax. Luke records the importance of Philippi with evident pride. The manner of its having become a Roman colony calls for explanation. It was here in 42 B. C. that a great battle was fought on the Plains of Philippi, in which Brutus and Cassius, the leaders of the old republicans in Rome and the assassins of Julius Caesar, were defeated by Anthony and the young Octavius, afterward the emperor Augustus. It was in honor of this occasion that Augustus made the city a Roman colony, and settled some of his veterans there, giving them homesteads. The citizens of Philippi were declared to be Roman citizens and the city was as though it were a part of Rome.

There was no synagogue at Philippi, for the number of Jews there was negligible. But such as were there had their place of prayer by the river, perhaps for the sake of ceremonial washings. Luke, who evidently was a Greek by birth (Col. 4, 10-14), had himself probably often visited the spot, for we may take it for granted that he was one of those devout Greeks who feared God. Lydia was a native of the Lydian city of Thyatira, to which one of the seven letters in Revelation was later addressed. Of her it is distinctly stated "which worshipped God." This is the technical expression referring to the fact that she was a Jewish proselyte of the gate. She conducted a store or bazaar in Philippi, the finest type of garments handled by her being the

purple dyed garments from her native Tyatira, which was famous for its dyeing, and with which she had trade connections. Lydia, then, became the first European convert of the missionaries. Out of gratitude she then did them a much-appreciated service by offering her home as a dwelling-place. She was probably a widow and her house no doubt was larger than Luke's.

In v. 16-18 we are introduced to the slave girl who brought her masters much money by fortune-telling. In the Greek she is described as having a "spirit of Python", Python being the mythical serpent which guarded Delphi, the famous oracle, and which was killed by Apollo. Some, even Dallmann, hold that she possibly practiced ventriloquism. But the text describes her as being possessed of an evil spirit, through whose influence she actually performed the supernatural art of soothsaying. Thus the poor girl was not only the slave of her masters, but of the devil as well. But the devil had now not his master, for in the presence of Paul the demon that possessed the girl was constrained to profess what he would rather have suppressed, and was subsequently driven out of his poor victim by this servant of the most high God.

But it was this very act of mercy and deliverance which again brought persecution upon the missionaries, 16, 19-24. When the masters of the girl saw that their source of gain was gone, they seized Paul and Silas, whom they must have recognized as the leaders, while Timothy and Luke were regarded as servants, and dragged them to the marketplace where the magistrates held court. In their entirely unfounded charge against Paul and Silas that they were trouble-makers who taught unlawful customs, they stressed that they were Jews. The Jews were extremely unpopular throughout the Roman Empire on account of their exclusiveness. Since by this time in the progress of the second journey, which started in early spring, late summer had quite likely arrived, it may very well be that news had lately arrived in Philippi of the expulsion of the Jews from Rome, for we have noted that this event occurred in all probability in the year in which we now find ourselves, 49. If that were so, we would have an explanation of why the missionaries received no fair trial as they did on other occasions. Indeed, they received no trial at all, for no sooner were they accused than they were condemned. It was a sad miscarriage of justice which resulted and a most disgraceful punishment that was meted out to the innocent men. Here is one of the instances of being beaten with rods to which Paul later referred in writing to the Corinthians, 2 Cor. 11, 25. One might ask why Paul and Silas did not declare that they were Roman citizens when confronted by the rods of the lictors, as they later did, 16, 37, since they knew that as Roman citizens they were exempt from such a beating. Perhaps they did, but the tumult was so loud that the magistrates and the lictors did not hear them. Where mob rule is permitted, justice has little chance to assert itself. And so we find the missionaries, after the scourging, subjected to the most cruel imprisonment, not merely being incarcerated behind locked doors, but "thrust" into the inner prison, with their feet rudo fast in stocks.

The sequel of what happened in that dark dungeon, of the praying and singing of the missionaries, of the coming of the earthquake, and of the conversion of the jailer, 16, 25-34, we need not dwell on, for over these scenes Christians have fondly lingered through the centuries. No road v. 35-40 of the final outcome of the imprisonment. During the confinement Luke and Timothy and other Christians may have appealed to the magistrates in the interest of obtaining justice for their leaders. The magistrates may also have been smitten by their own consciences. At any rate they reached the conclusion that the two foreigners were not dangerous people and might be freed. But when Paul and Silas were offered their freedom, they insisted first upon a public apology. They would not leave as fugitives from justice, no first upon a public apology. They would not leave as fugitives from



doubt feeling that in the interest of the progress of the Gospel they should demand a public acquittal. This having been given and Paul and Silas having not and suffered with the brethren, they decided to follow the request of the officials and leave the city. It was not Paul's plan to remain at one place till the whole city and region had come under the influence of the Gospel. Rather he desired rarely to plant the Gospel as used in the great centers, knowing that it would with time grow and spread. Then Paul and Silas departed from Philippi with Timothy, Luke remained, no doubt maintaining the blessed work. We gather that Paul remained at Philippi a month or two ("certain days", v. 12), and that a number of conversions took place beside those specifically referred to, so that a small, but active church was founded. This first church established in Europe soon grew. In like and Antioch and became Paul's next loyal church. We know that they aided him with gifts at Larac four times, twice soon after at Thessalonica, Phil. 4, 16, again at Corinth, 2 Cor. 11, 9, and finally when he was a prisoner at Beroe, Phil. 4, 16. This church was always particularly dear to Paul and stood forth as a model church, as the epistle to the Philippians abundantly shows.

The next church which was established in Macedonia was at Thessalonica, to which place the missionaries travelled from Philippi. The founding of this church is recorded in Acts 17, 1-4. The pronoun "they" in verse 1 would refer in the strict grammatical sense only to Paul and Silas (16, 25). But from 17, 14 we gather that Timothy left Philippi with Paul and Silas, only Luke having been left behind. The company of three travelled along the Via Egnatia, here joined with great blocks of stone, with a few walking thirty-three miles they reached Amphipolis on the Aegean. Another march of thirty miles brought them to Apollonia, located inland. Paul was impatient to reach the very center of Macedonia life, so they stopped to work at another city, but pushed on another thirty-seven miles west and so reached Thessalonica, (120 miles from Philippi) again located on the sea, lying on the Thracian Gulf, the next indispensible of the many bays on the western shores of the Aegean. The city gradually sloped upward from the shore to the elevated, back of which stood snow-capped Mount Olympus, the fabled home of the gods of Greece. Thessalonica was by reason of its location a great center of commerce by land and by sea. The Egnatian Way, which ran through it from west to east, connected the Imperial city of Rome with the Orient. The harbor of the city furnished a stopping place for ships plying between the West and the East. The city's population at the time of Paul numbered around 200,000. In Paul's pushing on to the west drudging at Thessalonica we have a fine opportunity to address his extraordinary counsel, as also that of Silas. Their heads were still raw and sore from the scourging that they had received, and yet they have no thought of hurrying anywhere to recuperate, but rather hurried on to more work and sufferings.

To one welcomed the missionaries into Thessalonica. After finding a place to lodge, the next necessity that pressed upon them was to find employment. Paul no doubt went to work at his trade of tentmaking. Either because the remuneration was small, or because the times were extra hard, Paul had to work night and day to make expenses, 1 Thess. 2, 9. There he received financial aid from the converts he had left behind in Philippi. For three consecutive Sabbaths Paul was allowed to preach in the synagogue without hindrance, but then no more. Further missionary work was carried on in private houses, and, largely among the heathen. The approved text, reading on the Great Issues, writes the "God-fearing" and "the Greeks" into the single class "God-fearing Greeks", but in this case the latter reading may well be erroneous. In v. 4 Paul goes on to a wider sphere of influence than the scope of the synagogue, and a large of this is implied in the extension of his work over the general population of the city, a period of perhaps two or three months. A Christian congregation was organized, most of the members being Gentiles, as we see from 1 Thess. 1, 9, 10.

The description of the riot, 5-9, is more detailed than any of the preceding. And it would appear that it was more serious than the words of Luke would at first sight suggest, as may be gleaned from the language of Paul in 1 Thess. 2, 14-16. The congregation seems to have had its headquarters in the house of Jason, where Paul and his companions were no doubt living. The mob assaulted the house of Jason, probably during the absence of Paul and his companions, and hailed him and certain of his friends before the magistrates, who are given the curious and rare title "politarchs", which title is approved by an inscription. The charge against Paul and his companions was given a political tinge, namely, that Jason had received into his house and was harboring some dangerous political agitators, men that were working for the overthrow of Caesar and for the enthronement of their king, one Jesus, and who with that end in mind had upset the whole world, causing disturbances throughout the Roman Empire. The result of this accusation was that Jason, who had entertained these men, was obliged to give bond as a security for the future peace of the city, as did also the other disciples who had been haled into court, after which they were released. When Paul and his helpers had become aware of what had happened, they thought it expedient to leave the city at once, in order to escape violence at the hands of the hostile Jews. That night they were smuggled out by the Christians and sent on the way to Berea. But they had the satisfaction of leaving behind them a strong church, whose good report spread far abroad within a few months, 1 Thess. 1, 7-8.

The next seat of operations was Berea, Acts 17, 10-15. Berea was located about forty miles southwest of Thessalonica. Here the missionaries worked at first without hindrance and with marked success. The nobler conduct of the Jews at Berea consisted in their freedom from that pride and prejudice which caused the Jews at Thessalonica and many other places to close their hearts against the Gospel. True, they were not so credulous as to accept Paul's preaching without putting it to the proper test, but daily compared it with the Old Testament Scriptures. Here then at Berea we have the first mention of a Christian Bible class. The process that compelled Paul's departure from Berea was evidently quite similar to that at Thessalonica. The Jews who came from there quite likely caused the populace of Berea to raise the same accusation that had been so successful in Thessalonica, namely that Paul was working for the coming of another king and another kingdom. But here it evidently did not come to a public trial, for the Christians, fearing for Paul's safety, escorted him out of the city. The church planted at Berea continued to grow and prosper. Later when Paul took up the collection for the poor at Jerusalem, one of its members accompanied him, Acts 20, 4.

From Berea the mode of travel changed, for Paul evidently made the trip to Athens by sea. Some of his friends took him to Dium, the harbor of Berea (the omission of this information is unique), seventeen miles away. From there they sailed for Athens, which was 251 miles away, requiring three days and three nights to reach. When Paul sailed over the blue waters of the Aegean did he think of some of the myths and accounts of glorious deeds connected with some of the features of the landscape which they passed? At the entrance of the Euboean Strait, for instance, is Thermopylae, the famous pass where Leonidas with his thousand Greeks held back the vast hordes of Xerxes for a time in 480 B. C. The ship must have entered the port of Salamis, where Themistocles in the same year of 480 defeated the Persians in a most glorious naval battle. The voyage ended at the Piraeus, the port of Athens. Having brought the missionaries through the five miles of the ruined Long Walls of Themistocles in safety to Athens, the Bereans left for home with word from Paul to Silas and Timothy to come with all speed. The question naturally arises here, why did Paul leave Silas and Timothy behind at Berea and yet send orders immediately upon reaching Athens for them to join him with all speed?

A comparison between Acts and Thessalonians solves the difficulty. From 1 Thess. 2, 18 we learn that Paul was very anxious to return to Thessalonica in order to strengthen the Christians, and twice he had made up his mind to do so, but, as he wrote, "Satan hindered us". One purpose in leaving Silas and Timothy at Berea was that they might be in a position to receive news from Thessalonica, especially as to when it would be safe for Paul to return. Paul may have expected messengers to arrive at Berea from Thessalonica about the time that he had been compelled to leave, and for that reason called Silas and Timothy to him at Athens to relay the news. Probably only a week or two elapsed before Silas and Timothy joined him according to his anxious directions. They brought with them no favorable news. It was evidently still impossible for him to return to Thessalonica. From 1 Thess. 3, 1-3 we learn that Paul thereupon "thought it good to be left at Athens alone" and decided to send Timothy to Thessalonica, to comfort the Christians there in their afflictions which were occasioned by the persecution which was still prevailing. Since Paul remained alone, Silas must have also been sent away. And as, some two months later, Silas with Timothy rejoined Paul from Macedonia, Acts 18, 5, he was probably sent to Philippi, for frequent communication was maintained at this time between Paul and the Philippian church, Phil. 4, 14-16. Doubtless Silas and Timothy traveled to Thessalonica together, retracing their journey and going by sea as before. Timothy remained at Thessalonica, while Silas went on to Philippi, discharged his mission, and returned. Then they again journeyed to Athens together. They did not find Paul there, for he had in the mean time gone on to Corinth, 18, 1. No doubt he had informed them that that city would be the next seat of work, so that they were able to find him there, 18, 5. We have traced these movements of the missionaries a little beyond the narrative that we have so far considered for the sake of cohesion. To get back to our story, we note yet that the stay at Berea, like that at Thessalonica, must have extended over two or three months.

The picture of Paul in Athens is given in Acts 17, 16-21. There was much in Athens to attract Paul. The city was, for instance, a great athletic center. In the great stadium, which has in modern times been restored to its ancient splendor, were held the famous Greek games. Paul was not a little interested in athletics, as the frequent references in his epistles to athletic contests testify, and it may be that he had the opportunity at this time to witness some athletic events. Yet Paul's interests undoubtedly lay more in the intellectual realm. As an art center Athens was unrivalled. Its profusion of gracefully carved statues, placed along the thoroughfares, as well as its superbly ornamented temples and public buildings made it almost a fairy city. The Parthenon, the crown of the Acropolis, was a marvel of architecture. Athens was famous also as a center of philosophy. Here Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle had given a great impetus to thinking. Various philosophical sects had arisen, the Epicureans and Stoics being mentioned in the text. Athens, we learn also from the text, was a gathering place for many different religions. The twelve gods of Olympus were no longer as real as they had been, and so other religions had found a place. The multiplicity of altars in the city must have been bewildering to any visitor.

As Paul looked on all the sights of Athens, he determined to make only a short visit. Quite likely the Jewish population was small; the character of the rest of the population was not of the kind to furnish a favorable field for Gospel preaching. Paul had already set his mind on Corinth as the best center in which to establish the Gospel in Achaia. Moreover, he was "waiting" for Silas and Timothy, his expectation being either to go back to Macedonia with them or to push on to Corinth. But while he waited his spirit was provoked within him at seeing the city so full of idols. He determined to use what little time he had in planting the seed of the Gospel here. Following his usual custom he began in the

synagogue and with that outer circle of "devout persons." And now we see the extraordinary versatility in Paul's nature, the ease with which he moved in any society, and the facility with which he changed his method of approach to suit the changing needs of his audience. Among the people in the agora Paul reached in the Socratic fashion, but when the philosophers, whom we might term the professors of the Athenian University, came upon the scene, they soon demanded of Paul a lecture in the style of the rhetorician. Paul was fully equal to this exacting demand. With the philosophers he ascended Mars Hill, an eminence close to the Acropolis, to the Areopagus, where the council of the Areopagus convened, the most ancient court of the Athenians. Some hold that Paul was actually led before the court to be examined as to his qualifications for the position of public lecturer in the city. It was more likely, however, that he was led to the Areopagus when the court was not in session and only because it afforded a quiet meeting place, removed from the noisy crowd.

There on Mars Hill Paul delivered a great address, even when considered merely for its literary worth. Even in the abridged form in which Luke has evidently recorded it, it is admitted to be a masterpiece. The inscription on the altar, "to the unknown God," furnished Paul an excellent starting-point and the topic of a telling introduction. In 1919 a stone was found at Pergamos in Asia Minor with a similar inscription. The opening sentence of the address should be translated to read: "Men of Athens, I perceive in all things that ye are rather religious", the derogatory note sounded in the King James translation hardly fitting the context. Though the philosophers of Athens had sensed that it was more superstition to confuse the idol with the divine nature, they had no way of knowing who or what God was. God, whom they ignorantly worshiped, Paul proceeded to declare unto them. In matchless, powerful words he dwelt on the spiritual nature of God and His supremacy as Creator and Preserver. But when he spoke of Christ as the Judge of the world and of His resurrection, he was interrupted, some mocking, some more politely declaring that they would hear him again on that subject at some other time. It was hardly to be expected that even a Paul could win the worldly wise. Although one member of the Areopagus and some others were converted, Paul decided that further efforts would not be the best use of his time. So when Silas and Timothy came from Berea, and he had dispatched them back to Macedonia, he departed from the proud city of learning for the commercial city of Corinth.

The time spent in Athens may be deduced approximately. We know that immediately upon arrival there Paul sent the men who had accompanied him there from Berea back to their native city with directions to Silas and Timothy to join him at once, the two companions quite likely got to Athens less than two weeks after he did. Since little work was done either in the synagogue or among the pagan population, we gather that Paul left Athens after a visit of about a month. This agrees with what may be deduced about the length of time Paul was in Corinth before Silas and Timothy joined him there, 18, 4.5 We note that Paul had already had some success in Corinth by that time. We take it he must have been working about a month and a half according to the statement of v. 4. Now it is evident that the visit of Silas and Timothy in Macedonia was not intended to be a prolonged one, for Paul needed them for the continuation of the work at Corinth. We will not miss it much if we allow two months for their trip and mission. Subtracting the six weeks that Paul spent in Corinth without them, gives us two weeks that Paul remained in Athens after they left, or three to four weeks altogether.

And at this point we can now give a rough month-by-month listing of the progress and the steps made on the second missionary journey up to the entrance into Corinth

The time spent in Athens may be deduced approximately.

in the beginning of 50. Starting out in the spring of 49, the missionaries would spend the months of April to June on their journey through Galatia and onward to Treas. Perhaps half of June and July were spent at Philippi. We can assign the two months of August-September to the work at Thessalonica, and October-November to Berea, with December being spent at Athens. We confess that we would like to allow two months more for the stops at Philippi, Thessalonica, and Berea. Perhaps since Paul did not start out on this journey by ship, he may have left very early in the spring, or may have passed very rapidly through Asia Minor, so that more time was spent in Macedonia. The text indicates, however, that a long period of time was not spent at the stations in Macedonia, so that our designations of time should be approximately correct.

Paul went to Corinth from Athens, a distance of forty-five miles, 15,1. We don't know whether he went by land or by sea. Before surveying the beginning of Paul's work in Corinth, it will be necessary to point to the strategic importance of the city itself. A glance at the map will reveal that it lies at the western end of the narrow isthmus connecting central with southern Greece (the Peloponnese). The eastern harbor of the isthmus was Cenchrea, and the western, in the immediate vicinity of Corinth, was Lechaon. Corinth was on the main route from Rome to Asia Minor and Syria. Julius Caesar conceived the work of cutting a canal through the isthmus, which, near Corinth, was only three and a half miles wide. Work on the canal was continued by Nero and at the time of Paul's stay at Corinth it must have been a public work much discussed and keenly anticipated. But the job was too much for the ancients, and it was not till 1893 that the canal was completed with the help of modern machinery. In Paul's day there was a sort of wooden railway across the isthmus over which the endless cargoes of merchandise and even the smaller ships were transported to save the trip around the peninsula. Such a strategic location for a commercial and industrial center was without parallel in the Roman world.

In 146 B. C., because of its leadership of an Achaean league against Rome, Corinth was largely destroyed. The treasures were carried off to Rome and other places. The "Beautiful Gate" of the Temple at Jerusalem was made of the molten brass which had been obtained from the statues and public buildings of the ruined city. Julius Caesar, keenly alive to the importance and beauty of the location, rebuilt the city in 43, just a hundred years after its destruction, and made it a Roman colony. Phoenix-like, Corinth arose from its ashes and renewed its youth. It was a Chicago for quick growth. At the time of Paul it was one of the most populous cities of the ancient world, being filled with people from all nations, who would carry the message of the Gospel westward and eastward to every port of the Mediterranean. No wonder Paul was moved to stay here longer than at any other center which he had visited thus far.

A few features of the city should be mentioned yet. Overlooking it is a huge, massive bluff, rising to 1,800 feet, called the Acrocorinthus, on which the wall-high impregnable citadel of the city was located. From its summit the traveler could see the Acropolis at Athens. The famous temple of Venus crowned the summit. It had 1000 priestesses, who as prostitutes pandered to the passions of citizens and visitors in the name of religion. A considerable part of the temple of Apollo survived the sack of the Romans. It was 600 years old when Paul saw it. To-day there still remain seven columns nearly 25 feet high and nearly 6 feet in diameter. Among the interesting finds of modern times at Corinth is a door lintel dating from the first century, which probably at one time rested over the door of the very synagogue which Paul frequented. It bears the inscription, "Synagogue of the Hebrews", cut in rough letters on the plain rock, being an instructive commentary on Paul's declaration of 1 Cor. 1, 26, "Not many wise after the flesh, not many mighty, not

many noble are called." Near the city was the famous stadium of marble where every second year the Isthmian games were held. With commercial success and intellectual culture came luxury, feasting, drunkenness, and sexual immorality. The Corinthian banquet became proverbial and to "Corinthianize" meant to indulge in the most depraved debauchery.

To such a city Paul came early in the year 50. In Acts 18, 1-11, we have the account of the founding of the Christian church there. After Paul's arrival at the city, he immediately looked up the Jewish quarter, which must have been of considerable extent. For a prolonged stay it was necessary for him to find a home and an opportunity to work at his trade. Both he found with Aquila and Priscilla. Aquila was a Jew of Pontus, who, with his wife Priscilla, had lived for many years in Rome. We have already noted the significance for our chronology of the statement of v. 2 that they had but recently come from Italy and that they had been forced to leave Rome because of the edict of Claudius expelling the Jews from the city, this edict having been issued in all probability in the year 49 (see p. 7). It was most likely in the fall of that year that Aquila and Priscilla had taken up their abode in the nearest large city outside of Rome. When and how they were converted we do not know. It may very well have been in Rome, for the Gospel had by this time been well established in the imperial city. Again they may not have been converted till they had established contact with the apostle Paul. Imagine Paul working in their shop during the day and at the same time and until late in the night talking with them and others of the Christian faith. His new friends no doubt told Paul much of Rome, which helped Paul reach the determination to go one day to Rome also, 19, 21. Soon Paul was preaching in the synagogue before both Jews and Greeks. His early efforts in the synagogue were unopposed, perhaps because he did not at the outset declare the Messiahship of Jesus in such an emphatic manner as later. The time occupied by the period of unhindered preaching in the synagogue we have estimated to have been about six weeks. It may have been some longer. To note from v. 5 that when Silas and Timothy came to Corinth with news from Macedonia, which was good news in the main, that Paul was so buoyed up in spirit that his preaching took on new vigor, which led to the crisis with the Jews. So Silas and Timothy arrived near the expiration of the first short period of Paul's work at Corinth, let us say late in February. By this reckoning we suppose that they traveled by ship from Athens to Macedonia, and back again, taking two months for their mission. If they perchance traveled by land, we would have to allow another month for their trip and stay in Macedonia, and also a month longer for the initial period of Paul's work in the synagogue. Now, it was the report which Timothy brought from Thessalonica which moved Paul to write a letter to that congregation. 1 Thessalonians was therefore quite evidently written sometime early in the year 50. Timothy could report that the Christians were still faithful to the Lord, and loyal to Paul, desiring greatly to see him, 1 Thess. 3, 3. That was the main thing, and Paul's heart was at rest. Ever since Paul had left Thessalonica he had been greatly concerned about the congregation which he had left behind there. It was this concern that prompted him to send Timothy to them from Athens, 3, 1, 2. From v. 3, 4 we gather that the persecution which had begun before the missionaries left was still continuing. Both Gentiles and Jews were harassing the Christians; but the Jews were the worst enemies. The Jews had been active in spreading slanderous rumors against Paul. They questioned his motives and misinterpreted his conduct. See 1 Thess. 2, 1-12; Paul's defence of his work in Thessalonica; and 1 Thess. 2 13-16; his denunciation of the Jews. So Paul first of all encourages the Christians to remain constant in spite of all tribulations and false insinuations on the part of the Jewish opponents. We gather from chapter 4, 1-12, that a few were tempted to fall back into grievous sins, against which Paul earnestly warns them. Then Timothy had another unfavorable matter to report. The teaching of the apostle concerning the second coming of the Lord had been misunderstood by a

number. So in the third part of the epistle Paul imparts instruction regarding the second coming of the Lord, and shows how the Christians ought to conduct themselves in anticipation of this event.

The Second Epistle of Paul to the Thessalonians was evidently written some short time after the first and may well be considered right now. He concludes that it was written but a few months later because of the fact that Paul again treats of the second coming of Christ, as in the first epistle. His instruction on the second coming, imparted in his previous letter, had been misunderstood by many, particularly the phrase "we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord." Some of the members believed that the day of the Lord was quite near at hand, and this expectation had thrown them into a state of religious excitement, which led them to neglect their daily work. Perhaps only a small portion of the church members had been carried away into extremes of illiness and disorder, but some of the most fanatical of these had ~~deliberately~~ forged a letter in the apostle's name in order to gain support for their erroneous views, 2 Thess. 2, 2. Now someone must have brought Paul news of the condition of the church in Thessalonica. Perhaps Timothy had been sent to bear the first epistle to Thessalonica, had stayed there for some time, and had then returned to report that the disorders resulting from a misunderstanding of the doctrine of the last things had become worse instead of better. Religious fanaticism spreads like a wildfire if it once gets a good start, so Paul at once again took up his pen to write a second letter to the Thessalonians, which evidently cleared up the misconceptions and restored order. After his greeting and thanksgiving in chapter 1 Paul corrects their false notions in chapter 2 by showing that the Lord would not immediately appear, rather that he would be preceded by a great apostasy and by the revelation of the son of sin, the Antichrist. Chapter 3 is the practical part of the epistle. We take it that 2 Thessalonians was written in the summer of 50.

Now we can get back to the narrative of Acts 18, 7-11. When the Jews rejected the message of life and blasphemed the Savior, thus making further work in the synagogue impossible, Paul took up the work in a neighboring house belonging to a convert named Justus. This man was evidently a Roman, whose citizenship in the colony of Corinth would afford Paul an opening to others of the more cultured class. Crispus, who had occupied the position of chief ruler of the synagogue, is mentioned as another prominent convert, who no doubt occupied a position of leadership in the Christian church. Gaius is mentioned as having been baptized by Paul personally, as was also Crispus and the household of Stephanas, 1 Cor. 1, 14-16. Stephanas and his house are mentioned as the first converts in Achaia and as willing workers in 1 Cor. 16, 15. When Paul's first epistle to the Corinthians was written on the third journey, from Ephesus, he noted with gratitude that Stephanas, Fortunatus, and Achaicus had come to visit him. Gaius was Paul's host when he later stopped at Corinth on the third journey, Rom. 16, 23. In the epistle to the Romans, written at that time, Paul also mentions Lucius, Jason, and Sosipater as kinsmen of his, Tertius, the scribe to whom he dictated that epistle, Praxiteles, the treasurer of the city, and Quartus, Rom. 16, 21-23. Chloe was the mistress of a large house, 1 Cor. 1, 11. These are some of the people of position and means who became members of the congregation, but the majority of the members were poor and unlettered, some from the middle class and some from the slave class, 1 Cor. 1, 26-29. What a wonder to see people of all classes united into one communion of brethren in the Lord, 1 Cor. 1, 30-31. A still greater wonder to see reprobate sinners transformed into saints of God, 1 Cor. 6, 9-11. No wonder Bengel exclaims: "A church of God in the city of Corinth, a joyous and a great paradox." It was not easy work for Paul to persevere when the unbelieving Jews were endeavoring to block his work at every step. Therefore the Lord appeared to Paul again at this time in a vision to encourage him and to indicate

that it would be necessary to continue the work here longer than at any other previous station, "for", as the Lord said, "I have much people in this city." This statement, coupled with the next that Paul continued to work for a period of eighteen months, indicates that the congregation must have grown to a large proportion within that time. Other churches must have been established in the territory around the city, for the expression "all the saints which are in Achaia", 2 Cor. 1, 1, makes this conclusion inevitable. Phoebe was a servant of the church at Cenchreae, perhaps a full-time deaconess, who most likely carried the Epistle to the Romans to Rome.

It was at the end of a year and six months, at the time of the arrival of a new proconsul, that the Jews thought it an opportune time to make a determined effort to stop the growth of the Christian church, which had become a formidable rival of the synagogue, Acts 18, 12-17. In provinces which were normally under the control of the Roman Senate, such as Achaia, the governors served one year only. We have seen that the governorship of Gallio began in the summer of 51, say in May (see page 3). Here we have a most important point of contact with Roman history, the most important date for our chronology. The eighteen months mentioned by Luke evidently is not intended to cover Paul's entire stay in Corinth, but only the length of time that elapsed until the event happened which is minutely described. As we shall see later, Paul did not leave Corinth till early in the following year of 52. Evidently the Jews at Corinth did not manage their accusation so well as those of Thessalonica, for Gallio at once recognized their complaints against Paul as being merely concerned with matters of religion. It is clear that Gallio's short speech represents the conclusion reached from an inquiry into the facts behind the accusation, for the accusation refers only to the law, whereas he refers also to words and names, v. 13 and 15. In this manner the cause of religious liberty was upheld by a heathen judge already in the middle of the first century. This action of the imperial government in declaring freedom in religious matters must have been a great encouragement to Paul and must have been an impetus in persuading him to carry the Gospel on to new provinces. More than that, it must have been helpful to Paul in obtaining that vision of the whole world united by the Gospel as men of every class forming one great brotherhood in Christ, Col. 3, 11. Ramsay also attaches another significance to Paul's stay at Corinth. He says (The Traveller, p. 200): "According to our view, the residence at Corinth was an epoch in Paul's life. As regards his doctrine he became more clearly conscious of its character, as well as more precise and definite in his presentation of it. The letters to the Thessalonians belong to the earlier part of his stay in Corinth, before he had definitely reached the new stage of thought and aim. To the new stage, when he had attained full consciousness and full dominion over his own plans, belong the four great letters, Gal., I and II Cor., Rom." Hayes (Paul and His Epistles, p. 70) also makes much of the characteristics of the four groups of Paul's epistles.

The new hour of Paul's return trip to Antioch, Acts 18, 18-22. The "good while" (v. 18) that Paul still tarried at Corinth after the riot had been summarily quelled by Gallio we take to have been about a half a year, for Paul evidently left Corinth in the very early spring, in time to get to Jerusalem in time to attend either the Passover or Pentecost. Some think that "this feast that cometh in Jerusalem", v. 21, was not the Passover. Thus Dallmann (Paul, p. 183) says: "As sailing did not begin until March, the feast Paul wished to attend was hardly the Passover, but likely Pentecost, May 12, 52." Dallmann forgot that Jews from all over the world got to Jerusalem for the Passover, even though sailing across the open sea was not safe till March or later. Coastal sailing was comparatively safe this early in the season. Some, as Dr. Arndt, think that Paul wanted to attend a feast that fell in the fall and left Corinth in the fall instead of spring. But it was most likely one of the spring festivals, Passover or Pentecost, which he attended, as was the case at the end of his third journey, 20, 16. If it was the Passover, Paul probably took



a pilgrim ship, carrying many Jews from Corinth and Ephesus toward for Jerusalem.

Before he boarded the ship in Caesarea, Paul had his head shorn, v. 13. This was in fulfillment of the vow of the Nazarite, which required that he should abstain from wine and let his hair grow during the period of his separation. At the expiration of the period of the vow, the prescribed sacrifices were to be made in the temple at Jerusalem, at which time the hair was to be cut off and burned in the sacrificial fire. If a Nazarite chanced to be away from Jerusalem at the expiration of this period, he cut his hair and then carefully kept the locks till he arrived there, when they were burned. The nature of Paul's vow is unknown, but it may have been connected with the success of his work at Corinth. Now that God had heard his prayer and Paul had kept his vow, the onerousness could be removed.

With Paul to Ephesus went Aquila and Priscilla, the two friends with whom he had lived so long at Corinth. They may have gone to Ephesus to better themselves in business, for Ephesus was renowned for its tents. But it is more likely that they changed the place of their abode purely for the Gospel's sake, for we doubt not that Paul had by this time resolved to plant the church in the important city of Ephesus on his next journey, see v. 21. We see that Aquila and Priscilla began to work there as his forerunner, 13, 24-26. They remained in Ephesus during Paul's sojourn there on his third missionary journey, for in 1 Cor. 16, 19, this epistle having been written by Paul from Ephesus, Paul makes mention of the fact that they had a church in their house, that is, they acted as hosts to a smaller group of Christians who assembled there for worship. There are two further references to this worthy Christian couple in Paul's epistles, which we might refer to here. In Rom. 16, 3-5, Paul commends them for having risked their own lives to save his when he was at Ephesus. From this passage we note that they had moved back to Rome, their former home perhaps in the year 56, where they also had a church in their house. The last reference to them is in 2 Tim. 4, 19, where Paul again salutes Prisca and Aquila. This letter was written from Rome to Timothy, who at that time was bishop of the church at Ephesus, so that it is apparent that our Christian friends had again moved back to Ephesus, where they no doubt continued to abound in the work of the Lord. What an inspiring example Aquila and Priscilla ought to be to all Christian laymen to-day!

But what became of Silas and Timothy when Paul left Corinth? Silas disappears from the sacred scene. We have noted how throughout the narrative of the third journey he, with Timothy, gradually receded here into the background. First it was "they", then it became "he", Paul, of whom Luke narrates. We doubt not that Silas continued to serve the church faithfully and effectively, for he is later mentioned by Peter as a "faithful brother", 1 Pet. 5, 12. From this passage it is evident that Silas at this time was with Peter at "Babylon", perhaps Rome, and was sent by him to bear this letter to the churches of Asia Minor. He may have returned with Paul to Jerusalem from Corinth, and then gone on to other fields of labor. Timothy quite likely accompanied Paul as far as Ephesus, and from there went on to his home at Lystra. This would have been the natural thing for him to do, for he was a young man who had been away from home for three years now (unless Paul had permitted him to make a previous trip home), and would be anxious to see his loved ones again, as they would be to see him. Aside from this consideration, there is a special line of evidence which causes us to conclude that Timothy not only visited his home, but all the congregations of Southern Galatia at this time, and that is the fact that Paul, most likely upon his return to Antioch, received disturbing news of the churches of Galatia, which led to his writing to them forthwith. How some other messenger could

conceivably have brought that news, but who, we ask, would be more likely to have done so than Timothy, who on the return from the second missionary journey had an opportunity to find out the state of affairs in the Galatian churches?

Luke devotes only a few verses to the stop that Paul made at Ephesus, indicating that the work done at that occasion was of the briefest duration. Paul perhaps preached in the synagogue only on one Sabbath day. There was no opposition as yet, rather only a warm desire to hear more. Paul promised to return "if God will." Paul may have stopped at Ephesus only as long as the ship stopped to change cargo or to receive additional passengers. Of the long journey from Ephesus to Jerusalem and up to Antioch Luke writes only a little more than one verse. The church which Paul went up to salute was undoubtedly not the church which was at Caesarea, but rather the church at Jerusalem. This then was the fourth visit to Jerusalem recorded in Acts. Arriving at Antioch, the second missionary journey was completed, on which Paul had traveled more than two thousand miles. It had lasted from the spring of 48 to early summer of the year 52. Three important and strategic Christian centers had been founded, at Philippi, at Thessalonica, and at Corinth, and by now the Gospel had been firmly planted in the provinces of Galatia, Macedonia, and Achaia. No doubt lengthy reports were given by Paul to the church at Antioch and much time was spent visiting with old friends and forming new ones.

#### Chapter III. Third Missionary Journey.

The start by Paul on the third missionary journey is given in Acts 18, 23. We notice that Luke has nothing to tell of Paul's activity upon his return to Antioch. Indeed there is nothing that Paul did beside the routine work of serving the church there, the same work that Paul had again engaged in upon his return from the first journey, 15, 25. That Paul did the same thing now as then Luke leaves to us to surmise. He does distinctly state that Paul "spent some time there." Now, though this phrase is quite indefinite, we think that it implies that some considerable time was spent there, a matter of months, and not just a few weeks. Some in their chronology have Paul set out on the third journey soon after his return from the second. This theory, who dates the events of the second journey a year later than we have, thinks that Paul returned to Antioch in the spring of 53 and set out again in the summer of 53. But we have seen that on the basis of the Gallic inscription the return from the second journey must be figured as having occurred in the year 52. Now, from our pivotal date of the recall of Felix and the accession of Festus, which was in 57, we deduce that the beginning of the third journey must have been in 53, for it evidently lasted four years. On this date most chronologies agree with us. So we cannot but conclude that Paul spent the period of almost a year from the early summer of 52 to spring of 53 in Antioch.

Now we must direct our attention to the date of the writing of the Epistle to the Galatians, for we hold with Ramsay and some others that it was written during the summer of 52, soon after Paul's return from the second journey. It is true that Galatians is one of the Pauline epistles which is most difficult to date. Some think that it is the earliest of Paul's epistles. This view is held by Dr. Arndt, who holds that it was written before the Jerusalem council, in the year 48. Such a date is based on the supposition that the Judaizers who came to Antioch, and were active also in the other churches of Syria and Cilicia, carried their campaign at this time into the churches of Southern Galatia as well. But this view seems to be precluded by the fact that the apostolic letters were not addressed to the churches of Galatia, 15, 23. Some think that Galatians was the latest of Paul's epistles, and it has been put at almost every possible place between the two extremes

dates. It is most often supposed, however, to have been written on the third missionary journey, either at Ephesus or later from some city of Macedonia or from Corinth. We concede that there is a possibility that the epistle was written from one of those places, but think that there is a greater probability that it was written from Antioch a year before the third journey was begun.

Let us consider what led to the writing of the epistle and see if that will not throw some light on the time of its composition. The epistle was occasioned through an invasion of the Galatian territory by the Judaizers who had previously created such a disturbance in the churches of Syria and Cilicia. They caused even greater havoc in Galatia. Here too they endeavored to burden the Gentile Christians with Jewish observances. This time they were more subtle subtle in their approach. They could no longer boldly teach the necessity of circumcision for salvation, Acts 15, 1, since the decrees had wisely been published by Paul also in Galatia when he passed through on his second journey, Acts, 15, 4. What they did teach may be legitimately inferred from Paul's reputation of their doctrine in the epistle, namely, that the observance of the Law was necessary for full perfection in Christianity, that Paul's Gospel was therefore an imperfect Gospel, that Paul had departed from the pure Gospel in his desire to please men, that Paul was a second-rate apostle after all, for he was not one of the original Twelve and had learned his doctrine from men, and that through his practice in regard to circumcision he had proved that he was most inconsistent. We see moreover from Galatians that the immature Christians there did not turn a deaf ear to these vigorous and skilled propagandists, that they began to yield to their determined attacks, and that they actually introduced the keeping of Jewish festivals, still talking, however, at circumcision (cf. Gal. 4, 10; 5, 7; 6, 12). We do not doubt that as soon as Paul received news of this state of affairs in the Galatian churches, that he immediately sat down and wrote his epistle to them, which so plainly shows the effects of his agitation and distress. The important thing to decide, then, is at what period the Judaizers carried on their nefarious work in Galatia.

We gather that there was a concerted and systematic effort on the part of the Judaizing party to effect the supremacy of the Jewish law on the Christian Church. They had been defeated at Jerusalem. When their influence there and at Antioch had been nullified, they looked about for new fields in which to carry on their subversive work. We gather that they set out upon well organized expeditions with the avowed purpose of canvassing the new fields where the church had been planted by Paul to undermine his authority and doctrine. We know that they were very active also in Corinth. From Corinth they may have intended to work north through Macedonia, but were hindered in extending their campaign into that province by the presence of Paul there. It is quite generally agreed that Paul wrote his First Epistle to the Corinthians while he was still at Ephesus, and that the Second Epistle, in which Paul fights the Judaizers so vehemently, was written while Paul was slowly making his way toward Corinth from one of the churches in Macedonia. Now, did the Judaizers wage their campaign in Galatia before they came to Corinth, or after they had been defeated there, or were both places invaded at the same time?

Hayes (Paul and His Epistles, p. 262), who makes such a keen and generally correct analysis of the Pauline epistles, thinks that the appearance of the Judaizers occurred at about the same time in Galatia and in Achaia. He thinks that it was not until Paul was in Macedonia, or had perhaps reached Corinth, that the news came to him of the wavering of the Galatians, so that he did not write Galatians till 2 Corinthians had been written, the order for this group of epistles being 1 Cor., 2 Cor., Galatians, Romans. The reasons which he gives for this conclusion are briefly

these: the Epistle to the Galatians belongs to the second group of the Pauline epistles; it is like Second Corinthians in several particulars; it is most like the Epistle to the Romans. These three internal reasons, while they may indicate that Galatians was written in the general period in which the others fall, certainly do not prove at all that it was written as the third in this group of four.

We rather believe that external considerations indicate that it was written as the first of this group. Why? Because the Judaizers would be apt to carry their work to the Galatian field before the Corinthian. The Galatian field was the older and had been known to the church at Jerusalem ever since Paul's return from the first missionary journey in 48. Paul did not return from the second journey till in 52. If the Judaizers were not fully convinced of their error by the Jerusalem council, they would reorganize their forces soon after and without too great an interval of time begin to follow Paul to the new fields established by him. We think that they followed Paul into Galatia while he was still on his second journey and carried on their activity there while he was still working at Corinth in the year 49 or 50. When Timothy then passed through the churches of Galatia on his way home to Lystra after parting from Paul at Ephesus, he learned of the sad state of affairs in Galatia and consequently traveled on to Antioch to acquaint Paul with them, knowing that he would meet the apostle there. When Paul then received the report from Timothy in the early summer of 52, he at once wrote his letter to the Galatians, knowing that he would not be setting out for their territory till the next year. Haysay thinks that Paul received Timothy's report in the early summer of 52, at once wrote his letter, and soon after set out to revisit the Galatian churches. But there certainly would be no point to his writing to them if he intended so soon to visit them. We find here a corroboration of our surmise that Paul stayed at Antioch from the summer of 52 to the spring of 53.

We have another line of evidence which supports our view of an early writing of Galatians and that is what we know of the special collection taken up by Paul on his third missionary journey. He had been at Jerusalem again after his return from Corinth and had noted the poverty of many of the Christians there. On his third journey he organized and executed a collection for these poor saints at Jerusalem. When 1 Corinthians was written on this journey from Ephesus, Paul charged the Corinthian Christians to systematically gather contributions for Jerusalem, 1 Cor. 16, 1-4, this message implying that the Corinthians had been told of the collection before. In 2 Corinthians, written a little later, Paul devotes one entire chapter to the collection, chapter 9, in which he states, in order to encourage the Corinthians, that the churches of Macedonia were contributing most liberally to the collection, v. 1-3. And when Paul left Greece to return to Jerusalem on his third missionary journey, Luke gives us the name of a number of deacons who accompanied him, ostensibly to bear the collection to Jerusalem; Acts 20, 4. Now, one of the deacons was Gaius of Derbe, and another was Timothy of Lystra, representatives of the Galatian churches. And in 1 Cor. 16, 1 it is distinctly stated that Galatia was taking part in the collection. Why, we ask, did Paul not refer to the collection when he wrote to the Galatians, as he did with so much emphasis in the two epistles which he wrote to the Corinthians? The answer is obvious and proves our point—because the Epistle to the Galatians had been written before the plan for the collection had been launched. When Paul then revisited the Galatian churches on setting out on his third journey in the summer of 53, he personally delivered the necessary directions for the gathering of the collection in Galatia. If the moneys were not gathered then, but over a longer period of time, which seems more likely from the analogy of the other churches, then they were later sent to Paul. But the mere fact that Paul does not mention the collection in his letter to the Galatians is a strong indication that it was not written at about the same time that the Corinthian epistles were, but earlier, before he passed through Galatia, in 52.

Galatians is the most severe of Paul's epistles. Paul was in no mood for delicate language, for he was boiling over with righteous indignation. God's honor and the salvation of God's people was at stake. He would have the Galatians realize the full significance of the issue. The first two chapters are a rare piece of autobiography. Paul had no desire to write about himself. But the Judaizers had attacked his apostleship. Paul's answer was to narrate the salient facts of his career so far as they concerned the source of his gospel. The circumstances of his conversion, the independent position accorded him at his second visit to Jerusalem, and his subsequent rebuke of Peter showed that he had received the Gospel not from man, but from God. In chapters 3 and 4 Paul turns from the personal side to arguments respecting the Gospel itself. After this doctrinal part there follows a practical section in chapters 5 and 6, followed by a short conclusion at the end of chapter 6.

Now let us return again to a consideration of Acts 18, 23. It was in the spring of the year 53, as we have heard, that Paul started out from Antioch on his third missionary journey. On each journey Paul made his departure from this city, being sent by the church at Antioch, and returned there to make his report to it, except after the third journey, when he was prevented. All that we know about the first stage of this journey is contained in one short sentence and merely acquaints us with the fact that Paul went through the country of southern Galatia, where he had founded four churches on his first missionary journey (for the terminology see page 47). Since he took the land route again, he may very well have visited his native Tarsus and looked up such relatives and friends as were still there. We note that no traveling companion accompanied Paul when he set out from Antioch, as was the case when he had left on the two previous journeys. But since there are repeated references to Timothy being with him on the third journey, we are safe in assuming that he again joined Paul when the apostle passed through his home town of Lystra. Our assumption that Timothy had been sent home from Ephesus for a "vacation" period is evidently correct, as well as our further assumption that he brought Paul news of the Galatian churches the previous year, soon after his arrival home. This journey to Antioch was an interruption of his stay at home, and we take it that he soon returned to Lystra, where he stayed for about a year, until Paul picked him up when starting out on his third missionary journey. The progress through Derbe, Lystra, Iconium, and Antioch was in the nature of a visitation for those congregations. Paul would inquire as to how the elders and the other officers of the churches were acquitting themselves and about the treatment they received. At this time he also inaugurated the special project of the gathering of a collection for the poor saints in Jerusalem, 1 Cor. 16, 1. It was now four years since Paul had visited the Galatian churches, his last journey in 49. In the meantime the great disturbance caused by the Judaizers had taken place. The Epistle to the Galatians, written but a year previous, had no doubt served to rout the foe and reestablish the truth and liberty of the Gospel. But we are sure that Paul would not be satisfied with making but a stop of several days at each of the churches, but that he rather stopped a full month at each in order to assure himself that the Galatians were still standing fast in the liberty wherewith Christ had made them free (Gal. 5, 1). The journey to Ephesus alone would have required at least a month, for it was a trip of about six hundred miles, which Paul, we think, made entirely on foot. So, since he left Antioch in spring, he must have arrived at Ephesus in the fall of 53, say in October. This time Paul was not forbidden to speak the word in Asia, but went directly to the heart of that large province. When he arrived at Ephesus, he quite likely lodged with Aquila and Priscilla, as he had done in Corinth.

Since Paul's work at Ephesus was the climax of his labors, we must have some acquaintance with the city. Ephesus was the capital of the Roman province of Asia,

which was one of the wealthiest of the Empire. Six centuries before Paul's time Croesus had accumulated his vast treasures at Sardis, so that to-day we still have the saying, "as rich as Croesus." Smyrna and Miletus were important centers of culture and commerce. But the city of Ephesus overshadowed them by far and was the largest, richest, and most influential city in which Paul founded a church. It had at Paul's time about half a million inhabitants. Ephesus owed its special pre-eminence to the natural advantages of its location. It lay at the mouth of the fertile valley of the Cayster River, the valley framed by mountains. The city had two ports, an inner and an outer one, which helped to make the place the most flourishing in Asia. It also had two rivers, for the long river Meander also flowed toward it from the interior of Asia Minor. When this river in its "meandering" course to the sea had almost reached Ephesus, it made a sharp turn to the south and flowed parallel to the coast for many miles to its mouth at Miletus. But the rich commerce from the interior and from the east found it easier to cross a small ridge to Ephesus than to continue on to Miletus.

But the city was not only important as a great commercial center, but was renowned for its culture as well. Like Athens, it was artistically laid out. Walls ten feet thick inclosed about a thousand acres, but the population overflowed these. A broad, paved street, lined with lecture-halls, smaller temples, and other public buildings, ran a mile straight east from the harbor to the largest of all Greek theaters, which was 600 feet in diameter, 40 more than the length of the Roman Colosseum (ruins of it are still standing). It was along this street that the school of Tyrannus, which Paul secured for his use, must have been located. Near the theater the main street was crossed by another running north and south, and it was at the junction of the two streets that the market-place was located, where the demonstration against Paul took place. Somewhat north on this latter street there was the stadium, or circus, an eighth of a mile long, holding 75,000 people. Here the bestiarii, or fighters with wild beasts, were mostly condemned criminals, were sent naked into the arena to be torn to pieces—the last number on the program. When Paul says in 1 Cor. 15, 32, "I have fought with beasts at Ephesus," he is speaking metaphorically.

The city of Ephesus was most famed for its magnificent Temple of Diana. The edifice had first been built six centuries before Paul's stay at Ephesus. Croesus had given columns and sculptores. But the first temple was destroyed by fire in 356 B. C. In 334 Alexander offered to pay the whole enormous cost of rebuilding it for the honor of having his name on it, but the proud and jealous Ephesians refused him with the flattering excuse, "It is not fit for one god to build a temple to another god." All Asia responded to the appeal to rebuild the temple in still greater glory. Many women gave their jewelry. It took 120 years to do it. A flight of fourteen steps led up on the four sides to the temple platform. The structure measured 323 feet by 151 feet. 127 columns, of which 36 were sculptured, supported the mammoth and magnificent roof of cedar. They were four feet in diameter and sixty feet high, being made of marble. Eight of them have been built into St. Sophia at Constantinople. The Temple of Diana was four times the size of the Parthenon at Athens, and one and one half times the size of the Cologne Cathedral. To wonder that this temple was classed as one of the seven wonders of the ancient world. It was dedicated to the worship of the Greek goddess Artemis, afterward identified with the Roman Diana. In the center of the temple stood an image of the goddess. The head of the image was crowned with two towers, one rising from the other; the bust was covered with paws, the symbol of reproduction; from the waist down it was swathed like a mummy and covered with all manner of curious carvings and inscriptions. According to a legend which was still believed by many at Paul's time, this image of the goddess had fallen from heaven and was the only perfect likeness of the goddess.

Hence it was that the thousands of pilgrims who came to worship, or to consult the oracle, which was almost as famous as that of Delphi in Greece, took home with them a small copy of the famous statue. The poorest pilgrims bought copies of terra cotta, the more prosperous ones copies of marble, while the wealthy tourists obtained those made of silver. Thus Demetrius catered to the wealthy class. Great numbers of priestesses served at the temple. With lewd dances they enticed men to the grossest debauchery. This was part of the worship of the goddess. May was called Artemision, the 24th day of the month being the birthday of the goddess. The whole month was given over to festivals in her honor. We can well see how Ephesus was called the "temple-keeper" of the great goddess Diana, Acts 19, 35.

We are now prepared to follow the narrative of Paul's sojourn and work in Ephesus. But first Luke digresses to tell us what had transpired there in Paul's absence, 18, 24-28. First we are introduced to Apollos, the Alexandrian Jew lately come to Ephesus, who was not only at home in the Scriptures, but who could also set forth his convictions with great eloquence. Though it is distinctly stated that this gifted man "was instructed in the way of the Lord," his instruction had evidently been deficient, for he knew only the baptism of John, which had been superseded by the Christian baptism. The fact that the twelve "disciples" spoken of in the first section of the next chapter also knew only the baptism of John leads Robinson (The Life of Paul, p. 162) to conclude that there was a regular sect made up of followers of John the Baptist in existence at this time which was one of the closest rivals of Christianity. He thinks that the Gospel of John, written long after the death of the Baptist, by emphasizing that the Baptist was not the Christ perhaps presents evidence that John the Baptist was so regarded by his followers. These later disciples of John, then, did not accept the Messianicship of Jesus and regarded him only as a prophet. Now, we do not deny that there may have been some such organized group of disciples of John, and that they may have been quite active in Ephesus, but we note from the text that both Apollos and the twelve disciples had come under Christian influence and had accepted the essential truths of the Christian faith even before they came into contact with the Christian missionaries at Ephesus. Under the tutelage of Aquila and Priscilla Apollos quickly developed into an able missionary, who removed to Corinth, where he was a great help to the church. This account of Apollos is introduced, not only because of its significance in the narrative of Acts, but also for the sake of rendering the opening of Paul's first letter to the Corinthians clear and intelligible. A contrast is drawn there between the more elaborate and eloquent style of Apollos and the simplicity of Paul's presentation of the Gospel, and the implication is that the Corinthians preferred the style of Apollos. Here Apollos, who no doubt continued to be an influential figure in the early church (1st. 3, 18), is introduced by Luke to his readers in order to acquaint them with his background and manner of beginning his ministry in the church. The order in which the different threads of the narrative here succeed one another recalls the method of 11, 27-12, 25. First Paul is brought to the frontier of Asia, next the events in Ephesus are brought up to date, and then Paul's entrance into Asia and his work at Ephesus is described.

Acts 18, 1-7, presents the beginning of Paul's work at Ephesus. These twelve disciples, to whom we have already alluded, may very well have already been contacted by Aquila and Priscilla. But because of their misconceptions regarding the person and work of John, there was need for further instruction, which was furnished by Paul. When Paul asks them whether they had received the Holy Spirit at the time when they became believers, he is referring, of course, to the bestowal of special miraculous gifts by the Holy Spirit, granted so freely to Christians in the first century, as may be seen from v. 9. Of this paragraph Ramsey writes (The Traveller, p. 270): "This episode I must confess not to understand. It interrupts the regular method of Luke's narrative; for in all similar cases, Paul gives to the synagogue, and his regular

efforts for his own people are related before any exceptional cases are recorded." But here the circumstances were evidently different than when Paul took up work at the other places. Here he found those twelve evidently before he had the opportunity to begin work in the synagogue and his dealing with them is therefore to be regarded as a prologue to his work at Ephesus.

Acts 19, 8-12, is a most important section of early church history, for it relates the establishment of the Christian church not only in Ephesus, but also throughout Asia. Ephesus was Paul's greatest opportunity and Paul's greatest achievement. The distinction between the period of preaching in the synagogue and his wider work among the Gentile population of Ephesus is marked. After three months of testifying in the synagogue, opposition became definite and stubborn, manifesting itself in blasphemous attacks on the Gospel, so that Paul abandoned his efforts of making use of the synagogue and transferred the seat of his operations to the school, or lecture-room, of Tyrannus, which thus became the first Christian church in Ephesus, just as the house of Titus Justus did in Corinth. This building was undoubtedly used during the morning hours for academic instruction. It is thought that in that hot climate it was customary to begin all work early in the morning, even before sunrise, so as to have the burden of the day's work done by 11 o'clock. Harnsey thinks that Paul's statement of 1 Thess. 2, 9, "ye remember our labor and toil, working day and night," refers to the time before sunrise as the "night", as often in ancient literature. Paul no doubt continued to work at his trade with Aquila and Priscilla till closing time an hour before noon. He taught, then, in the lecture-room during the afternoon, the time of leisure which was usually devoted to rest and home-life. No doubt Paul also carried on mission work toward sunset and in the evening, to which time he may have referred with the word "night". We know that Paul spent much time also in visiting and working with individuals in their houses, as he testifies in his farewell address to the Ephesian elders, Acts 20, 18, 23: "and have taught you publicly, and from house to house. I ceased not to warn every one night and day with tears." We note the long stay that Paul made at Ephesus, longer by some two months than the one at Corinth had been. The work in the synagogue had lasted three months. That was followed by a two year period of operations from the school of Tyrannus. We take it that this mention of two years is to be considered as following upon the three month period previously set apart from it, also that it carries us to the end of Paul's stay in Ephesus, so that the incident of the seven sons of Sceva which follows occurred sometime during this two year period and the great riot at its close. That is Luke's method of narration, first to give an overview of the whole period, then to state some particular occurrences. So here Paul's entire stay at Ephesus can be definitely stated as having lasted for two years and three months. This agrees with Paul's casual reference to the length of his stay at Ephesus as being three years which he made to the Ephesian elders, Acts 20, 31. Here we have an example, then, of inclusive reckoning, the term "three years" signifying merely parts of three years. We agree with Harnsey that Paul's Ephesian residence lasted quite likely from October of the year 53 till January of 56, but we shall have to examine the time of Paul's departure again later.

The result of this long period of work was not only that a large, flourishing church was established in the city of Ephesus itself, but also that the Gospel was spread throughout Asia, as is emphasized in v. 10. Up the valley of the Meander the Gospel went. About ninety miles east of Ephesus this river receives the waters of the Lycus, and on the banks of this river stood three cities. Hierapolis, the "Sacred City," contained the great temple of Cybele. Beside being a holy city, it was also a city for healing, for it had a hot spring. Six miles south was Laodicea, which was famous throughout the world for its fine wools and especially for an eye-salve of great merit. Ten miles southeast of Hierapolis was Colossae. It had been a flourishing city in previous times, but in the days of Paul it had dwindled to a position of insignificance. It was certainly the least important place to



which Paul addressed a letter. Though Paul was near to these three cities during his stay at Ephesus, yet he never visited them. That Paul never left Ephesus during the more than two years of his sojourn there may be inferred already from verses 9 and 10 of chapter 19—"daily". And yet we know that congregations were founded in all three of these cities already at this period, Col. 4, 15. Who founded them we do not know. It may have been one of Paul's regular helpers, as Timothy, Col. 1, 1, or it may have been Epaphras, who was the minister of the church at Colossae, Col. 1, 7, and perhaps also of the churches at Laodicea and Hierapolis, Col. 4, 12-13. Philemon and Onesimus were members of the church at Colossae, Col. 4, 9; Philemon 10. Philemon was evidently a man of wealth and had placed his comedious home into the service of the church, Philemon 2. Onesimus was the slave of Philemon, who had run away from his master, and whom Paul, having met him at Rome, was sending back to his master at Colossae, Philemon 12. These men had all most likely been among Paul's hearers at Ephesus, as had also Nymphas of Laodicea, Col. 4, 15, for Paul knew them personally. But that Paul had never worked in any of the three cities of the Lycus valley is attested by Col. 2, 1, where he refers to the Christians there as "as many as have not seen my face in the flesh."

Perhaps all of the seven churches of Asia Minor to whom the seven letters of the book of Revelation were addressed were founded by Paul and his helpers at this time. The first church addressed was the mother church at Ephesus, Rev. 2, 1-7. The next was the church at Smyrna, which city was on the sea coast north of Ephesus, where bishop Polycarp was martyred by fire. It was located in Lydia, the central region of Asia, Rev. 2, 8-11. Pergamos was the most important city of the northern region, that of Mysia, and was located on the river Caicus, about 20 miles from the sea, Rev. 2, 12-17. Thyatira was in Lydia, near the boundary of Mysia, on the road from Pergamos to Sardis. It was famous for its dyeing of purple. Lydia, the seller of purple in Philippi, had come from Thyatira, Rev. 2, 18-29. Sardis had been the capital of Lydia and was situated on the river Pactolus, a tributary of the Hermus, Rev. 3, 1-2. Philadelphia, also in Lydia, was about 27 miles southeast of Sardis in the plain of the Hermus, Rev. 3, 7-13. Of Laodicea we have already heard, Rev. 3, 14-22. It was the least faithful of the churches to which John wrote. The effect of Paul's work in and about Ephesus was really phenomenal. Fifty years later, when Ptolemy the Younger governed neighboring Bithynia, he finds to his dismay "the temples abandoned, religious festivals long since discontinued, while the priests have stopped selling the meats from the sacrifices, which no one will purchase any more" (Epistolae 93, 9b). The temple of Diana at Ephesus stood without the city, on the lower slope of a low mountain. St. John who went to Ephesus to live and work after the death of Paul lies buried on a slope of that same mountain. On the summit of the mountain the church of St. John Theologus was built by Justinian, and it was surpassed only by the larger St. Sophia at Constantinople.

In get back to the narrative of Paul's activity in Ephesus, the sacred historian adds to his general survey that God enabled the apostle to perform many miracles of healing diseases and cases of demoniacal possession. The use of garments of the apostle to effect cures shows how extensively the gift of miraculous power must have been used during this period. This use was occasioned by Paul's inability to visit all who were sick or distressed and the cure was effected not through the garments themselves, but because they represented to the afflicted the power of God which dwelt in His chosen apostle. This extensive use of divine power here at Ephesus is unique in the ministry of Paul.

Luke's mention of the many miracles performed by Paul leads him to relate an instance of Paul's demonstrating how the divine power was capable of overcoming the powers of the dabblers in the black art, Acts 19, 13-20. Ephesus was a center of magical arts and practices, and it was therefore inevitable that the new teaching should be brought into contact with them and triumph over them. Not only did pagans

practice witchcraft, but Jews as well. Such Jewish exorcists as are presented in the text no doubt made plenty of money by reciting formulas which called upon evil spirits to come forth, and claiming generally to effect magic cures through means divine powers. Recent finds of papyri have yielded many examples of these formulas (see Robinson, *The Life Of Paul*, p. 157). The seven sons of Sceva, noticing that Paul performed his miracles by calling on Jesus, attempted to use the name of Jesus as a magical device, with the outcome related. What a sensation this occurrence must have made in Ephesus, steeped as it was in superstition. Here was all the proof that was needed to demonstrate that Paul's was the superior power. The burning of the books was the outcome. Luke indicates that some of the Christians themselves had continued to use magic formulas. The value of the books publicly burned, fifty thousand drachmas, amounted to about ten thousand dollars, which sum might have bought several thousand such books or rolls. The public demonstration, then, must not have been a small one. Here was the greatest blow ever delivered at magic. No doubt many were converted as a result.

In Acts 19, 21, 22 we have a chronological note of considerable interest and importance, especially when studied in conjunction with passages from the epistles which apply. We note that Paul had by this time (and perhaps long before) formulated the plan of undertaking a fourth journey which would carry him to Rome, the capital and center of the Empire. Furthermore, we learn from Rom. 15, 24 that his visit to Rome was intended to be only a stop on the longer journey to Spain. By going to Spain Paul intended to plant the Gospel in the most distant seat of Roman civilization in the West and thus to carry it across the entire Mediterranean world from east to west. The opening words of v. 21, "after these things were ended", refer to the conclusion of the episode of the exorcists and the dealers in curious arts which the author had just set forth, and cannot refer to the end of Paul's stay at Ephesus as did the mention of the two years in v. 10, for in the next verse it is stated that Paul thereafter stayed in Ephesus for a season.

The sending of Timothy and Erastus into Macedonia therefore occurred some time before Paul's own departure from Ephesus, as would, of course, be expected. Paul himself intended to go to Macedonia after leaving Ephesus, and from there to Asia, and finally to Jerusalem. From 1 Cor. 4, 17 we note that Timothy was to go to Corinth though from 1 Cor. 16, 10 and other considerations it is doubtful whether he ever arrived there (2 Cor. gives no hint that he was there). Paul intended to follow him soon, 1 Cor. 4, 18. Erastus was to remain in Macedonia and Timothy was to first go to Macedonia and then on to Corinth. He certainly did not make two separate trips to the two places. No matter, then, that 1 Cor. was written just after Timothy had been sent on the journey to Macedonia and Corinth, 1 Cor. 4, 17 ("have I sent"), 1 Cor. 16, 10. We shall see that Paul left Ephesus in January of 56. So we take it that Timothy and Erastus must have been sent away on this trip and 1 Cor. must have been written sometime in the fall of 55.

Paul wanted to revisit particularly the Corinthian congregation, for disorders had crept in there. The full knowledge of the state of affairs at Corinth was brought to him by envoys from the congregation, 16, 17. When Paul received their report, he wanted to go to Corinth in person to correct what was amiss. His plan to sail direct from Ephesus to Corinth, thence going to Macedonia, and returning to Corinth, from where he would sail to Jerusalem, is revealed in 2 Cor. 1, 16. But we note that this plan had to be abandoned in favor of the plan which was later followed of first going through Macedonia and then sailing down to Corinth, 1 Cor. 16, 5. The abandonment of the plan was no doubt due to the conviction that the work in Asia demanded a longer residence. Instead of going at this time, Paul wrote a letter ~~last~~ <sup>last</sup>, 1 Cor., which was intended to set things aright in Corinth. Some hold that Paul did make a visit to Corinth during his Ephesian sojourn and ground their view on 2 Cor. 12, 14 and 13, 1. But the second passage must be read in the light of the first - "I am ready to come to you." The first two times that Paul wanted to go to Corinth he found it impossible

to do so, that is all that these passages say. And Acts 19, 9-10 indicates that Paul remained at Ephesus during the entire period, and in 2 Cor. 1, 23 he plainly states that he had not gone to Corinth as yet.

But this does not preclude the possibility of Paul having had contact with the Corinthian congregation before this time. We would expect that he would maintain a certain amount of intercourse with Corinth from Ephesus, considering the proximity of the two places. Messengers from Corinth must have repeatedly brought news of affairs there, as did Onesimus, 1 Cor. 1, 11. Yes, once before writing 1 Cor. Paul had even written a previous epistle to them, to which he refers in 1 Cor. 5, 9. And in addition we know that the Corinthians had written a letter to Paul, to which he refers in 7, 1. It was partly the receipt of this letter that caused Paul to write our 1 Cor. to them. At the time when 1 Cor. was written it was Paul's intention to remain at Ephesus till Pentecost of 53, 1 Cor. 16, 9, which would have been about a half a year after the time of his writing. But Paul evidently had to leave the city before Pentecost because of ever increasing opposition which culminated in the riot, this being the immediate cause of his departure. Since Paul spent the winter of 56-57 in Corinth and the summer and fall of 58 in Macedonia and in Illyria, as we gather from 2 Cor. and from Rom. 15, 19, it becomes evident that he left Ephesus early in 56. If he stayed to work at Troas, as he says he did in 2 Cor. 2, 12, he must have left very early in 56, say already in January. To have placed Paul's residence in Ephesus from October 53 to January 56. Now, we recognize that it might be placed a month or two later, for the Galatian ministry which preceded it might have lasted till the very end of 53 and the ministry which followed it might have begun later than we suppose (see 1 Cor. 5, 7-8). But there is a hint in 2 Cor. 2, 12, 13 that Paul was prevented from leaving Troas which gives a cue for our dating. If Paul left Ephesus about in January, as we think he did, he could take a coasting vessel up to Troas. Upon arrival there he very likely would have preferred to push on to Macedonia immediately. But undoubtedly he had to wait for passage across the Aegean for some time, for, though in January a voyage could easily be made along the safe Asian coast, it was more difficult for the voyage over the open sea to Macedonia. During the delay in Troas, Paul found an open door there and may have remained till general navigation began on March 5th. This reckoning seems to best fit the facts in the case.

Having heard that 1 Cor. was written from Ephesus in the fall of 55, we should give some additional consideration to the occasion of writing as well as to the contents. The history of the difficulties in the Corinthian church may be reconstructed from Paul's letters. Soon after coming to Ephesus Paul may have established contact with the church which he had founded on his previous journey. In time painful news began to reach Paul. From 1 Cor. 5, 9-13 we see that Paul wrote an early letter to the Corinthians because news had previously reached him of a great moral scandal which had occurred in the congregation. The members were evidently still tolerating the offender in their midst, although Paul evidently had directed them in his brief letter, which may have been written mainly for that purpose, to separate themselves from the fornicator. But the letter had been misunderstood. The Corinthians interpreted it as saying that Christians should not associate with unconverted sinners. So Paul explains that his meaning was that Christians should not tolerate the presence of an immoral person in their own ranks. Robinson points out that 2 Cor. 6, 14-17 is a passage on exactly this subject and is aumble of the same misinterpretation. And since it would seem that the thought was broken off in 6, 13 and taken up again in 7, 2, he concludes that it is part of that very first letter and got into 2 Cor., which he thinks comprises four or five letters, or all of Paul's correspondence with the Corinthians outside of our 1 Corinthians. His theory (The Life of Paul, p. 164f) has not a little merit. In response to Paul's brief note the Corinthians wrote a somewhat extended letter to him, 1 Cor. 7, 1. Reading between the lines of 1 Cor., we infer that they asked a number of questions on subjects that were being discussed

among themselves. These were questions about marriage, about eating meat that had been sacrificed to idols, about the conduct of women in the services, about the proper way to celebrate the Lord's Supper, about the relative value of spiritual gifts, and perhaps finally also questions about the resurrection, so that all of 1 Cor. from chapter 7 on was written in reply to their questions. This letter, then, that was sent to Paul would have in itself been a sufficient reason for his writing a lengthy letter in reply.

However, Paul had heard certain things about the church in Corinth which were not mentioned in their letter. In chapter 8 of 1 Cor. he reproaches them for taking their personal disputes before the public courts. And chapter 5 deals entirely with the matter which had not been settled by his earlier letter, that of separation from vile sinners, although the case of incest mentioned here, may have been a different one from the previous one (in which case the congregation had excommunicated the guilty party). The first four chapters of 1 Cor. are taken up with the most urgent part of Paul's message and have to do with the factions that had come into being. Paul may have first heard of the factions from Apollos, who was indirectly responsible for their being formed, for at the time of writing 1 Cor. Apollos was with Paul in Ephesus, 1 Cor. 16, 12. At about this time news was brought by the family of Chloe of division in the church. The messengers mentioned in 1 Cor. 16, 17, who may very well have brought the letter from Corinth, could have given Paul the same report. What had happened in Corinth was this: When Apollos came to Corinth after leaving Ephesus, his learning and eloquence made a deep impression on the Corinthians. "The Greeks seek after wisdom," 1 Cor. 1, 22, and the school learning of Apollos quite likely did exceed that of Paul. Soon the cry arose on the part of some that he was greater than Paul. Others retained a full spirit of loyalty to Paul, the founder of the church. Rivalry developed between the two groups. There then developed a third faction, those whose hero was Peter. Since they called him by his Hebrew name "Cephus," we may suppose that they themselves were Jews. Some of them may have come from Antioch. The contention of this party was that both Paul and Apollos lacked the ecclesiastical authority represented by Peter and the other primitive apostles. Was there a fourth party? 1 Cor. 3, 22 Paul mentions only three, but in 1, 12 he mentions four. It is possible that those who said, "I of Christ" were only a conciliatory group who were trying to unify the church. But it is far more likely that there was a fourth party who based their claims for superiority on the fact that they did not take their theology from any human teacher, but only from the Lord. It seems to have been this Christ party which later headed the whole opposition to Paul, 2 Cor. 10, 7; 11, 23. That the leaders of this party were outsiders who had probably come from Jerusalem is substantiated by the references to them in 2 Cor. 11, 4, 13, 22. In all probability they were Judaizers, who advocated the observance of the entire Law after the example of Christ. This was most likely the narrowest and most intolerant of the factions at Corinth. By the time Paul wrote 2 Cor. the four parties were apparently extinct, but in place of these there was a most virulent anti-Pauline party which we may regard as a carry over of the Christ party, and which was still undoubtedly headed by the Judaizers, the implacable foes of Paul. In rebuke of the factious spirit Paul first reminds them that the Gospel should be the sole cause of their glorying, 1, 10-31, and that it was through his lowly preaching that they had received the Gospel, 3. He then tells them that they should not build on Paul or Apollos, but on Jesus Christ, 3. And in chapter 4 he shows them how shameful their conduct is and warns them that after sending Timothy to them he himself will come. The effect that this epistle had on the Corinthian congregation was on the whole satisfactory. Paul's decision on the mooted questions was no doubt approved. The factional lines were dissolved. Yet there continued to be a certain strong opposition to his person and message, which led to his later writing the second letter to the Corinthians.

And now we are ready to return to chapter 19 of Acts to consider the riot which is reported there in v. 22-41 and which became the occasion of Paul's premature departure. The public opposition to Paul and his work was roused this time not by the Jews, but by the tradesmen whose business was injured by his teaching. The small shrines which these silversmiths made represented the goddess Diana in a niche. They were sometimes taken home and sometimes left in the temple as a native offering. Demetrius called a meeting of the brotherhood of silver image-makers. There then was a later scene. The Roman Empire was more modern than is often realized, for inscriptions and papyri also tell us of the existence of corporations and even of imperial regulation of prices. The mob which the silversmiths aroused got beyond their control, and a general state of confusion set in. But some who knew what they were doing caught two of Paul's companions, Gaius and Aristarchus, and rushed them into the theater, where the crowd had by this time assembled. It is a question whether the reading of some few MSS., "Gaius and Aristarchus a Macedonian," should not be followed. Gaius, in that case, would be the native of Beroe mentioned in 20, 4, and Luke would have added the nationality of Aristarchus out of pride, he himself being a Macedonian. The epithet, "travelling companions," seems to point forward to 20, 4, and supports this view. Paul himself was on the point of going to the theater to the rescue of his friends when he was dissuaded by the disciples and certain of the Asiarchs, who were his friends." The Asiarchs, or high priests of Asia, were the heads of the imperial, political-religious organization of the province in the worship of "Pam and the Emperors"; and their friendly attitude is a proof both that the spirit of the imperial policy was not as yet hostile to the new teaching, and that the educated classes did not share the hostility of the superstitious vulgar to Paul" (Ramsay, *The Traveller*, p. 231). "It is evident that the mob thought that the enemies of Diana and the temple were the Jews, for they did not distinguish between Jews and Christian Jews. It was fortunate that Alexander was not allowed to speak, for he would have thrown the blame on Paul and his Christians. It is possible that he was the worker in bronze who did Paul much harm, 2 Tim. 4, 14. When Luke tells of the howling mob keeping up their devoted outcry for two long hours, we catch his tone of sarcasm and contempt. The speech of the town-clerk, which is evidently given at length, is an important document, for it shows the utter groundlessness of the accusation which was brought against Paul in the eyes of responsible officials. The clerk was probably the most important official in Ephesus (the mayor), who was in close contact with the court of the proconsul, who generally resided there. But though Paul was completely exonerated by the civil government, it was nevertheless advisable for him to leave the city. To remain would bring further persecution upon the Christians.

But we cannot as yet bring down the curtain on Paul's activity at Ephesus, for we learn from the epistles that there is much that transpired there that Luke does not even hint at in Acts. Luke had told us of much of Paul's successes, but little of his difficulties. When we examine the epistles which Paul wrote during and soon after his stay at Ephesus for allusions to his experiences there, we find that he indeed experienced many tribulations during his long residence in the chief city of Asia. We are greatly astonished by these remarks of the apostle. In 1 Cor., which was written some few months before his departure, we have such a startling statement in 4, 11-13. Not only does Paul write here of physical privations, but also of bitter persecution. A still stronger passage is that of 1 Cor. 15, 30-32. Whatever the definite meaning of Paul's words may be, it is clear that he had passed through terrible scenes and had been in daily danger of losing his life. In 1 Cor. 15, 9. 9 he again acquaints his readers with the fact that in Ephesus "there are many adversaries." and all this, it must be remembered, was written before the tumult caused by the silversmiths had taken place. Next we examine the evidence of 2 Cor., which was written some six to nine months later when Paul was at some point in Macedonia. Already in the first chapter, immediately after the greeting, Paul speaks of his tribulations which he suffered in Asia, first mentioning them only in a general way, 1,

3,7, and then more directly, 1, 8-10. Again he states that he despaired even of life, and he certainly is speaking of something far more dangerous than the mob demonstration, which did not affect him directly. Of importance as we are now piecing together what Paul himself reports on his stay at Ephesus is 2 Cor. 11, 23-25, Paul's catalog of his afflictions. Significant is the fact that Paul drew up this list about half a year after leaving Ephesus. We have noted before that very few of these sufferings can be identified from the narrative of Acts. Not once, for instance, does Luke refer to Paul's receiving thirty-nine stripes from the Jews. We have recognized before that Luke passes lightly over the sufferings of Paul. Some of them may have occurred before Paul was brought into the narrative of Acts, during his years of obscurity in Syria and Cilicia. But all of them certainly cannot be assigned to that period. Which events in this catalog of suffering may have happened in Ephesus? We do not know. But there is an early tradition that Paul was imprisoned while at Ephesus, and "The Prison of Paul" is one of the prominent ruins of Ephesus shown to this day. The only imprisonment which Luke records up to this time was the brief one at Philippi. Next we turn to the book of Romans, which was written in the winter of 56-57 in Corinth. There in chapter 16, 5-4 we have another pertinent statement. The place where Aquila and Priscilla risked their lives for Paul was evidently at Ephesus. Furthermore, we read in Rom. 16, 7 that Paul greets Andronicus and Junia, whom he terms his kinsmen and fellow-prisoners. The reference to imprisonment is again significant. Where could these two relatives have been in prison with Paul? It may very well be that they had of late removed to Rome from Ephesus, as we know Aquila and Priscilla did, and that they had been imprisoned with Paul there at Ephesus. There remains yet the address which Paul delivered to the elders of the church of Ephesus when he met them at Miletus on his journey back to Jerusalem. In the opening words, Acts 20, 18-19 Paul states that he suffered severe trials at Ephesus which were brought upon him by plots of the Jews. Our knowledge of how it fared with Paul during his residence in Ephesus is greatly enhanced by these scattered references in his epistles. We gather that there was such opposition from the Jews, as at other places, that they plotted against him, quite likely had him beaten and possibly also imprisoned, so that at one time at least Paul expected to lose his life. We take it though, that Paul was cast into a Roman prison while at Ephesus and his case was brought to trial before a Roman tribunal, that he was quickly acquitted and permitted to continue his work, for Luke's account of the riot reveals that the officials of the city were uniformly friendly to Paul. The fact that the elders are called his friends might indicate that he had first come into contact with them through accusations brought before them by the Jews. But if they, or any other Roman officials had taken him into custody, we are sure that his imprisonments could have lasted only for very short periods, for any long period of imprisonment would nullify the statement of Acts 19, 8-10 that Paul continued to teach daily in the school of Tyrannus for the space of two years.

Once the possibility is admitted of Paul having under one or more imprisonments at Ephesus, the question arises whether any of the so-called "prison epistles," Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, and Philemon were not written from Rome, during Paul's first imprisonment there. Yet there have always been those who have not been willing to accept this view in its entirety. Already Origen, unwilling to date Philippians as late as a Roman imprisonment, assigned it to the period between 1 and 2. Corinthians. But the modern view of assigning all the prison epistles to Ephesus begins with W. Lisco of Berlin, who developed the theory in his *Vincula Sanctorum* in 1800. Prof. A. Deissmann, of Berlin, has been sympathetic to the hypothesis, though he himself has made no contribution to the subject. An hypothesis which has been favored by scholars such as Deissmann, Scio, and others, is not one to be set aside lightly.

We have examined the presentation of it by G. S. Duncan in his book, "St. Paul's Ephesian Ministry." In the first part of the book Duncan presents the historical

narrative of Paul's movements before, during, and after the Ephesian sojourn and makes special reference to the development of opposition on the part of the Jews. He says, for instance, "from what we know of the parallel case of Corinth, we may reasonably infer that the Jews of Ephesus worked up a case against the apostle, though the failure of the attempt at Corinth would have taught their leaders that there was no hope of effective civil interference unless they had quite definitely a civil as well as a religious charge to lay against their victim. Are we to imagine that during the two years of active propaganda among 'all the inhabitants of Asia' the Jewish leaders looked quietly on and took no action? Shortly later it was Asiatic Jerusalem, catching sight of him in the Temple, were ringleaders in the outbreak that led to his arrest." Duncan is no doubt right in his surmise that attempts were made by the Jews to work up a legal case against Paul and to hail him before court. He thinks he can divine the exact nature of the charge trumped up against the apostle. When the town- clerk asserted that Paul and his associates were not robbers of churches, Duncan thinks that the reference was not to the Temple of Diana, but to the Temple at Jerusalem. He points out that the contributions of the Jews for the Temple treasury were brought to Ephesus from all Asia, and from there were transported to Jerusalem. Sometimes attempts would be made by robbers to steal this money, and so the Jews, in their eagerness to adopt any measure to suppress Paul, had previously raised the accusation that he was robbing their Temple. The language of the municipal secretary would imply that here was a revival of the former charge of which Paul had been acquitted.

Duncan then takes up what he terms direct evidence of an Ephesian imprisonment. But this direct evidence merely consists of the passages which we have adduced above relating to the apostle's tribulations while at Ephesus, and in addition a few references to imprisonment and persecution from extracanonical sources. Concerning all this so-called direct evidence Duncan himself confesses that in itself it is not convincing. We have noted before that none of the passages previously listed force the conclusion upon one that Paul was actually in prison while at Ephesus. Dr. Kretzmann says (The New Testament in the Light of a Holograph's Research): "The tribulations and afflictions of which Paul speaks there may well have been such as pertained to the spirit alone, having their basis in the difficulties with which the apostle was battling, not only in establishing the congregation in Ephesus on a sounder basis, but also in removing the obstacles which had arisen in the congregation at Corinth, as his two letters to Corinth so amply demonstrate." We do believe that there may well have been an occasional flare-up of antagonism on the part of the Jews which led to Paul's being apprehended and haled before the authorities, as was the case at Philippi, and which is implied in his declaration of 2 Cor. 11, 23, but we also believe that he was speedily acquitted and spent no considerable period in prison at Ephesus, which is indicated by the account of Acts 19 and 20, which gives him an uninterrupted activity.

When Duncan goes from his chapter on direct evidence to indirect, he says: "If the evidence of the previous chapter stood alone, no safe superstructure could be raised on it. The great argument for an Ephesian imprisonment is that it provides by far the most intelligible setting for some, or for all of these epistles." And then he goes on to illustrate. We shall examine some of these points of probability. 1. In Philothon we are told of the fugitive slave Onesimus, who has come to Paul and who is sent back to his master Philothon, who lived at Colossae. Duncan asks, "Is it not in every way more probable that Onesimus fled from the little town of Colossae in the Lyons valley to Ephesus rather than to Rome?" Ephesus was only about ninety miles from Colossae, while Rome was more than a thousand miles away. Well, it is hard to say to which of the two cities Onesimus was more likely to have gone, to the metropolis near his home, or to the more distant one. It could be argued that a runaway slave would be more likely to get as far away from his former home as

possible and that Onesimus would not have wanted to stay in Ephesus for fear of being detected there and captured. Duncan admits that there is much in Onesimus's relations with Paul which is wrapped for us in mystery and that the data which we have are of no great relevance for our present inquiry. 2. Duncan does make much of Paul's request for a lodging at Colossae, Phil. 2:23. He says: "How natural would such a visit be at a time when his activities, temporarily interrupted by imprisonment, were directed towards, the evangelisation of Asia; not far from him as he lay at Ephesus were those churches in the Lycus valley which in some indirect way owed their origin to his missionary work in the province. On the other hand, how unlikely was he to contemplate such a visit, let alone give thought to the provision of a lodging there, when he lay a prisoner at Rome." Besides, it is pointed out, when Paul was in Rome his heart was set on going to Spain, Rom. 15, 23-28. We recognize the logic and force of this argument. If there were no other considerations than this to take into account, we might be led to espouse the Ephesian imprisonment view. But since, as we shall see, there are cogent reasons for not accepting this theory, we must regard also this argument as lacking in validity. We point out that it is not at all impossible that Paul should have planned to go to Colossae upon release from his Roman imprisonment. It is true, he had intended to go to Spain from Rome. But he had come to Rome under different circumstances than he had at first anticipated. Having been a prisoner there for two years, he had been separated a long time from the congregations which he had founded. To know it was his policy to revisit the churches. What is more likely than that he should have planned when he had been released from prison to revisit the churches in the West? We know that at about the time that he wrote to Phil. he also notified the Philippians that he intended to visit them, Phil. 2, 24. By crossing Italy and the Adriatic he could follow the Via Egnatia across Macedonia and be at Philippi in a month. A still shorter journey would bring him to Colossae. Wishing to assure Onesimus a friendly reception, why should he not write to Onesimus from Rome that he expects to visit him soon and request that lodging be prepared for him?

Next we consider the argument based on Paul's relation with the Philippian church. From Phil. 2, 19-24 we notice that there was a frequency of communication between Paul and the Philippians. Quite a number of journeys are indicated. The sequence of events is probably this: "Since Paul had been put into prison (at Rome let us say), (1) news of the apostle has traveled to Philippi; (2) the Philippians have made a collection, and have sent it by their messenger Epaphroditus to Rome; (3) their messenger having fallen ill, news of his illness has been carried back to Philippi; (4) the news has caused considerable grief at Philippi, and report of that grief is carried back to the invalid at Rome. So much for past journeys; we turn now to look at prospective ones. (1) Timothy is to be sent as soon as opportunity affords; (2) Timothy is expected to return and report to Paul, Paul presumably remaining meanwhile at Rome; (3) Paul, having received Timothy's report, hopes to visit Philippi in person." Duncan points out the great time that was required to make the journey from Rome to Philippi. It involved a land journey to Brundisium (360 miles), a sea-crossing to Dyrrachium and Apollonia (2 days), and a long journey of 360 miles along the Via Egnatia to Philippi (See Hastings, p. 335). Most of the 740 land miles would be made on foot, a good traveler averaging only 15 miles a day. By way of contrast, the journey from Ephesus to Philippi would require only seven to ten days. Duncan then asks, "have we not here a finger-post that points clearly to Ephesus rather than to Rome?" Again we answer that the time required for these journeys would fit into the picture better if we assume that Philippians was written from Ephesus rather than from Rome. But, knowing as we do that Paul's imprisonment at Rome lasted for two years, Acts 23, 30, we see that there was ample time for all the journeys indicated, for we rightly assume that the first one was made soon after Paul's arrival at Rome. In fact, the mere listing of the frequent communication



between Paul and Philippi precludes the possibility of Paul's imprisonment having been at Ephesus, for even with the shorter time involved if the journeys were made between Philippi and Ephesus we would have to assume an imprisonment of at least several months, and, we have heard, such an imprisonment would do violence to Luke's narrative. We simply cannot believe that if an imprisonment of long duration, on which the Ephesian theory is postulated, would have taken place at Ephesus, that Luke would have passed it over in silence. We have, moreover, as far as Philippians is concerned, a bit of internal evidence which connects the epistle with Rome, and that is the reference in 1, 13 to the palace, or praetorium, and in 4, 22 to Caesar's household. For even if the palaces of the proconsuls in the senatorial provinces were also designated as praetoria, and even if the expression "Caesar's household" might have been used for the servants in charge of imperial property or possessions throughout the empire, this does not change the fact that these expressions were more likely to have been used in Rome. Acts 28, 16, 30 clearly shows that Paul enjoyed the custodia libera for two years until his case should come up for hearing. In Rome he had an opportunity to do more extensive mission-work among the soldiers of the imperial barracks than he would within the confines of a prison at Ephesus.

4. Finally, we must take note of the many references to Paul's companions during captivity in question, which Duncan holds constitutes a strong argument against connecting the prison epistles with Rome. He says, "According to the traditional view Aristarchus, Epaphras, Onesimus, Timothy, Mark, Tychicus, Jesus Justus, Luke, Demas, Amphroditus are all in Rome." That, of course, is not impossible; but is it probable? With the possible exception of Aristarchus, Mark, and Luke, we have (outside the imprisonment epistles) no evidence whatsoever for associating any of these friends with Rome, ... while in regard to every one of them there is a strong possibility, which in the case of Aristarchus, Timothy, and Tychicus is a certainty, that they were associated with the apostle in Ephesus." To refute this argument, it will be best to survey the movements of some of these companions of Paul to show how highly probable it was that they were with him at Rome. There is Aristarchus who is mentioned in Acts 19, 29 as Paul's companion in travel. He was from Thessalonica, so likely had not traveled with Paul till the apostle left Ephesus. He was one of the delegates who brought the collection of the Macedonian Christians to Jerusalem, Acts 20, 4. In Acts 27, 2 we are told that he was a companion of Paul on the voyage from Caesarea to Rome, and Col. 4, 10 indicates that he may have been a fellow-prisoner of the apostle in Rome. In this passage Mark is mentioned. Since it can be demonstrated that Aristarchus went with Paul to Rome, it must also be concluded that Mark also was to be found at Rome at this time. These passages also point to Rome as the place from which Philemon was written, for, aside from the fact that Philemon lived at Colossae, so that Paul had the chance to send both the epistle to the Colossians and the one to Philemon by the same messenger, we find the name of Aristarchus in v. 24 of Philemon. In v. 23 and 24 of Philemon we also find the names of Epaphras, Mark, Demas, and Luke, all of them mentioned in the same breath with Aristarchus, who we know went to Rome. Epaphras we know was from Colossae, Col. 4, 12, so that here already we have evidence that Colossians and Philemon were written from Rome. Next we can examine the case of Timothy. We know that he was at first with Paul at Ephesus, for he was sent with Praxiteles to Macedonia sometime before the tumult of Demetrius. When Paul later left Ephesus and had come to Macedonia, he wrote his Second Epistle to the Corinthians, in which Timothy's name is added to that of Paul's in the address, 2 Cor. 1, 1. Now this is not done in 1 Cor., which was written from Ephesus, for the simple reason that Timothy had already been sent away on his trip. Now the significant fact is that Timothy's name is also added in the addresses of three of the captivity letters, Col. 1, 1; Philemon 1, and Philemon 1, 1. He was clearly with Paul when these letters were written. But he was sent away from Ephesus a considerable time before Paul

left, even before the writing of 1 Cor. If the prison epistles were written from Ephesus, then, they must have been written at an early time, evidently before 1 Cor. (where Paul does not use Timothy's name in the address). But this assumption complicates things. Why, then, for instance, did Paul make no reference to his imprisonment in 1 Cor. as he did in the prison epistles if it was written at about the same time as these? If the prison epistles are placed at Rome, this and other difficulties disappear. The movements of Tychicus confirms our case. He was among the men who accompanied Paul to Jerusalem, Acts 20, 4, and he was clearly in Paul's company when he wrote the letter to the Ephesians, Eph. 6, 21, 22. He was in fact the bearer of that letter as well as of Colossians, Col. 4, 7, 8, and therefore also of Philemon. We know that during the second captivity at Rome he was with Paul and was sent by him to Ephesus, 2 Tim. 4, 12. It is therefore quite plausible to assume that he was with Paul also during the first captivity. Paul's giving him a recommendation after the lapse of four years might be expected in the circumstances. The Ephesian theory breaks down completely when we consider the case of Luke. He was clearly with Paul at the time when the captivity letters were written, for he sends greetings in Col. 4, 14 and in Philemon 24. Now the "we" sections of Acts ~~show~~ that Luke was not with Paul during the sojourn at Ephesus. On the other hand there can be no doubt that Luke was a companion of Paul on his journey to Rome and the indication is that he remained in Rome during the first captivity there, Acts 27, 1-28, 16. So Luke being a companion of Paul during his imprisonment at Rome, indicates that the captivity letters were written from Rome. We have sufficiently examined this interesting theory and have shown that it is untenable.

We must now sketch the events that occurred in the year which followed Paul's departure from Ephesus. Luke covers this entire period in two and a half verses, in Acts 28, 1-3a. At first we are rather surprised that Luke should skip over a whole year of Paul's blessed activity with two short sentences, but we remember that Luke's purpose is not to give us a complete biography of Paul, but rather only to present the highlights of the Gospel's triumphant progress from Jerusalem to Rome. When he states that Paul gave "much exhortation" to the churches of Macedonia, he gives us a hint that the situation there at this time was a disturbing one. It is Luke's plan merely to give his readers an account of the establishment of the leading churches, but not to acquaint them with controversies which arose soon after their founding. Thus when in Acts 18, 24-28 he relates the work that Apollos carried on in the newly founded church at Corinth, he in no way even hints at the factionalism that developed as a result of the able ministry of Apollos.

Happily, it is possible for us to obtain a much more complete picture of Paul's activities in this year 58 from scattered references in his epistles. From 2 Cor. 2, 12, 13 we learn that upon leaving Ephesus Paul traveled north toward Macedonia, presumably by ship, and stopped at Troas, expecting to meet Titus there, whom he had entrusted with the mission of <sup>organizing</sup> ~~organizing~~ <sup>public and orderly</sup> ~~public and orderly~~ in the Corinthian congregation, 2 Cor. 2, 12, 13. It would be interesting to know just when and under what circumstances Titus had been sent to Corinth. The raising of this question gives us occasion to take up the broader consideration of Titus's entering upon the stage again at this time. We heard of him once before in connection with Paul's second visit to Jerusalem at the time of the famine, when he took Titus along from Antioch, Gal. 2, 1. We have noted the strange fact that Titus is nowhere mentioned in Acts, even though he apparently was one of the most important of Paul's helpers, this being due perhaps to the fact that Titus was a relative of Luke's, as is attested by tradition. We know that Luke is extremely modest about mentioning himself in the narrative, never calling himself by name. Thus the unnamed brother who in 2 Cor. 8, 13 and 18, 13 is mentioned as having been sent by Paul with Titus

to Corinth to help Titus complete the collection and then also to convey the offering to Jerusalem as a representative of the churches of Achaia is identified by an early tradition with Luke. We take it that Titus had been assisting Paul in the work at Ephesus. From 2 Cor. 8, 6 it is apparent that Titus was sent to Corinth on two different occasions. The prime purpose of his two trips was to inaugurate and to consummate the collection for the Jerusalem poor. His first journey was in all probability made from Ephesus, for when Paul later left Ephesus and came to Troas, he expected to find Titus there on his return trip, 2 Cor. 2, 12, 13, and, being disappointed in this, he pushed on to Macedonia, where he finally found his assistant and received an encouraging report of the church at Corinth, 2 Cor. 7, 5-7. In 2 Cor. Titus is prominent to a degree unique in Paul's letters; he is named nine times and always with marked affection and distinction. This prominent mention is rather to be expected in view of the recent visit of Titus to Corinth. As a result of this visit Titus maintained a special interest in and affection for the Corinthian congregation, 2 Cor. 7, 15, 16. After the meeting with Paul in Macedonia the apostle decided to send his able helper back to Corinth along with two other brethren, 2 Cor. 8, 16-24. Though the expressed purpose of this mission was the completion of the collection, we know that Paul wrote his second epistle to the Corinthians at this time, so that Titus became the bearer or one of the bearers of 2 Cor. It is not impossible for him to have been the bearer of 1 Cor. also. It must have been about the time that 1 Cor. was written that Titus was sent on his first mission to Corinth. However, if he had been sent with the letter, we would almost expect some mention of him in the epistle. But not once is his name mentioned. It is more likely, then, that 1 Cor. was conveyed to the church by the committee that had been sent by it to Paul at Ephesus, 1 Cor. 16, 17, and that Titus was sent on his mission a little later as a follow-up of the letter.

its admonitions and thus to help restore harmony, as well as to inaugurate the collection at Corinth. Since Timothy's name is not joined to that of Paul in the salutation of 1 Cor., as it is in 2 Cor. and other epistles when Timothy was with the apostle, we gather that he and Erastus had been sent to Macedonia (Acts 19, 22) shortly before 1 Cor. was dispatched. Titus, then, was sent directly by the sea route, while Timothy was proceed around the much longer land route, first visiting Macedonia and then going down to Corinth, 1 Cor. 4, 17. Paul, then, left Ephesus several months later, in January of 48, going by the same route as Timothy was to follow. Coming to Troas, and not finding Titus there as he had expected to, for he had been delayed too long at Corinth, Paul stayed there a while to "preach Christ's Gospel," 2 Cor. 2, 12, 13. Luke relates nothing of Paul's work in Troas because nothing extraordinary took place there, this being merely a pause on Paul's journey, necessitated most likely by the fact that it was winter and he could not obtain passage across the Aegean. But that the apostle's labors were successful is attested by the fact that when he again visited Troas a year later on his return trip to Jerusalem it is noted that there was a congregation there, Acts 20, 7. We gather that Paul stopped at Troas for about a month and a half, from about the middle of January to the beginning of March. It must have been at Philippi that he met Titus, for after having received the report of conditions in Corinth, Titus was sent back to Corinth along with Luke, who, we know, had been left at Philippi on the second missionary journey and who again accompanied Paul on his journey to Jerusalem at the conclusion of the third, Acts 20, 6. Now it was Paul's meeting with Titus which also occasioned the writing of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians. And since Titus was immediately sent back to Corinth, 2 Cor. 8, 6, 16-19, he was quite certainly also the bearer of the second letter. Since Paul joins his name with Timothy's in the address, 2 Cor. 1, 1, we gather that he too joined Paul at Philippi. Ramsay thinks that Paul did not meet Timothy until he had come to Berea or Thessalonica, and that 2 Cor. was written from one of those cities, so that Titus did not take the letter with him, but rather preceded it to Corinth. But from Paul's failure to mention meeting with Timothy in 2 Cor., as well as from 1 Cor. 16, 10, we gather that Timothy never did get to Corinth. The work in Macedonia may have prevented his completing the journey, or, meeting Titus on his way into Macedonia, he may have

concluded it would be best for him to wait for Paul. 2 Cor., then, was written in the spring of 56. But Paul did not arrive there till the following winter. Already when he wrote 1 Cor., at which time he planned to stay at Ephesus till the following Pentecost, so late spring, he had informed the Corinthians that he hoped to spend the following winter with them, 1 Cor. 15, 5-6. And in Acts 20, 2-5 Luke gives us the valuable chronological note that Paul spent three months at Corinth, which we conclude were the three winter months of December 56 and January and February 57.

What did Paul do all the time between spring and winter of 56? Before answering that question we should scrutinize his Second Epistle to the Corinthians more carefully. A person who in one sitting reads both epistles to the Corinthians will at once be struck by the contrast between the two. Ballmann says (Paul, p. 198): "Going from First to Second Corinthians, we pass from a park to a trackless forest. The former is Paul's best-ordered letter the latter the least-ordered." Godet says: "The language is all full of emotion, of outpourings of grief, anguish, and love, outbursts of indignation, quivering sarcasms." We gather from the epistle that Titus had brought both good and bad news from Corinth. On the whole the situation which had existed because of the factions had cleared up, so that the first epistle had the desired effect, 2 Cor. 7, 6-9. Then Paul here and elsewhere, 7, 12, speaks of the former letter which he wrote to them, he evidently refers to our 1 Cor. for in the section 2, 1-11 he evidently refers to the case of the young man guilty of incest which he had dealt with in chapter 5 of 1 Cor. The congregation had undoubtedly taken disciplinary action against him, which had brought him to a state of repentance, so that now Paul admonishes that he should be forgiven and reinstated.

On the other hand Titus had something unfavorable to report: some of the members were still prejudiced against Paul and disparaged his ministry, 2 Cor. 10, 10, 11. We are quite certain that they were misled by the Judaizers, as especially a perusal of 11, 18f will suggest; see also 2 Cor. 5, 1. There is only one quotation from Paul's enemies which is explicitly designated as such, and that is the one in 10, 10, but throughout the epistle there are undoubtedly many indirect quotations which are taken from the charges that had been brought against him. "The key to the interpretation of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians," therefore says Hayes, "is to be found in the proper use of quotation marks," and he makes a long list of the slanders against Paul which he groups under the following heads: 1. As to his personal appearance; 2. As to his speech; 3. As to his authority; 4. As to his teachings; 5. As to his character. All of these slanders Paul answers. In fact, the one great theme of 2 Cor. is Paul's defence of himself and of his ministry.

The great difficulty in understanding this letter is due to the fact that it is full of allusions and familiar references which we can ascertain only approximately and also due to the fact that it was written in such a state of agitation that the language is not always coherent. Yet it is possible to ascertain a certain order in the contents. The letter evidently falls into three parts. Chapters 8 and 9 treat of the collection and they separate the preceding chapters from those which follow. In chapters 1 to 7 we have Paul's vindication of his ministry. And in chapters 10 to 13 we have another more vehement defence. There is quite a diversity of tone between the first section and the last. In his first defence Paul is much less agitated and is apparently pleased that things are shaping themselves so satisfactorily at Corinth. In chapter 7, especially, when he speaks of Titus bringing him news from Corinth, he repeatedly states how he had been comforted thereby. But contrast his declaration in 2 Cor. 7, 16: "I rejoice that in everything I am of good courage concerning you," with chapters 10 to 13 which are filled with indignation and denunciation.

This strong contrast has led some to conclude that both sections do not belong to one and the same letter. Thus Robinson (The Life of Paul, p. 170) espouses this theory. He thinks that 2 Cor. is a collection of letters or parts of letters. Chapters

10-13 he holds are from a letter of reproof which Paul sent some time after 1 Cor. was written in order to foil the party of outsiders who were heading the whole opposition. This would have been before the meeting with Titus. Chapters 1-7 are the letter which was written after meeting with Titus. There are left chapters 8 and 9 which deal with the collection and which, says Robinson, can hardly have been written at the same time, since 9,1 introduces the subject in a way that indicates it had not been mentioned before. In explanation of how these letters or parts of letters came to be incorporated in one manuscript, Robinson writes: "Apparently one of Paul's disciples, going around after the death of the apostle with the object of making a collection, and coming to Corinth, found one long letter which would just about fill a standard papyrus roll. After copying the letter he would number this roll Corinthians I. Then using a second roll of papyrus he arranged the shorter letters or fragments as best he could, copied them, and numbered the roll Corinthians II." Robinson also points to the fact that a study of Philippians reveals reference to several letters which that church must have lost in whole or in part. Now, we recognize the difficulty which Robinson points out. His theory, moreover, sounds quite plausible, and we might be willing to accept it, if it were not for a very obvious fault. And that is that a copyist could hardly do otherwise than to copy letters in their entirety, and we notice that the several additional letters that Robinson recognizes in our 2Cor. have no beginning or ending. In all of 2 Cor. there is only one salutation and only one conclusion, and that brands it as a unit, despite the diversity of tone and content.

Now a consideration of Paul's activity between the writing of 2 Cor. and his arrival at Corinth in the early winter. This is the period from about early March to early December of 56, so nine months. Some of this time was obviously spent in Macedonia revisiting the three large Christian centers which he had founded on his second journey. That was in the year 49, so that by now seven years had elapsed. Thus Paul gave his Christian friends in Philippi, Berea, and Thessalonica the longed-for opportunity of seeing his face again. But more than that; he delivered "much exhortation", as we are told in Acts 20, 2. This expression may, of course, merely refer to exhortation of a general nature, but we think that something more is implied. In 2 Cor. 7, 5 Paul writes that upon coming into Macedonia "we were troubled on every side: without were fightings, within were fears." And in 2 Cor. 11, 28 he speaks of the daily care of all the churches which rested upon him. Now we know that one thing that agitated and depressed the apostle when he first came into Macedonia was his lack of knowledge of the state of affairs at Corinth. However, when he met Titus at Philippi and had been informed that the Corinthian church had been brought around to a state of comparative harmony and loyalty, his spirits were revived and he apparently ceased worrying about Corinth. Yet the above passages from 2 Cor. indicate that Paul continued to be burdened with difficulties in the churches. The expression "fightings without" is especially significant, and we think that it refers to contentions with the Judaizers and their adherents. We know how the Judaizers followed Paul into Galatia and almost succeeded in undermining his work there. We also know that they were active at Corinth and created considerable disturbance in the church there. Having been active in Achaia, it is hardly likely that they would overlook the neighboring field of Macedonia. During Paul's long absence from Macedonia, they were almost sure to have gotten in some subversive activity, so that now, we feel, it was necessary for Paul to counteract their teaching and correct certain tendencies. While the influence of these false teachers was undoubtedly not so potent as it had been in the Galatian churches and at Corinth, yet it required "much exhortation" for Paul to set things in order.

How long Paul remained in Macedonia we do not know. It must have been three or four months, and yet it could not be longer than that, for it was evidently at this time that Paul made his journey to Illyricum. Paul's journey to the northwest into this province he alludes to in Romans 15, 19, this epistle being written from Greece

soon after his return. Illyricum was a vast country bordering on the west of Macedonia and included Dalmatia, the country east of the Adriatic opposite to Italy. Along the coast were excellent harbors. But the country was traversed by the most easterly portion of the great Alpine chain of mountains, and the Illyrian race which inhabited the region were wild mountaineers. From what we know of Paul's missionary policy, we can see little in such a country to attract him. He no doubt felt impelled to visit it, since this would enable him to carry the Gospel a step farther west. But as in the case of his journey through Pamphilia, so here the work did not result in the founding of any church. Had an important congregation been founded by Paul in Illyricum at this time, we feel that Luke would not have failed to mention this journey. And yet that it was not altogether a hopeless field is shown by the fact that during his second imprisonment at Rome Paul sent Titus to Dalmatia to carry on work in the coast cities, 2 Tim. 4, 10. Paul himself may never have reached the coast, for the time at his disposal was not long, only about four months.

Sometime late in the fall Paul traveled south to Greece and paid the Corinthians the visit which had repeatedly been a topic of his correspondence. In 1 Cor. 16, 5 he had spoken of visiting them subsequent to his passing through Macedonia. It would seem that at this writing he had no intention of visiting Illyricum. We know that he had been compelled to leave Ephesus some months earlier than he had planned on doing, and because of the extra time gained in this way he may have been prompted to make the side-trip into Illyricum. His intention was to winter in Corinth, 1 Cor. 16, 6. He wanted a prolonged period in which commercial activity at Corinth was restricted by the lack of shipping in the winter in which to instruct and exhort where this was needed. This lasted three months, Acts 20, 3. In the home of Gaius, whom he had personally baptized, 1 Cor. 16, 5, grateful hospitality was accorded him, Rom. 16, 23. Perhaps during these months he did not have to labor with his own hands to support himself.

It was evidently during the later part of this period of comparative quiet and rest, so early in 57, that Paul wrote his great epistle to the Romans, the longest epistle which we have from the pen of Paul. It was not called forth in response to some pressing need and is more in the nature of a doctrinal treatise than a letter. Because of its rich doctrinal content it is one of the chief books of the Bible. The letter is addressed to the church at Rome, 1, 7. It had evidently been in existence for quite some time, 16, 19, and its origin may go way back to the first Christian Pentecost, when "strangers of Rome" heard the Gospel preached by Peter and carried it home with them, Acts 2, 10. Paul, as the apostle to the Gentiles, considered the church at Rome as within his sphere of influence, 15, 15-16. He would not intrude into another man's peculiar field of labor, as he testifies in this epistle, 15, 20. This precludes the possibility of Peter having founded the Roman church. Now Paul did have one special reason for writing to the Romans at this time, to prepare them for his impending visit. "Having no more place in these parts," 15, 23, he purposed to make a missionary journey to countries farther west. After taking a collection of the churches to Jerusalem for the poor saints there, he would journey to Rome, stop there for a while, and then proceed to Spain, 15, 24, 25, 28. Since it would be some little time before he would reach Rome, and, not knowing what might befall him at the hands of his enemies, 15, 30-32, he decided to first get in touch with the church at Rome by letter. There was, moreover, a special chance to send such a letter with Phoebe, a deaconess of Cenchoea, who was about to make a trip to Rome. Such a letter to the Romans, even as his contemplated visit, was also designed to strengthen the Christians in the faith, 1, 10, 11. Having many friends at Rome (chapter 16 he names twenty-six), he was fairly well acquainted with the spirit of the congregation. It seems that the Gentile and the Jewish Christians clung to the idea that as Jews they enjoyed special prerogatives in the kingdom of God, and the Gentile Christians

were inclined to despise the Jews, who had so often rejected the Word and grace of God. This prompts the apostle to show in the doctrinal section of the epistle that there is no difference between Jew and Gentile in the New Testament, neither in regard to their sinful state, nor in regard to their justification before God. The practical section indicates that the Christians at Rome stood in need of admonition regarding particular duties. The Epistle to the Romans is so precious to all Christians of today because it contains such a complete declaration of Christian doctrine. There was a temporary lull in Paul's stormy career at this time. It seemed to Paul to be an opportune time to make a detailed and formal presentation of the Gospel truth. He decides to write a sort of systematic theology. He was prompted to do this also because of the consideration that his life was continually in danger. He might be taken away from the Church at any time. Therefore he formulates more fully than ever before the main body of Christian doctrine. Hence the supreme importance of this epistle.

Now we can return to the narrative of Acts and consider the section, 20, 3b-5. How little Paul was ever permitted to enjoy ease and calm for any length of time is illustrated by what happened at Corinth. His implacable foes, the unbelieving Jews, having learned by this time how difficult it was to secure his condemnation by the government, resorted to another measure to put him out of the way—they plotted to murder him. They had evidently learned that Paul planned to leave Corinth at the opening of navigation on the first ship that would sail east to take pilgrims to Jerusalem to the Passover. During the voyage they planned to do away with Paul, perhaps by tossing him overboard, which murderous act they could cover up by claiming that an accident had befallen Paul. When somehow or another the plot became known to Paul, he altered his plans and returned through Macedonia. His intention was to take passage on a boat at some port far removed from Corinth, and thus to ultimately reach his destination. He was accompanied by seven men as far as Philippi. There they left Paul with Luke to celebrate the Passover with the Philippians, while they went ahead to Troas, there to await the coming of Paul and Luke.

The purpose of this numerous company is not stated in this text, but they were evidently the representatives of the churches of the West who were to accompany Paul all the way to Jerusalem to present the good-will offering. The presence of Trophimus the Ephesian at Jerusalem is referred to in Acts 21, 29. The great importance which Paul attached to the collection is attested in various ways. It probably grew out of the plea made years before by the apostles at Jerusalem to Paul to remember the poor, Gal 2, 10. This Paul was eager to do, not only to relieve suffering, but also because it would serve as nothing else could to bind the Gentile and Jewish Christians together in one community. It was of the utmost importance, then, that all his Gentile churches should participate in this unifying act. In 1 Cor. 16, 1 he speaks of the Galatian churches being engaged in the collection and urges the Corinthians to take part. Timothy, who was from Lystra, had been appointed to carry the Galatian contribution along with Gaius of Derbe. In 2 Cor. 8, 19 an unnamed man, who evidently is Luke, is declared to be a representative of the Macedonian churches, although the Bereans and the Thessalonians had their own delegates. Out of modesty he does not mention himself as one of the administrators in Acts 20, 4. In 2 Cor. Paul devotes two chapters, 8 and 9, to encouraging the collection at Corinth. That Titus had charge of gathering the collection there is indicated in 2 Cor. 8, 6. Perhaps Paul himself conveyed the offering of the Corinthian church, it being impossible to fulfill Paul's desire of sending a delegate, 1 Cor. 16, 3., Tychicus and Trophimus of Ephesus completed the body of representatives. It was Paul's desire that the churches should raise a very liberal offering, 2 Cor. 8, 7. In order to further this end, he

admonished the Corinthians to lay something aside for this purpose every week, 1 Cor. 16, 2. We also note the care with which Paul arranged for conveying the sizeable sum to Jerusalem. He himself did not want to handle the money, 1 Cor. 16, 3. His enemies had no doubt passed slanderous remarks about his gaining in some way from it. That is why he insisted upon the moneys of each church being conveyed by a delegate. It is quite evident that Paul attached great importance to this collection, that he regarded it, in fact, as the crowning act of his work in these four provinces. As soon as it was over, his purpose was to go to Rome and the far West.

In Acts 20, 6-12 we have an account of the voyage of Paul and Luke to Troas and of what happened there. In A.D. 57 Passover fell on Thursday, April 7. This may be corroborated from the time references in the text. The days of unleavened bread would last from April 7-14. Paul left Philippi and sailed from Neapolis, then, on Friday, the 15th. The journey to Philippi lasted till the fifth day, Tuesday, April 19. The winds must have been contrary, for upon a previous occasion the trip was made much faster, Acts 16, 11. In Troas they stayed seven days, both the day of arrival and the day of departure being counted in. Thus they were at Troas from Tuesday, April 19, to Monday, April 25. It is distinctly stated that the disciples met for services on the first day of the week, on Sunday, and that Paul planned to depart "on the morrow," on Monday. So this detailed account of the days spent in travel and in stopping at Troas agrees perfectly with the known date of the Passover for the year 57, April 7, whereas the incidence of the Passover in the years 56, 58, and 59 is not reconcilable with the data furnished by Luke. Thus we have a wonderful corroboration for the year 57.

The account of the service is interesting, because it throws some light on the time and the manner of conducting the Christian services. The Christians did not limit their assemblies to night services. Governor Pliny wrote the Emperor Trajan from Bithynia regarding the Christians services: "The whole of their fault lay in this, that they were wont to meet together on a stated day, before it was light, and sing among themselves alternately a hymn to Christ as God and to bind themselves by a sacrament (or oath), not to the commission of any wickedness." After this early service they would separate and assemble again in the evening to partake of a common meal, called the Agape, with which the celebration of the Lord's Supper was also connected. Their meeting thus in the early morning and in the evening was no doubt necessitated by the demands of their daily occupation.

The service which Paul conducted at Troas was obviously prolonged far beyond the ordinary limits. Thus it had its serious consequences. We gather that Luke, who was present in that upper room and who saw the lad fall out of the window, rushed down to where he lay in the hope of rendering some professional service. When he as a physician had examined him, he pronounced him dead. The narrative implies that Paul restored him to life again in the same manner as Elijah restored the widow's son in 1 Kings 17, 21.

In 20, 13-16, we again feel the personal touch that Luke brings into the narrative. He is writing as an eye-witness of these events, and is no doubt transcribing notes from a diary which he kept. Paul wanted to linger at Troas as long as possible, perhaps to be assured of the recovery of Eutychus. The ship which the delegates boarded would have to round the projecting cape of Lectum before reaching Assos. This would take a longer time than the land journey required, so that Paul preferred to walk to Assos, a distance of about twenty miles. There Paul, too, boarded the ship, no doubt around noon. Paul no doubt purposely chose a ship which would sail past Ephesus without stopping, partly because his reappearance at



Ephesus so soon after his stormy departure would occasion trouble, but principally in view of the fact that he was very anxious to get to Jerusalem by Pentecost. This would be a particularly appropriate occasion for presenting the contribution of the Gentile churches to the Jerusalem church, which had been born on the first Christian Pentecost. The frequent stopping of the vessel was, of course, largely due to the loading and unloading of freight. Even to-day nearly every steamer that stops at Smyrna remains long enough for tourists to make the trip to the ruins of Ephesus and back again. Paul's ship evidently stopped every evening because of the wind dying away. By evening of the first day Mitylene was reached; on Tuesday they stopped opposite the island of Samos, the promontory and town of Trogyllium, which lay across the gulf from Miletus; and on Thursday morning early they crossed the gulf to Miletus. When Paul's boat stopped at Miletus April 28, he found that he could reckon on a stay of some days and that he had enough time to summon the elders of the church at Ephesus to Miletus for a meeting. A messenger was dispatched to Ephesus, 30 miles away, who would get there late that night. It would take a little time to summon the elders the next morning, and they would hardly be able to reach Miletus that day. The third day, then, of Paul's stop would be devoted to the farewell visit, and the ship would leave Miletus Sunday morning, May 1.

This meeting at Miletus is reported in Acts 20, 17-38. The speech of Paul to the elders is a most touching one not only because it is fraught with such loving council, but principally because it is a farewell speech. After the review of his past labors at Ephesus, in which he alludes to the trouble caused him by the Jews, Paul goes on to solemnly reveal his expectation of meeting with further tribulations and bonds. Though his own future is somewhat shrouded in darkness, he yet knows that his life will be in danger in Jerusalem. And it seems very likely to him that he will not have the chance to return to Ephesus again. Therefore he lays the solemn charge upon the elders to take heed to themselves and to the entire flock, warning them that false teachers will arise from without and from within. By way of conclusion he holds up his own example for their encouragement and then in his closing words preserves a saying of Jesus nowhere else recorded. Incidentally we notice the ancient reckoning of time. The sojourn at Ephesus is loosely given as "those years", but could not have been more than two and a half.

The journey from Miletus to Jerusalem with several incidents that happened on the way is recorded in Acts 21, 1-18. The last two verses of chapter 20 and the opening one of 21 show how Paul had to tear himself away from his Ephesian friends. Leaving Miletus early on Sunday morning, May 1, Paul's ship would first pass the island of Patmos, to which the Emperor Domitian later banished the evangelist John. That evening they came to Cos, a garden island, and of special interest to Luke no doubt as the birthplace of Hippocrates, the first scientific physician. The next day, Monday, they rounded the point of Cnidus and made Rhodes, the island of roses. The city of Rhodes was famous for its ship-building. Here had stood the Colossus of Rhodes, a statue of Apollo, 105 feet high, one of the seven wonders of the ancient world, built about three hundred years before. After fifty years an earthquake had toppled it over, and Paul could see only the legs on the pedestal, the huge body of bronze lying along the port. In 672 a Jewish junk dealer bought the metal, and nine hundred camels carried away the \$20,000 pounds. The next day, Tuesday, the snowy peaks of Lycia arose to the north and the ship dropped anchor that evening at Patara. On Wednesday, May 4, they took another ship and sailed across the Mediterranean. They passed Cyprus on their left, when Paul was reminded of the beginning of his missionary journeys to the west just eleven years previous in the spring of 46, and after a voyage of probably four days they landed at Tyre, 340 miles from Patara, arriving there probably on May 7, a Saturday. King Hiram of Tyre built the splendid breakwaters and furnished the lumber for Solomon's Temple. Nebuchadnezzar for thirteen long years laid unavailing

siege to the city and finally was forced to make a treaty with her king. Alexander the Great built a great causeway to Tyre on the island, and it finally fell a victim to his long-baffled rage. Here Paul tarried seven days, from Saturday to the following Friday, May 7-13. Whether this comparatively long stop was required because of the ship unloading and loading cargo, or because they had to wait for another ship is not clear. Paul used the time to seek out the Christians at Tyre. Through the Spirit they warned him that trouble awaited him at Jerusalem. But Paul would not be dissuaded from going. Touching is the scene of the Christians, who in less than a week had become deeply attached to the apostle, taking their leave of him. Even the children went with their parents to see him off. This reveals the lovable character of the great church-builder. On Friday, May 13, the company sailed for Ptolemais, one of the oldest seaports in the world, the Accho of Judg. 1, 31. Since this was a short run, the day which they spent with the brethren there may have been the same day, Friday. The voyage ended here, the rest of the trip being made by land. On Saturday, then, (possibly Sunday) the company made the thirty miles to Caesarea, on May 14 or 15. We are quite confident that this computation of time for the journey from Philippi to Caesarea, which we along with Dallmann have borrowed from Ramsay (The Traveller, p.289f), is approximately correct. There are only three numbers which are at all doubtful, the length of the stay at Miletus, the duration of the over-sea voyage from Patara to Tyre, and the time spent in going from Tyre to Caesarea. But in each case a day more or less is the utmost possible variation. Since Pentecost did not come till May 28 Paul had fully thirteen days time to make the trip from Caesarea to Jerusalem, which, in a pinch, could have been made in four. Yet many scholars go so far astray in this simple reckoning of days. They conclude from the statement in v. 10, "we tarried there many days," that Paul was too late to get to Jerusalem by Pentecost. This conclusion is overthrown already by a close observation of the author's style in v. 16 in chapter 20. After stating that the object of the journey was to reach Jerusalem before Pentecost, Luke leads the reader to gather from his silence that this object was obtained. At Caesarea lived Philip the evangelist, who was one of the first seven deacons, Acts 6,5, and who labored so successfully in Samaria, Acts 8, 5f, and who converted the Ethiopian eunuch, Acts 8, 26. The four virgin daughters of Philip no doubt uttered similar prophecies to that of Agabus, the prophet who came from Judea, the same who had at Antioch in the year 44, prophesied the coming of the famine, Acts 11, 28. His prophecy was more definite than was that of the Christians of Tyre or even the Lord's revelation to Paul himself. But again Paul would not be dissuaded from his purpose. He set his face steadfastly to go up to Jerusalem, as Jesus had done before him. The journey from Caesarea to Jerusalem was sixty-four miles over a well-paved Roman highway. From the reference to packing their baggage it is generally thought that this stage of the journey was made on horseback in two days. So at least Paul's return journey was made, when he was brought back to Caesarea a prisoner, Acts, 23,24. The company likely reached Jerusalem the day before Pentecost, a Friday. The night was spent with Mnason, an old convert. In Jerusalem Paul was received "gladly" by the brethren whom he met. Thus Paul returned from his third journey, which had lasted four full years, from the spring of 53 to early summer of 57, and on which he had planted the Gospel in the province of Asia as well as confirmed the churches of Galatia and Europe.

#### Chapter XX. Imprisonment at Jerusalem, Caesarea and Rome.

From the time Paul returned to Jerusalem and was arrested, the narrative becomes fuller than before. Luke continued to follow his former method of concentrating on certain selected scenes, while the intervening periods are dismissed very briefly. But the scenes selected for treatment lie closer together than formerly. The amount of space assigned to Paul's imprisonment and successive examinations marks this as the most important part of the book in the author's estimation. We are now approaching

the real climax of the book and catch sight of the main object of Luke's writing. It has been striking all along that Luke devotes special attention to the occasions on which Paul was brought into contact with Roman officials. Generally the relations between the parties end in a friendly way. It is only the magistrates of ordinary Greek cities who were not so favorable to Paul. Especially as we come to the last scenes of the book we see how the friendly disposition of the Imperial officials to Paul is emphasized. This is all the more marked since nothing is said of the kindness shown to Paul by others, the Christians at Caesarea, for instance. Luke selects for emphasis the friendliness of Roman officials to show the tolerance that the Romans extended to the new teaching at that time. For his purpose the trials of Paul following his third journey are of paramount importance. His case was appealed to and tried before the supreme court of the empire and must have been regarded as a test case and as establishing a binding precedent for that time. That Paul was acquitted follows from the Pastoral Epistles with their wealth of historical details which are not consistent with Paul's journeys before his trial, and must have occurred on later journeys. Now the importance of the trial lies in its issue; it would hardly seem intelligible to wholly omit the final result, even though that is suggested in the book of Acts. Luke may therefore very well have contemplated writing a sequel (as Acts is a sequel to Luke, Acts 1, 1), in which should be related the final stages of the trial, the acquittal of Paul, and the active use which he made of his permission to preach and to organize churches in new provinces. Luke may ~~have~~ not have found time or opportunity to write such a conclusion to his sacred history, may, for instance, have died before he could write it, or may have written it and the manuscript become lost before it could be copied, as evidently occurred with some New Testament epistles. But even without such a sequel we gather that the acquittal of Paul was a formal decision of the Empire that it was permissible to preach Christianity. Ramsay points out (*The Traveller*, p. 386f) that its importance for Luke and his contemporaries lies in its being a charter of religious liberty. And he affirms that consideration gives us a possible clue to the time of the composition of Acts. There runs through the entire book a purpose which could hardly have been conceived before the State had begun to persecute on political grounds. After the Flavian policy had declared Christianity illegal and proscribed the Name, the best line of defence was to claim previous legal right. This claim Luke sets forth in Acts. Ramsay says: "It is the work of a man whose mind has been moulded in a more peaceful time, and who has not passed through a time like the reign of Domitian." And again (p.22): "Our view classes Acts with 1 Peter, intermediate between the Pauline letters and the literature of the last decade of the century." He also points out that in Luke's Gospel there are careful reckonings of dates at the great steps of the narrative, which have the appearance of having been put into an already finished narrative, whereas in Acts there are no such calculations. He thinks that the work was left incomplete, the reason perhaps being in the author's martyrdom under Domitian.

Now we return to the narrative, Acts 21, 17-26. Since not so many chronological considerations are bound up with the remaining narrative of Acts, we can proceed more hastily. When on Pentecost Day Paul and his companions appeared before James and all the elders of the Jerusalem Church, it must have been a proud moment for them when they could present their leather bags with the money collected for years by Paul's heathen converts for the poor Christians at Jerusalem. Luke does not mention the presentation, but only the report of mission activity. We know, however, how much this collection meant to Paul and how much he hoped to accomplish by it. His fear was that Christianity would be divided into a Jewish Christian body and a Gentile Christian body and he was determined to keep the Church one. This was the purpose of the collection and of his insistence upon carrying it to Jerusalem himself. The pillar apostles and the elders were apparently in entire sympathy with Paul's purpose and

were also agreed that in maintaining this union the Gentiles should not be subjected to Judaistic legalism. But there were the legalists in the Church to be satisfied. They were suspicious of Paul, to put it mildly, and they may have kept the church from a hearty response to the collection since Luke is silent about its reception. Paul had evidently entertained some doubt as to whether his gift would meet with the approval of all, Rom. 15, 30, 31. The pillar apostles, wishing to assist him in his purpose of cementing friendship between Jew and Gentile made a proposition that he should conciliate the legalists by assisting in the purifying of four Jews who were perhaps too poor to carry out all the ceremonies themselves. They wanted Paul to give the assurance that his acceptance of the Gentiles on a non-legalistic basis did not mean that he was encouraging disregard of the Law on the part of the Jewish Christians. This request was one that Paul could comply with. It is distinctly tragic that Paul's magnanimity in granting this request should have brought disaster upon himself.

The account of the outbreak in the Temple, Acts 21, 27-40, shows that it all began because Paul was seen with Trophimus, the Ephesian delegate, in the city, which gave the Jews who had come to the feast from Asia and who knew Trophimus the opportunity to maliciously accuse Paul of having brought this Gentile into the Temple. This was a serious offence, as may be seen from the inscription on the stone placed on the wall of the inner court as a warning, this stone having been found in Jerusalem by the Palestine Exploration Society. The warning reads: "No Gentile may enter within the railing and fence around the Sanctuary. Whoever is caught is himself responsible for the consequences which are death." The mere suspicion that Paul might have recklessly taken a Gentile into the forbidden enclosure was all the excuse the Jews wanted for setting upon Paul to kill him. Such a crime the Jews might punish with death without interference from the Roman authorities, as Titus conceded a few years later. The prime motive for the attack against Paul was, as we see from v. 28, that Paul was regarded by the Jews as a rebel who had turned against his own people and his national religion. The sentinel on the Tower of Antonia, in the northwest corner of the Temple place, noticed the gathering of the mob and at once alarmed the garrison. The mob had dragged Paul out of the Temple, within which no man could be put to death, and soon the noblest Israelite of the day would have been killed had not the guard rescued him in the nick of time. The commandant of the castle, Claudius Lysias, had acted with dispatch and now he acted with justice. Paul was immediately taken into custody, both to safeguard him from the mob as well as prevent his escape until he could be examined. His being bound with two chains quite likely signifies that he was linked with a light brass chain to the wrists of two soldiers, who were to guard him with their lives. When Lysias could not ascertain the cause of the tumult nor the nature of the prisoner's offence from the hysterical crowd, he curtly commanded the soldiers to remove the prisoner to the castle. It was upon the castle stairs that Paul asked leave of the tribune to speak to the people. Lysias was astonished to hear Paul address him in excellent Greek, having supposed that he was a native of Palestine, perhaps the fanatical Jewish insurrectionist, known as the "Egyptian," who some time before had led an uprising, and who might now have returned to instigate new crimes. Hearing from Paul that he was "a citizen of no mean city," of Tarsus, Lysias gave him permission to speak.

Paul's speech and its effect is given in Acts 22, 1-23. A scene of greater drama could not be imagined. Here is Paul, just rescued from the jaws of death, bound to two soldiers with chains, speaking in calm self-possession to the enraged multitude. Here is one of the grandest exhibitions of courage on record. The extemporaneous address itself is remarkable. Note the dignified, winning salutation. Indeed, it is apparent throughout the address that Paul is not only endeavor to exonerate himself, but also desires to win his hearers for Christ. Certainly the Jews should have been impressed by

the evident sincerity of the speaker if for no other reason. In a rapid, but telling manner Paul spoke of his strict Jewish training and of how his zeal had been evidenced by his persecuting those of "this Way," the Christians. Then with considerable detail he told the story of his conversion, from which he led over to his being commissioned by the Lord to preach the Gospel to the Gentiles. The mention of salvation being offered to the Gentiles without the demand first being made upon them to become Jews broke the spell of silence that had been cast over the audience, so that an outburst of fanatical intolerance welled forth. There was nothing for the chief captain to do but take the prisoner away.

Acts 22, 24-29, relates what went on within the castle. Lysias, who had perhaps not understood the Aramaic speech, commanded Paul to be examined under scourging in order to force a confession of whatever misdemeanor had scaroused the people. Then it was that Paul made his celebrated appeal to his status as a Roman citizen, a declaration which in an instant changed the behavior of the Roman officers to ward their prisoner. It was something majestic to be a Roman citizen. The chief captain had had to pay a large sum of money for this highest civic prerogative. Judging from his name, Claudius Lysias, Acts 23, 26, he bought his citizenship from the wife of Claudius, who made much money in this manner, as Dio Cassius reports. But Roman citizenship was often worth the price paid for it. Says Cicero: "How often has this exclamation, 'I am a Roman citizen,' brought aid and safety among barbarians in the remotest parts of the earth."

Next comes the appearance of Paul before the Sanhedrin, Acts 22, 1-23, 10. The tribune wanted to get to the bottom of the case, and so the next morning asked the Sanhedrin to assemble to give these leaders of the Jews an opportunity of stating their complaints against the prisoner in his presence. Lysias may have sensed by this time that it was a purely religious issue. Acts 23, 28, 29. Now all charges of a religious nature were brought to trial before the Sanhedrin. If the Sanhedrin had decided that Paul was worthy of death, the next step would have been to secure the consent of the Roman government to his execution. But by his skillful handling of the situation Paul escaped conviction by the council. At the beginning of his defense, when the high priest commanded Paul to be smitten, Ananias was apparently not wearing the usual white robe of his office this meeting being informal, and therefore Paul did not recognize him. Josephus notes the avarice and cruelty of this Ananias. Later his house was burned in a sedition raised by his own son; he was drawn out from his hiding-place and slain by the ~~his~~ sicarri, the Assassins. Paul's prophecy came true. When he perceived that the two parties in the Council, the Pharisees and the Sadducees, were antagonistic, Paul precipitated a division between them by declaring that he was a Pharisee. In the dispute which followed Lysias was again frustrated in his attempt to learn the facts and, fearing for the safety of his prisoner, he again took him back into the castle.

Further developments which led up to Paul's being imprisoned at Caesarea are described Acts 23, 11-35. Paul was certainly in need of the strengthening assurance brought to him by the appearance of Jesus in the night, for the very next day a new danger threatened. A band of no less than forty Jews banded together and bound themselves with an oath to kill Paul. The Jews rightly felt that if they did not succeed in doing away with Paul in Jerusalem, the center of Judaism, they would have less chance elsewhere. Plots such as this had been laid before. Josephus tells of ten Jews who had sworn to assassinate king Herod the Great, whom they held to be an apostate from the Jewish faith. We know that they also accused Paul of being an apostate, though evidently the other Christians at Jerusalem were not regarded in this light. It was an

unwritten law amongst the Jews that such a one might be killed by any private person. But Paul had friends in the city. Though the conspiracy to kill Paul when he should be brought out of the castle under the ruse of the Sanhedrin wanting to question him was carefully planned, its execution was stayed by divine providence. Lysias, impressed by the intensity of the hatred against Paul, decided that political expediency demanded his removal. The fact that Paul's nephew learned of the plot and made it known to his uncle, shows that Paul must have kept in close touch with his relatives and they with him. Lysias provided as elaborate protection for Paul as he would on ordinary occasions have given to a member of an official Roman delegation. The guard set out secretly by night to escort him to Felix, the governor of Judea, residing at Caesarea. Claudius sent along an official report, which reveals him as a diplomatic letter-writer. He very conveniently forgot to mention his attempt to scourge Paul, a Roman citizen, yet he wants to make it appear that he rescued Paul because he knew him for a Roman citizen, although he had found that out later. And so Paul arrived back at Caesarea, where he had stopped some two weeks before on his journey to Jerusalem, not, however, as a free agent, but as a prisoner of Rome. Paul's confident bearing must have attracted Felix when Paul was presented to him. Often prisoners who stood before him whined and pleaded. But here was a man of Tarsus who had faced the mob in Jerusalem with distinguished courage. He now stood before the governor composedly, as though confidently awaiting the outcome of his trial. Little did Paul imagine, perhaps, that his acquittal would not come for more than four years.

A few notes concerning the city where Paul was doomed to spend two long years of comparative inactivity will be in place. Caesarea, which a hundred years before Paul's imprisonment had been an insignificant fishing village, was rebuilt and beautified by Herod the Great. Josephus says: "He drew his model and set people to work, and in twelve years' time finished it. The buildings were all of marble, private houses as well as palaces; but his masterpiece was the port, which he made as large as the Piraeus of Athens—a safe station against all winds and weathers." Immense blocks of stone, fifty feet long, were sunk to twenty fathoms, on the south and southwest, to form a breakwater, leaving a free passage only by the north." Famous for its harbor, Caesarea became the port of Jerusalem. The road of seventy-five miles between the two cities was splendidly paved with huge blocks of stone. Aqueducts brought water from Mount Carmel, twenty-five miles to the north, and from the Crocodile River. Herod also built a temple to Augustus, remarkable for its size, a forum, a stadium, an amphitheater, and a gorgeous palace, and dedicated the city in the year 10 B. C. Herod's palace was used as the *Prætorium*, the residence of the Roman governor. Here was also the prison where Paul languished from June, 57, to June, 59.

In Acts 24, we have the account of Paul before Felix. A speedy trial was a rule of the Roman courts, and so five days after Paul's removal from Jerusalem (it was now early in June) the high priest Ananias and a lawyer named Tertullus came down to Caesarea, and the first trial of Paul was held. A worse judge than Felix, the governor, Paul could hardly have had. He had been appointed governor by the emperor Claudius in the year 52, and that through strong political influence exerted on his behalf. He and his brother Pallas had been slaves of Antonia, the mother of Claudius, but became freedmen. Pallas became the emperor's favorite and, together with the Empress Agrippina and the high priest Jonathan, secured the appointment of his brother to succeed Cumanus as governor of Judæa. The Jewish rebellion Felix stamped out for the time being by promptly using the utmost cruelty. When the high priest Jonathan protested against his outrages, Felix hired murderers to kill the priest in the very Temple. He accepted bribes wherever and whenever he could. In private life he was as bad as in public. Suetonius says he was the husband of three queens. The third was Drusilla, the sister of Agrippa II. She had been the wife of King Azizus of Emesa, who had turned Jew for

her. The charms of the fair Jewess fired the lust of the lewd Felix, and he persuaded her to leave her husband. Felix and Drusilla were living in adultery at Caesarea at this time. Such the judge of Paul.

Tertullus opened the trial very, very shrewdly, for while he did not omit the usual compliments, he did not praise the judge overmuch, for that would have offended his clients, who hated Felix heartily. We notice that he brought a threefold charge against Paul, that of sedition, sectarianism, and sacrilege. The first count was the most serious, for here Paul was charged with high treason, which put him into a position of great peril. But Paul's defense was a decisive refutation of the several charges so that the governor must have been convinced of the innocence of his prisoner. But though Felix knew that the accusation was false, yet he did not declare Paul innocent and discharge him. Felix deferred a decision, saying that before pronouncing a verdict he would have to confer with the commandant of the Jerusalem garrison. We may assume that before long Lysias appeared and confirmed the innocence of Paul. But still the governor did not release him. His object was to please the Jews, whom he had offended so grossly in his five years of office, as the last verse of the chapter brings out.

But there was an ulterior motive which prompted his course, and that is stated in v. 26. In his defense Paul had mentioned the bringing of alms to Jerusalem, v. 17, incidentally the only mention of the collection found in Acts. The special significance of this statement in the ears of Felix is not hard to imagine. This man Paul, it appeared, had friends throughout the world who were willing to raise money for him. Surely, now that their leader was in prison, his disciples in distant provinces would raise a goodly sum to purchase his freedom. Accordingly, he treated Paul with consideration, granting him much freedom of action, and placing no restrictions on visits by his friends. On one occasion Felix, no doubt impressed by the bearing and speech of Paul, invited the apostle to deliver a discourse to himself and Drusilla on the Gospel. Felix and Drusilla--what a congregation! When Paul began by preaching the Law to these reprobate sinners, Felix, moved to the point of trembling by his accusing conscience, quickly terminated the meeting. But he often got in touch with Paul for brief conversations, these visits being a bid for the opening of ransom negotiations. But Felix waiting for a bribe in vain. Two full years elapsed and Paul was still in prison at Caesarea.

This period of limited freedom was undoubtedly one of blessed, though somewhat restricted influence for the apostle. There is the hint given by Luke that his friends were not hindered from visiting him. No doubt Philip, the deacon, and other members of the Christian church at Caesarea frequently made their way to the Praetorium to consult with the beloved apostle. Some of his former companions who had accompanied him to Jerusalem, now no doubt followed him to Caesarea. Some could not remain however. ~~Luke was not with him~~ although the pronouns "we" later reappear in Acts 27, 1 at the departure from Caesarea. Luke may have gone back to Macedonia. ~~But~~ perhaps it was at this time that he spent considerable time in Jerusalem and Galilee collecting data on the life of Jesus for the writing of his gospel. News of his imprisonment must have soon spread through all the congregations of the East and the West, and it is not unlikely that visitors and delegations came from the churches he had founded to ask his advice on difficult questions. Paul may even have written some letters to his churches during this period when he could not visit them, as he later did at Rome. We know that the care of the churches must have continued to engage him now as before; see 2 Cor. 11, 28. Often during those years he must have walked along the masonry of the castle above the breaking waves and looked longingly toward his beloved churches in Asia and Macedonia and Achaia and toward the yet unvisited regions of the far West.

At the end of two years the curtain rises for another act. Paul had waited long and hopefully for a change in the governorship. Any governor would be better than Felix. And now Felix was finally overtaken by his many misdeeds. Toward the end of his reign riots had broken out in Caesarea between the Jews and the Syrians, each of which claimed greater rights in the city. There was street-fighting almost every evening. When Felix hastened to disperse the mob, the Jews committed further outrage. The procurator charged them with his soldiers and killed many, and gave up the houses of the ringleaders ~~for~~ plunder. Because of his misconduct in the riots at Caesarea and because of numerous other complaints previously lodged against him, the emperor ordered Felix's recall and sent Porcius Festus to take his place. There had been a new emperor since 54, Nero. Claudius had been murdered by the poisoned mushrooms of his estranged wife, the cruel and crafty Agrippina. Nero was her son by a former marriage, whom she now at the age of 17 succeeded in raising to the throne. In the following year the rightful heir, Britannicus, was disposed of by poison. Nero had been adopted by Claudius and had been given his daughter Octavia in marriage, whom he repudiated in 62. At the time of our story already Poppaea, a Jewish proselyte, was his mistress, and she it was who procured the recall of Felix. Before quitting Palestine Felix left Paul in prison to please the Jews and make them a bit more lenient in their charges against him. But Felix barely escaped death. He had to disgorge his great wealth and died in obscurity.

Paul's trial before Festus is given in Acts 25, 1-12. Portius Festus came to Caesarea in the year 59 and already after three days went up to Jerusalem to get to know the people he was to rule. The new high priest, Ishmael, who had been appointed by Agrippa II in the same year, and the other Jewish leaders, availing themselves of the change in the governorship, at once asked that Paul be taken to Jerusalem for trial, hoping to have a chance to kill him on the way. Festus, however, at first refused to accede to this request, holding that the trial should be held at Caesarea. The Jews were forced to go down to Caesarea then to press their charges. There they again made demands that Paul be brought back to Jerusalem. Unsuspecting Festus was inclined to grant their request this time, for he felt that he must conciliate the Jews as far as possible. It was then that Paul, knowing the treacherous designs of his enemies, uttered those potent words, "I appeal unto Caesar." He thereby made use of a privilege which only a Roman citizen had, to appeal from a provincial court to that of the emperor. Paul made his appeal not only because he knew how dangerous it would be for him to be brought to trial in Jerusalem, but also because of his impatient desire to get to Rome and preach the Gospel there. For some years he had wanted to go to the imperial city. And so now he made use of his very bonds as a means of reaching his goal.

But before the voyage to Rome occurred, the memorable scene took place in which Paul gave an account of his faith before a distinguished company—Acts 25, 13-27; 26. The occasion was a state visit from King Herod Agrippa II and Bernice to Festus. It was a matter of etiquette to visit the new governor. Agrippa was a great-grandson of Herod the Great. His domain lay on the other side of Jordan and stretched northward toward Damascus. He also had the right of overseeing the Temple and of appointing the high priest. Bernice was his sister. She had been married to her uncle, King Herod of Chalcis. She became a widow at twenty-one and was now living with her brother in incest. This Bernice was famous for her dazzling beauty and notorious for her immorality. King Herod was now drawn into Paul's case. Though he was Idumean in family, his sympathies were very broad and tolerant. At times he served as a kind of mediator between the Jews and the Romans, understanding the prejudices and ideals of both, and it was natural that Festus should take advantage of his visit to secure an opinion concerning Paul. After a public appearance of the prisoner and a consultation with Agrippa about his case, Festus would be in a better position



to know what to write to the emperor, v. 26. And yet the mere fact that they had been there "many days," v. 14, before the hearing was arranged, shows how little concerned Festus was that speedy justice should be effected his prisoner, whom he regarded as innocent of crimes against the state, 25, 18.25.27. It is quite evident from v. 23 that Paul's appearance before the royal visitors was arranged as a special entertainment, as one of the high points of their visit. The setting was one of great pomp indeed. At Caesarea there was usually stationed three full legions of soldiers, besides five cohorts of auxiliary troops. The gleaming armor and gay attire of the army officers together with the flowing robes of the municipal officials must have presented a picturesque spectacle. Far more transplendent, however, were Festus and his court, King Agrippa and Queen Bernice, in all their gaudy splendor of Oriental royalty. Paul's defense before King Agrippa was a forceful appeal. His opening words were not flattery or a mere compliment. Rabbinical writers note Agrippa's knowledge of the Jewish law. Paul again told the story of his youth and his conversion and his labors among the Gentiles. But when he came to speak of Christ's resurrection, Festus could not but give voice to his disbelief. But Paul was not mad, it was rather Festus who was mad for denying the evidence which Paul presented to him. Festus was living in a wholly different world from Paul. But Paul knew that King Agrippa admired many of the Jewish ideals and he apparently made a real attempt to win Agrippa to faith in the Gospel. Here is the real climax of the scene when Paul addresses the stirring question to the king, "King Agrippa, believest thou the prophets? I know that thou believest." But Agrippa, whatever may have been his opinion of the prophets, refused to believe the Gospel, despite his confession, "almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian." Almost persuaded, but not quite! A consultation followed between the dignitaries and the unanimous decision was that Paul was entirely innocent. Undoubtedly the letter which Festus wrote the emperor about Paul was most favorable to him, the governor's testimony finally bringing about his acquittal.

We do well to scrutinize Luke's account of the voyage to Rome, recorded in Acts 27 and the first half of 28. This is one of the most vivid, thrilling narratives of a voyage which has come down to us from ancient times. It is remarkable with what interest Luke records the incidents from harbor to harbor. If one compares his account of the land journey from Caesarea to Jerusalem, or the one from Puteoli to Rome, on both of which he accompanied Paul, one is struck by the scanty details as compared with the manner in which he describes the scenes and experiences of this voyage from Caesarea to Rome. Luke had the true Greek feeling for the sea. Though he reported nautical matters with accuracy, he was not a trained and practised sailor. His interest for the sea sprang from his natural and national character, and not from his occupation.

The first leg of the journey is described Acts 27, 1-5. A convoy of prisoners was starting for Rome under charge of a centurian of "Augustus' band." This was not one of the regular auxiliary cohorts which carried such surnames (the cohorts of the legions never bore names), but rather was a corps attached to the emperor's service, for Augustus and Caesar were both used as terms of office. This was a corps attached to each provincial legion to communicate between the emperor and his forces abroad, mainly to carry dispatches and convey prisoners. So Paul was delivered to a centurian of "the troop of the emperor." From the recurrence of the pronoun "we" we note that Luke left in the same ship with Paul, as did also Aristarchus of Thessalonica, the same comrade who was seized by the mob at Ephesus, whom Paul mentions in Col. 4,10 as his "fellow-prisoner." In the harbor at Caesarea there was no ship about to sail for Rome, so the prisoners were put on board of an Adramyttian ship which was going to make a voyage along the coast towns of the province Asia. Adramyttian was a port near Troas. Communication direct from Rome might be found in some of the great Asian harbors, or, failing to find any suitable ship in the late season, the prisoners might be taken by the land route to Troas and across Macedonia to Dyrrachium, and thence to Brundisium

and Rome. The ship first followed the Syrian shore and stopped at Sidon. Paul was permitted to go on shore and visit his friends. He occupied a very different position from the other prisoners, for he was a man of distinction, a Roman citizen, who had appealed to the supreme court in Rome. Westerly winds blow with great steadiness through the summer months in the eastern Mediterranean, which made it impossible for ships to sail directly from Syria to Lycia. They went around the northern end of Cyprus, as the Adramyttian ship now did. We notice that Luke explains why they sailed under Cyprus and this explanation stamps him as a stranger to these seas. The ship worked slowly along the Cilician and Pamphylian coast, the sailors availing themselves of temporary land breezes.

Acts 27, 6-13. In the harbor of Myra, the centurion found an Alexandrian ship on a voyage towards Italy. Now the Alexandrian ships were generally laden with grain for Rome, for Egypt was one of the granaries of Rome. That this ship, too, was engaged in the grain trade is inferred by Luke himself, who mentions in v. 38 that the cargo of wheat was cast overboard. From the position of this ship in its voyage from Alexandria to Rome at Myra, we again see that it was impossible at least during a certain season of the year to make the direct run because the winds would not permit it. But the steady westerly breezes were favorable for the run from Alexandria to Myra. The ships referred to by Luke had only one large mast provided with one huge sail. Their construction and equipment were of rude simplicity. Their size, however, was often considerable. This Alexandrian ship which Paul and his companions boarded accommodated on this voyage, besides its cargo of wheat, 276 people, Acts 27, 37. But undoubtedly there was much crowding of the passengers and crew on board. How fortunate that neither had been spoiled by the comforts and indulgences which our present-day civilization affords. From Myra the ship found great difficulty in making the course because of the strong westerly winds. After a slow voyage they came opposite Cnidus. Here they encountered strong northerly winds blowing down the Aegean. These threatened to force a ship which would attempt the run across to the island of Cythera just south of Greece down on to the north coast of Crete, which was dangerous because of its lack of harbors. The choice was either to put in at Cnidus and wait a fair wind, or to run to the east and south of Crete. The latter alternative was chosen because of the late season. They rounded the eastern promontory, Salmone, and began anew to work slowly to the west under the shelter of the land. They kept their course along the shore with difficulty until they reached a place named Fair Havens, which is the small bay still bearing the same name east of Cape Matala. It is not stated in the narrative why they stayed here so long, but the reason is evident: Fair Havens is the nearest shelter east of the cape, while west of it the coast trends away to the north and no longer affords any protection from the north or north-west winds, so that they could go no farther so long as the wind was in that quarter.

The mention of the great fast again gives us a chronological hook on which to hang the voyage. This fast-day was the Day of Atonement, observed on the 10th of Tisri. In the year 59 this day fell on Oct. 5th. The Feast of Tabernacles began five days later, on Oct. 10. Now since Luke mentions the Fast rather than the Feast of Tabernacles as having occurred while they were waiting at Fair Havens, we may infer that the Feast fell after they had again put out to sea. The ship left Fair Havens soon after Oct. 5. It must have arrived there toward the end of September. Since the entire voyage from Myra to Fair Havens had been slow and hard, we cannot allow less time for it than from Sept. 1 to 25. It must have taken about two weeks for the trip from Caesarea to Myra. Thus we get the approximate date of the middle of August as the time of departure.

At Fair Havens a meeting was held to consider the situation, at which Paul was present as a person of rank. Paul's experience as a traveler was known to be considerable, and he was drawn into the counsel as a competent adviser. At the council the centurion evidently presided and the ultimate decision rested with him. To our modern ideas a captain is supreme on the deck of his ship. But here the centurion is represented as the commanding officer, which implies that the ship was in the service of the imperial government. That was true to facts, for the Alexandrian ships on which Rome depended for grain were not run under private enterprise, but were under contract to the state department. They generally ran in fleets. The centurion was guided in the matter by the opinion of his professional advisers, who were anxious to get on as far as possible before navigation ceased on Nov. 11. But the period between Sept. 14 and Nov. 11 was considered a perilous period, so that it would have been better to follow Paul's advice as the sequel shows. But it was resolved to take any fair opportunity of reaching the harbor of Phœnix, or Phenice, which was not only further on, but would also be a better place to winter.

Acts 27, 13-44 Luke relates the gripping story of the storm. One morning after the council their chance came to proceed westward when a moderate south wind began to blow. At this point the writer says that they went close in to shore, and this statement must have some special force. Cape Matala projected well out to the south about six miles west of Fair Havens, and from Luke's emphasis we gather that for some time it was doubtful whether they could round the point. After passing the Cape, they had before them the broad opening of the Gulf of Messara. But before they had covered many of the seventeen miles across the bay there descended from the Cretan mountains, which towered above them to the height of over 7000 feet, a sudden eddying squall. Such a tempest is characteristic of that sea, where southern winds almost invariably shift to violent winds from the north-east. It appears that they were not able to slacken sail quickly, and had the ship been kept up towards the wind, the strain of the great sail on the single mast would have shaken her to pieces. Even when they let the ship run with the wind, the leverage on her hull must have been tremendous, and would in a short time have sent her to the bottom. ~~It was under similar circumstances that three times suffered shipwreck, one time drifting on a piece of wreckage for a day and a night, 2 Cor. 11, 25.~~ The sailors knew that their only hope was in the smoother water behind Claudia, and kept her up accordingly with her head to the wind, so that she would make no headway, but merely drifted with her right side to the wind.

When they had gotten under the lee of Claudia, three distinct operations were performed. First the lifeboat was hauled on board. It had been towed and the squall had come too suddenly to haul it in. That it might be needed was all too evident, and to preserve it from being dashed to pieces it was laboriously hoisted on board. Their ropes were got out and the ship was undergirded to strengthen her and keep the frame together. These ropes were passed underneath the ship transversely. Finally the sail was reefed, that the vessel might offer less of a surface to be attacked by the furious wind and yet be kept from being blown upon the dangerous sand banks ("quicksands") along the African coast. These were still far off, but the sailors knew that at this late season the wind might last many days. With just enough sail to keep the ship's head to the wind, the shift drifted, her head to the north, making lee-way proportionate to the power of the wind and waves on her broadside. In their situation the great danger was of foundering through leakage caused by the constant strain due to the sail and the force of the waves. To lessen the danger, the sailors began to lighten the ship by throwing away part of the cargo. On the next day the ship's equipment, especially the tackle was sacrificed. They would not have dared cut away the mast, for it kept them off of the African shores and enabled them to drift westward. But the leakage was steadily growing worse.

Another difficulty was that of obtaining food. Much of it may have been ruined by the water coming overboard and then there was the difficulty of preparing it. Day after day the crew and the passengers sat doing nothing, eating nothing, waiting for the ship to sink. In this situation Paul stood forth in the midst of the helpless, panic-stricken crowd. Cool and confident, he speaks to the people to cheer them with the only message that could lift their spirits, the hope of escape. In a vision he had learned that all were to escape, and he adds that an island is to be the means of safety. By this time the ship was well across the southern extremity of the Adriatic Sea, this name being given at this time not only to the sea between Italy and Dalmatia, but also between Malta and Sicily and Achaia and Crete. The ship had apparently drifted at the rate of about 36 miles in twenty-four hours, for it was now near to the island of Malta, which is about 500 miles away from Fair Havens. Luke describes their progress as drifting to and fro in the sea. So it no doubt seemed, though they were going in a uniform direction.

On the fourteenth night the practised senses of the sailors detected that land was nearing; perhaps they heard the breakers. Their surmise that land was near was confirmed by the soundings. In the dark there was no choice in beeching the vessel, so they had to anchor. With a strong wind blowing it was doubtful whether the cables and anchors would hold, so they let go four anchors. Anchoring by the stern was unusual, but in their situation it had the advantage that the ship would not have to be swung around when they wanted to run for the shore, but had merely to cut the cables. As the ship was now lying at anchor, the sailors were about to save themselves in the lifeboat and abandon the ship with all on board to its fate, but Paul, vigilant ever, detected their design and prevented it. Most prudent was the advice of Paul to all to take food, for he was alive to the fact that the safety of all depended on their being fit for active exertion in the morning.

The description of the beeching of the ship selects only the essential points and is clear and precise. Some doubt has arisen about the expression "The bank between two seas." But James Smith, who made exhaustive and scholarly studies and explorations in preparation for his excellent work, "Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul," shows that all the circumstances of the landing on Malta are united in St. Paul's Bay on the north-eastern where a neck of land projects towards the island of Salmonetta, which shelters the bay on the north-west. No place could have better favored their purpose. The ship struck a bottom of mud into which the fore part would fix itself, while the stern was exposed to the force of the waves. Thus the foreship was held together till ever person got safe to dry land. And thus under the divine providence of God a most fortunate ending came from the apparently hopeless situation. At about the time of Paul's shipwreck Josephus, the Jewish historian, was also on his way from Palestine to Rome and was shipwrecked; out of 600 people 520 were drowned. The eye-witness account of the tempestuous voyage is so technically described that some have been led to conclude that Luke at some period of his life must have been a professional sailor. His record is highly esteemed because of the information it gives on ancient sea-life. Dr. Breusing, Director of the Bremen Navigation School, wrote: "The most valuable nautical document preserved to us from antiquity is the description of the sea-journey and the shipwreck of the Apostle Paul."

Paul's stay on Malta is described Acts 28, 1-10. Doubtless many of the sailors had been at Malta before, for eastern ships bound for Rome must have often touched at the island, v. 11. The term "barbarians" is characteristic of the nationality of the writer. It does not necessarily indicate rudeness or uncivilized habits, but merely non-Greek birth. No one but a Greek would have applied the name to the

people of Malta, who were of Punic origin and had been in contact with the Phoenicians and Romans for many centuries. The inherent sympathy and kindness of the natives was shown by the way in which they treated the shipwrecked band. No doubt they brought oranges, figs, and olives to eat, which abound on Malta. Infidels have tried to deny the veracity of the account of Paul's being bitten by a serpent by pointing out that there are no snakes on the island, neither any wood for fire. However, such charges are natural and probable in a small island, populous and long civilized. When the rustics saw the viper attack Paul, they concluded that he was being pursued by Vengeance, or Nemesis, the avenger of wrong. But when they saw that he was unharmed by the deadly snake, they concluded that he himself was a god. Close by was the town, where Publius, the "chief man" of the island lived. His title, "Protos," first, is technically correct in Melita; it has inscriptional authority. He was likely a legate of the *propraetor* of Sicily, which was only sixty-two miles away. For the courtesy of Publius in lodging Paul for several days Paul was able to extend a much greater favor, that of healing the father of Publius. When this miracle had been performed, others who had diseases in the island came to receive the divine help dispensed through Paul. That Paul also preached the message of salvation during his unexpected sojourn on Malta, we may certainly take for granted. In this our day the Maltese still celebrate the "Naufragio," the shipwreck, on Feb. 11, there being civic and church processions and joyous cries of "Evviva San Paolo!"—"Long live St. Paul!"

The coming to Rome is described in Acts 28, 11-16. The wreck took place about Oct. 20, for they left Fair Havens a few days after the fast on the Day of Atonement, Oct. 5, and fourteen days had been spent in drifting westward. Since they wintered at Malta for a period of three months, it was near the beginning of Feb., 60, when they left the island. That is earlier than the usual beginning of navigation, but we may understand that favorable weather tempted them, and moreover, they would soon reach the coast of Sicily and would then be able to stay close to land all the rest of the way to Rome. They departed in another Alexandrian grain ship, whose emblem was Castor and Pollux, the Twin Brothers, sons of Zeus by Leda, who were translated into the sky and as the "shining stars" had a good influence on the ocean and so were the patron gods of the sailors. After a run of eighty-six miles under a favorable wind the ship reached Syracuse on the south-eastern shore of Sicily. The wind fell, so that they had to wait there three days, which might have given Paul a chance to explore the city and even preach there, for we know how favorable the centurion was to him. Syracuse was a city which rivaled Carthage in wealth. It was a colony of Corinth. The Athenians besieged it in vain and lost their power forever. After their surrender six thousand troops were imprisoned in the caves from which the stones were quarried to build the imperial city. The most interesting of these is one 200 feet long and 75 feet high, the shape of an S, called "The Ear of Dionysius," because the slightest whisper could be heard all over, like in the Tabernacle at Salt Lake City. When the ship left Syracuse, the wind was not favorable, yet they were able by tacking to work up to Rhegium, located at the toe of the Italian boot.

Here after one day a south wind arose and they were able to sail rapidly across to Puteoli, arriving there on the second day. Fifteen miles from Rhegium, Paul saw jutting out from the Italian shore a rock pictured by the ancients as a fearful monster. On the Sicilian side Paul saw Charybdis, another sea monster at whose feet the sea was churned by a terrible whirlpool. Because of the steady southern breeze the ship was not caught between Scylla and Charybdis, as many an ancient ship was. After passing through the Straits of Messina, the ship made up the Italian shore for the Bay of Naples, termed by the poet Shelley the most beautiful bay in the world. Dominating all the bay is the towering Mount Vesuvius with smiling vineyards running to the top, and nestling

at the base Pompeii to the right and Herculaneum to the left, both destroyed by the great eruption of the volcano in 79. In the bend of the bay was Neapolis, now Naples. But the ship was headed for Puteoli, eight miles north-west of Naples, at the northern end of the bay. Here was the greatest port of Italy. Here the grain which was brought in had to be transferred to smaller ships which could go up the Tiber to Rome, 140 miles away. Curious crowds often came to watch the ships discharge their passengers and cargo. From a letter of Seneca we learn that all ships which entered the Bay of Naples had to lower their topsails as soon as they reached the promontory of Minerva at the southern extremity, with the exception of the Alexandrian corn ships, which could be recognized because of their approach with their topsail set. Still standing are thirteen columns which supported the great pier where Paul landed at Puteoli.

And now came the last stage of the journey, the march from Puteoli to Rome. Puteoli possessed a congregation, a treasure which far surpassed the beautiful villas and art collections of the neighborhood. It is not surprising that Christianity had already established itself there, as it was such a crossing point of commerce. We know that even Pompeii had Christians living there in 79 from an inscription found among its ruins. On the eighth day after landing, Paul and his company set out for Rome on the Via Consularis. Passing between the two mountains beyond the city, he crossed the famous and fertile fields of Campania. He reached Capua, nineteen miles away, and left it on the Via Appia, the renowned Appian Way, which runs that far from Rome. It was built by the Censor Appius Claudius in 312 B.C. Eight hundred years later this road was still in perfect condition. Procopius, who writes then of the road, states that Appius had the hard stones brought from a great distance and had them smoothed and polished and cut in corresponding angles so as to be firmly united. Mile-stones were all along the way; every forty feet was a seat; about every twenty-miles was a post-station where horses and vehicles were kept. It took five days for a good walker to traverse the Appian Way. While Paul stopped for seven days at Puteoli, word had been carried to Rome of his arrival in Italy, so that when he got to Appii Forum forty-three miles from Rome, there were Christians there waiting to meet him, as also ten miles farther along at The Three Taverns. Appius Claudius had founded a market for the country people at the former place when he constructed "the Queen of Roads." When Paul met the second delegation of Christians at The Three Taverns, "he thanked God and took courage." It is evident that Paul had been feeling dispirited. This may have been a concomitant of some physical disorder, or again it may have been occasioned by the approach of a new crisis. We have observed him in a similar state of depression when he was at Troas and Philippi. What Paul's frame of mind was when he reached the Imperial city we are not told. But he had written, "I must see Rome," and he was no doubt impressed by the eternal city.

When the city was reached, the centurion delivered his charge to his superior officer, who bears the title, Stratopedarch, Chief of the Camp. This officer is thought by some to have been the Prefect of the Praetorian Guard, but the Prefect would hardly be concerned with a comparatively humble duty like the reception of and responsibility for prisoners. He was rather the head of the corps of officer-couriers already referred to, who were employed for numerous purposes that demanded communication between the Emperor and his armies and provinces. Since they really belonged to legions stationed in the provinces, they were considered to be on detached duty when they went to Rome, and hence in Rome were called perigrini, soldiers from abroad. While in Rome they resided in a camp on the Caelian Hill called Castra Perigrinorum. In this camp there were always a number of them present, changing from day to day, as some came and others went. There is no doubt that Paul was presented by the centurion Julius to his superior with words of highest commendation. It was to Paul that Julius,

too, owed his life. Perhaps also on this account, as well as because of the favorable report that Julius had brought from Festus, the governor, Paul was treated with courtesy and consideration. Though subjected, as at Caesarea, to continual surveillance always chained to a guardsman who was with him day and night, he was, nevertheless, left free to lodge wherever he saw fit. For a short time he may have accepted the hospitality of some Christian family, 28, 23, but he preferred to be independent and so withdrew to lodgings hired at his own expense. This house was quite likely close to the Imperial Palace, Phil. 1, 13. Paul probably had been turned over to the Praetorian Guard by the officer to whom he had been delivered. The Praetorians were the cohorts of picked men who were to guard Rome and the Emperor. Tiberias had built barracks for ten thousand Guards outside the walls to the north-east of the city. A detachment of Praetorians had their quarters in the palace, directly beneath it. Paul no doubt had been placed in the custody of this detachment.

Luke concludes the book of Acts with a brief account of Paul's residence in Rome, Acts 28, 17-31. The only incident which Luke mentions with any fullness is Paul's meeting with the non-Christian Jews. It was Paul's custom on arriving in a new city to plead first of all with his fellow-countrymen. In the days of Paul the Jews of Rome numbered about 60,000 (the population was about one and a half millions, one half slaves), and they had seven synagogues. The "chief of the Jews" that Paul called together were probably the foremost members either of the most prominent synagogue of the city or of the one nearest the Palace. Paul's address to them at their first meeting is an artful appeal by which he succeeded in winning them over to a receptive attitude. Since they had received no written or verbal reports against him from Jerusalem, they were willing to regard his case tolerantly. Paul had so won them, that they even invited him to expound the Christian doctrine to them, and that despite the fact that the Christians were regarded as a sect and were everywhere spoken against by the Jews. At the first meeting there was some ground for hope of success. But the second meeting soon dispelled it. This meeting lasted one whole day and was held in the house where Paul was lodging since his shackles and his keeper made it impossible for him to appear in a synagogue. This house must have been a large one, for there were evidently quite a number of Jews present. There was much discussion about Paul's exposition of the Messianic prophecies, the result being that "some believed," perhaps only a minority, and "some believed not."

Far more fruitful was the seed sown in Gentile hearts during the two years that Paul dwelt in his hired house and preached the kingdom of God unhindered. What additional power and persuasiveness the prisoner's appearance, with a soldier linked to his side, must have lent to his eloquence. Though his hands were bound, he could now, as he later did, declare: "The Word of God is not bound," 2 Tim. 2, 9. One special effect of his work in Rome was no doubt to animate the faith of the Christian community at Rome. Though the faith of the Roman Christians was already well known all over the world, Rom. 1, 8, yet there was evidently room for considerable improvement in sanctification, as may be seen from the practical portion of Paul's epistle which he had written them from Corinth some three years previous. The faith, too of some was weak, Rom 14, 1; 15, 1. While the majority of the Christians were probably possessed of a faith that was sound and pure, they were no doubt lacking in zeal in the propagation of that faith, Rom. 12, 11. This defect the apostle would seek to remedy. By his own example he showed with what perseverance the Christian should confess before men. His enthusiasm must have communicated itself to the church, so that it experienced a revival and increase during those two years of the apostle's sojourn in Rome.

Paul's influence upon the Praetorian guardsmen stationed at the palace must have been pronounced. Since the soldiers no doubt alternated in being chained to Paul, many were thus forced to observe the apostle when alone and when with visitors. Surely

Paul would not have hesitated to speak to his guards of Christ. No doubt some were converted. Some find a direct indication of this in the passage Phil. 1, 12, 13, where Paul states that "the things which happened unto me have <sup>fallen out rather</sup> to the furtherance of the Gospel, so that my bonds in Christ are manifest in all the Praetorium and in all other places." But it is doubtful whether Paul is here referring to his imprisonment. Ramsay says that the words "the things which happened unto me" and the term "Praetorium" point to the earliest stages of the trial which were over, and here he finds an indication that Philippians was written near the end of the imprisonment. He quotes Mommsen who tells us that the Praetorium was the whole body of persons connected with the sitting in judgment, the supreme Imperial Court. V. 14 should also be brought into consideration, for there Paul completes his thought. Ramsay says (The Traveller, p. 357): "The expression of the chapter as a whole shows that the trial is partly finished, and the issue as yet is so favorable that the brethren are emboldened by the success of Paul's courageous and free-spoken defence and the strong impression which he evidently produced on the court." But even though this Philippian passage does not offer proof of Paul's influence on the soldiers, this may be taken for granted. And we know from another passage that Paul exerted an influence in the palace above the soldiers' barracks, Phil. 4, 22, where "chiefly they that are of Caesar's household" salute the Philippians. It is not to be supposed that Paul himself was permitted to enter the Imperial Residence and testify of his faith, but the Gospel message was carried there by slaves and freedmen of the palace. Some of these may have embraced Christianity before Paul's coming, but after his coming they would be influenced by him to testify in the palace more freely. One thing is certain, there were not many of those occupying high positions in the palace who were converted. At Rome, as everywhere else, the great mass of converts came from the common people, yes, even from the throngs of slaves, 1 Cor. 1, 26, 27. This class was not only the most numerous, but also the most receptive. One weighty proof we have that Christianity did not to any great extent influence the higher classes is the predominance of Greek in the earliest age in the Roman Church. For almost two centuries everything in the Church is Greek, for Greek was the common speech of the lower classes, in which the foreign element predominated. And yet there is some slight proof that the Church had some influence over Romans of high rank and family. There are certain apocryphal, but very ancient accounts (Acts of the Martyrs, etc.) which allude to tombs of high-born believers as standing in a cemetery of Apostolic times, one to which a Christian matron called Priscilla had given her name. There were the remains of "Prudentiana and Praxedis, daughters of Pudens," and near them "Aquila and Priscilla," the Jewish artisans to whom Paul was so attached. Now Pudens is mentioned by Paul at the time of his second imprisonment, 2 Tim. 4, 21. Two interesting facts have been brought to light by Roman excavations. One is, that the Cemetery of Priscilla was originally a place of burial occupied in common by the Cornelii and their kinsfolk and the Acilii, and that the latter had Christian tombs therein; the other, that the site on the Aventine, where the house of Aquila and Priscilla stood, was on property belonging to the Cornelii. An inscription found at this spot actually bears the name of one Pudens Cornelianus. From these various bits of evidence Signor de Rossi concludes that some members of the Gens Cornelia had been converted in the days of the apostles, at least Pudens and his two daughters, Prudentia and Praxedis (the Claudia of 2 Tim. 4, 21 may have been his wife). He also concludes that since Aquila and Priscilla built their house on property belonging to the Cornelii and finally found their last resting-place in that family's burial ground, they must have been dependents of these patricians, either their freedmen or their clients. It is quite likely that Paul came into contact with these patricians through Aquila and Priscilla, though he himself may not have converted them. From Rom. 16, 3-5 we see that the house of Aquila and Priscilla was large enough to accommodate a congregation of some size. This mansion afterward became the Basilica of St. Prisca. Another of the oldest churches in the city bears the name of Saint Praxedis, to whom it was dedicated. It was erected on the property belonging to her father Pudens.



From Phil. 1, 15-18 we learn that not all of the Christians in the Roman Church were sound in faith. Scattered amid the pure grain there had sprung up tares, men who preached Christ in a spirit of envy and strife. These must have been Judaizers, bent on propagating their observances. By this time the errors of legalistic Christianity had been planted in Rome, and Paul apparently was not successful in completely uprooting them. His efforts in bringing the false teachers over to the pure Gospel only made them more headstrong in clinging to their errors and antagonised them the more to him. Soon they no longer preached Christ out of sincere hearts, but only in hope of thwarting their opponent. Did that worry Paul? No doubt it did, yet with sublime grandeur of soul he rejoiced that Christ was being preached by them.

In the work Paul was assisted during part of his stay by a good number of his helpers. Luke and Aristarchus of Thessalonica had been his fellow-travelers and companions in shipwreck, Acts 27, 2; Col. 4, 14, 10. Though other former companions of Paul were prevented from accompanying him on his voyage, perhaps being absent from Caesarea at the time of his departure, some of them followed him to Rome. Timothy was with him during the greater part of his imprisonment, but was sent on a mission to Philippi about the end of 61, Phil. 2, 19. Thereafter he seems to have had his headquarters in Asia, whence he was summoned by Paul to join him during his second imprisonment. Tychicus also joined Paul in Rome in 60, and was sent on a mission to Asia, and especially to the churches of the Lycos valley early in 61. Moreover, Mark, who on the first journey had proved so unfit for the work and who had then been disowned by Paul at Antioch had by this time proved himself and had become reinstated in the esteem of Paul (perhaps at Jerusalem or Caesarea), so that we also find him helping Paul at Rome. He left Rome in 61, contemplating an extended tour in the province of Asia, in the course of which he would probably visit Colosse. Paul writes a formal recommendation of him, Col. 4, 10, although oral instructions had already been sent to the Colossians and perhaps other churches, probably by Onesimus and Tychicus. Mark's work during the following few years seems to have lain in Asia also, for in 2 Tim. 4.11 Paul bids Timothy to bring Mark with him to Rome, implying that they were near each other; and Timothy was in Ephesus at the time. The greeting that Peter sent from Mark to the churches of Asia Minor at a later date indicates that by that time he was well known in Asia. Demas, who was later to forsake Paul for the world, at this time was still faithful, Col. 4, 14; Philemon 24. Besides these co-laborers we know the names of a goodly number of his friends to whom he had sent greetings in his letter. The majority, if not all of these, were still in the city. Aquila and Priscilla may still have been in Rome although later we again find them back at Ephesus, 2 Tim 4, 19. There were, for instance, Mary who had toiled so much for the church, his dear Persis, Tryphenus and Tryphosus, both alike zealous in the cause, Rom. 16, 3-15.

We must now turn our attention to the four epistles which Paul wrote from his Roman imprisonment, the so-called "prison epistles," Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, and Philemon. We have already shown that the supposition that some or all of them were written while Paul was in prison in Ephesus is untenable. We now have to examine the occasion of their writing as also the time and order of their composition. It is generally agreed that three of the four prison epistles are to be grouped together, as they were written at the same time and dispatched together, these being Philemon, Colossians, and Ephesians. We believe that they were written in that succession. What led to their writing was Paul's coming into contact with a runaway slave named Onesimus from Colosse. Paul sent him back to his master Philemon with a letter intended to secure his pardon. Tychicus was to accompany Onesimus from Rome to Colosse. Taking advantage of the fact that he had this messenger on hand, Paul proceeded to write two other letters for him to take along. One was to the church at Colosse, of which Paul had heard from Epaphras that it was giving ear to false doctrine. The other

one was a somewhat longer treatise which quite likely was a circular letter intended to be read first at Ephesus and then at other churches in the region, Col. 4, 16. Philippians, the fourth letter of the prison group, was written sometime later, shortly before Paul's release. We shall now take up each of these epistles in turn and establish their setting and order more definitely.

The Epistle to Philemon. That this epistle was written from prison is indicated in v. 9. That it could not have been written from Caesarea or any other place is attested by the companions of Paul who are mentioned in v. 23,24. Thus Mark is never mentioned as having rejoined Paul on either his second or on his third missionary journeys, though from the time of Paul's arrival in Rome we find that he made use of his services, Col.4,10; 2 Tim.4,11. Demas had never been with Paul on any of his journeys. Epaphras was from Colosse, where he served the church as a faithful minister, Col.1,7. The type of false doctrine that he reported to Paul was not only the old legalism of the Judaizers, Col. 2, 16, but also something altogether new, as we glean from Paul's refutation of it in Colossians, Col.2,8. This new perversion of the truth is recognized as a later development which could hardly have taken shape while Paul was at Caesarea. Thus these and other circumstances point to Rome as the place whence the Epistle to Philemon was written.

But at what approximate time during Paul's two year imprisonment from the spring of 60 to the spring of 62 was it written? Evidently not during the first part of the imprisonment. It no doubt took some time for news of Paul's removal to Rome to travel from Caesarea to the distant Lycus valley. To be sure news moved rather quickly along the great highways of the Empire. Yet, though Paul left Caesarea in the fall of 59, it may have taken till well into the summer of the following year for word to reach distant Colosse that Paul was undergoing a long confinement in Rome, yet was free to receive his friends in his own house. Then it quite likely took several months or more before Epaphras came to Rome to acquaint Paul with the state of affairs at home, Col.4, 12, 13. On our supposition, Epaphras did not come to Rome till late in the year 60, so that the Epistle to Philemon as well as the other two that were dispatched with it could not have been written till early in 61. It is more likely that they were written about in the summer of 61, for Paul seems to have looked forward at the time of writing to acquittal and a visit to Colosse, as we see from Philemon 22, where he asks that a lodging be held in readiness for him. These words must not be pressed too much. Paul did not mean to imply that he would be leaving Rome for Colosse in a few weeks or so. But his expectation evidently was that his trial would not be delayed much longer, and, being confident of a favorable outcome, he could look forward to an eventual journey to Colosse. The trial may have been delayed beyond Paul's expectation or it may have commenced in the fall of 61 and then drag out till the spring of 62. At any rate, as we shall see later, Philippians suggests a later period in the term of Paul's imprisonment, when most of his former companions were no longer with him, so that we cannot assign these three epistles to the end of 61, when Philippians evidently was written, but cannot do better than to assign them to the summer of 61.

The letter of Philemon was a purely personal one. The apostle addresses him as a friend, as he also does Apphia and Archippus, who were evidently the wife and son of Philemon. In this household a slave named Onesimus, "Profitable", became "Unprofitable" by running away, v.11. He made his way to Rome, where like so many others he hoped to hide his identity in the nameless masses which thronged the metropolis. In some way or another Paul came into contact with him. Onesimus may have met Paul previously in some visit to Ephesus with his master. Conscience stricken, or impelled by want, he must have deliberately sought Paul out in his dwelling. Or it may be that his first contact was made with Epaphras, whom he found in the city, and whom he had seen many a time in Philemon's house, which was used for church services, v. 2. Through Paul's influence the poor fugitive was won over for Christ, v. 10. He was furthermore

persuaded than the only right and honorable course for him was to go back to his master, v. 12. Paul now asks Philemon to receive him "not now as a servant, "but as a brother beloved, "v. 16, and promises him that he will make personal restitution for whatever harm Onesimus has done, v. 18. The Epistle to Philemon gives us three portraits, those of Philemon, Onesimus, and St. Paul. That of Paul portrays the grace and courtesy of this great man of God. This short private letter from the pen of Paul is so tactfully and lovingly written that scholars have vied with one another in chanting its praises.

The Epistle to the Colossians. When Paul sent the personal note to Philemon, he accompanied it with a letter to be read to all Christians at Colosse, some of whom at least met for worship in Philemon's home, Philemon 2. Paul was sending Tychicus Onesimus, and thus had an opportunity to dispatch a letter to them, Col. 4, 7-9. Paul put great trust in Tychicus, a native of Asia, Acts 20, 4, and was sending him for their special comfort. But the epistle was evidently also called forth by Paul's knowledge of conditions at Colosse, Col. 2, 1. The source of Paul's information was not Tychicus, for we take it he had been with the apostle for some time, but it was Epaphras who had acquainted Paul with the state of affairs at Colosse, Col. 1, 7, 8. Epaphras is called a "fellow-servant" of the apostle either because he had been associated with Paul at Ephesus or because he was even then assisting Paul with the work at Rome. From Col. 4, 12, in which verse Epaphras sends greetings to the Colossians, we gather that he was not to return home at this time, but would continue to help Paul for a while. But Epaphras was a minister of the church at Colosse, Col. 1, 7, who could therefore give Paul first hand information of the heretical ideas that had arisen there. The Colossian heresy was partly oriental and mystic in character, Col. 2, 8, 18. The teachings which were perverting the Gospel in Colosse were not unrelated to the geographical location of the city in the interior of Asia where the mystery religions were dominant with their attempts at entering upon mystic communion with heavenly powers. The Colossian Christians were being led into the idea that their quest for "fulness" of religious experience was to be fulfilled in communion not only with Christ, but with other heavenly powers as great as, or perhaps greater, than He. Along with the teaching of mystic communion were associated certain ascetic practices, the "touch not, taste not, handle not" ordinances which had their place in the preparatory rites of the mystery-religions, Col. 2, 21. The situation was further complicated by the presence of Judaizing tendencies, Col. 2, 16, 17. Paul does not combat the heresy by fierce denunciation, but by the plain presentation of the truth. Using the thoughts and even, so far as possible, the language of the errorists, Paul presents the supreme greatness of Christ, Col. 1, 26-28 (note use of the words "mystery," "wisdom," "perfect"). He lays the ax to the root of the trouble by showing the perfect sufficiency of Christ for our salvation. Of special interest is Paul's direction in Col. 4, 16 to read the epistle from Laodicea. We think that this letter is not a lost letter, but rather our Epistle to the Ephesians.

The Epistle to the Ephesians. A striking fact in connection with the study of Ephesians is that the phrase "at Ephesus" in the address is uncertain. Strange that it should be. Yet the words "in Ephesus" are not found in the two oldest manuscripts, Sinaiticus and Vaticanus. Moreover, there are other strange phenomena which has led many to conclude that the letter was not written to the Ephesians alone. This epistle has no greetings of any kind. Yet Paul had spent a longer time in Ephesus than anywhere else and must have had a host of friends there. He has several personal salutations in Colossians, though he had never been in Colosse. Then there is an official formality and distance in tone in this letter that is not found in any other. Not once does he address his readers as "brethren" or "beloved". It would almost seem as if he were writing to strangers as when he speaks of "having heard of the faith in the Lord Jesus which is among you," 1, 15 (see also 3, 2; 4, 20, 21).

What is the explanation of these strange facts? It has been suggested with a great show of right that the Epistle to the Ephesians was a circular letter, a sort of general epistle to all the churches of Asia, carried by Tychicus along with the epistles to Philemon and the Colossians. Tychicus would land at Ephesus, and the church there would read the epistle first. Then he would carry it on to Laodicea and leave it there while he hastened on to Colosse. The Colossians were told in their epistle to send to Laodicea for it as well as to send their letter to Laodicea to be read, Col. 4, 16. Marcion in the second century had a letter of Paul "to the laodiceans" in his canon, which apparently was in the place of our Ephesians. The testimony of other church fathers also supports the view that it was not addressed to the Ephesians alone. Its impersonal character also speaks for this hypothesis, which is accepted very generally to-day.

The letter is somewhat similar to Colossians in general structure. They have the same general subjects and the same leading thoughts. There are even some remarkable parallel passages, especially Eph. 5, 22-6, 9 and Col. 3, 18-4, 1. Since it is also a prison epistle, Eph. 6, 20, and since it was also intrusted to Tychicus, Eph. 6, 21, 22, it is evident that it was written at about the same time as Colossians. Colossians was called forth by a special emergency, and, having written it, Paul elaborated on the new theme in another letter which he sent to all the churches of Asia. The two form a pair. Colossians sets forth the dignity of Christ, the Head of the Church. Ephesians presents the sublimity of the Church, the body of Christ.

The Epistle to the Philippians. This too is one of the prison epistles. Paul makes frequent mention of his bonds, 1, 7, 13, 14, 16. The references to the praetorium, 1, 13, and to Caesar's household, 4, 22, have led most critics to conclude that the Roman imprisonment was the one to which the epistle refers. What led Paul to write to the Philippians at this time was his receipt of gifts from the Philippians, 4, 10-20. When the Christians at Philippi heard that Paul was in prison at Rome, they promptly raised a collection and sent it, perhaps with other gifts, 4, 18, to Paul. Epaphroditus was their messenger, 2, 25; 4, 18. This was not the first time that the Philippian church had sent Paul money. At least three times previously they had aided him. Twice they sent him contributions just after he had left them and gone on to Thessalonica, 4, 15, 16. When he had pushed on to Corinth, and was in want there, the Philippians again supplied his need, 2 Cor. 11, 8, 9. Paul probably had written them an acknowledgment of each of these gifts, but his other letters to the Philippians have been lost. Elycarp in his epistle to the Philippians mentions the fact that Paul had written a number of letters to them. As far as we know Paul received financial help from no congregation other than the Philippians. He rigidly adhered to his plan of self-support while preaching the Gospel. But he made an exception in the case of the Philippians since he knew that they would not grudge their gifts. Paul had such high confidence in the Philippians because he knew that they had such perfect confidence in him. And now some ten years had passed by since they had sent the last gift that we know of from Corinth (there may have been others in the intervening time). When the Philippians heard that their beloved apostle was in prison at Rome, their loyalty prompted them to send Epaphroditus to him with their best wishes and another liberal gift. It is plain that Paul did not actually need the help that they now sent, yet his gratitude is as warm and genuine as if he had been in deep need. Having now seen that this epistle was called forth mainly to thank the Philippians for their contribution, we must ask yet at what time during Paul's Roman imprisonment it was written.

We have seen that the epistles to Philemon, the Colossians, and the Ephesians form one group as to time of composition and were probably written in the summer of 61. Philippians is evidently separated from them by some interval. Was it written earlier or latter? There are some first-class authorities, as Lightfoot and Farrar, who maintain that it was written before the other prison epistles. Their main argument

in support of their contention is that Colossians and Ephesians "exhibit a more advanced stage in the development of the Church. That cannot be gainsaid, but the inference that Philippians was written earlier does not follow. The contents of Colossians and Ephesians is determined by the incipient heresies which were arising in Asia. But this speculative heresy had not in any way affected the church at Philippi, hence there was no reason for Paul to counteract it. The tone of Philippians, as well as of the other epistles, was determined by the circumstances. Hence the absence of any reference to the new heresies arising in Asia is no indication that it was written before Colossians and Ephesians.

On the other hand, we have internal evidence which indicates that it was written later, in fact near the end of the imprisonment. We know that considerable time must have elapsed after Paul's arrival at Rome before he could have written this epistle. News of his arrival had been carried to Philippi and a contribution for his needs had been raised there and Epaphroditus had carried it to Rome. Epaphroditus remained at Rome for some time, becoming Paul's companion in labor and fellow-soldier, 2, 25. He worked so hard in the cause of the Gospel that he fell sick and was nigh unto death, 2, 26-30. From v. 26 it is evident that the news of his sickness had been carried back to Philippi and the Philippians had sent back a message of sympathy to him. At least four trips between Rome and Philippi are thus indicated, and there are intervals of greater or less length between them. The distance between the two cities was some seven hundred miles. Communication was easy by the Appian Way and Trajan's Way to Brundisium and across the Adriatic to the Egnatian Way, which led directly to Philippi. But the journey would occupy a month at least, and the four journeys were not in direct succession. The consideration of these journeys only indicates, of course, that Paul did not write Philippians near the beginning of his imprisonment.

However, we have still stronger evidence. When Paul wrote to the Philippians, his practice of sending subordinates away on missions had just about stripped him of trusted companions, as is plainly indicated in 2, 19-23. It would have been impossible for Paul to have written this if he had had with him the companions whom he had previously had at his side at Rome. Luke had accompanied him to Rome, but was evidently no longer at his side, or he would have sent a greeting to the Philippians, to whom he was so well known. He was still with Paul when he wrote Colossians, Col. 4, 14, but had subsequently made his departure. He may very well have returned to Philippi and may very well be the "true yoke-fellow" referred to in Phil. 4, 3. In the last chapter of Colossians, 4, 7-11, there are four men mentioned as being fellow-workers by Paul, Tychicus, Aristarchus, Marcus, and Jesus Justus. Tychicus had been sent to Colosse as the bearer of the Epistle to the Colossians. Aristarchus had apparently also been sent on a mission during the summer or fall of 61, and Mark likewise. Jesus Justus was not a prominent worker nor was Demas who is mentioned along with Luke in Col. 4, 14. If they were still in Rome when Philippians was written, they belonged to those of whose thorough trustworthiness Paul did not feel sure, Phil. 2, 20, 21. Epaphras, who is mentioned Col. 4, 12, and had come from Colosse, evidently had returned to the Lycaonian valley. So Timothy was the only one of his trusted helpers whom Paul still had with him, and him he planned on shortly sending to the Philippians, Phil. 2, 19. Since the coworkers who had been with Paul when Colossians and the other two epistles of the group were written were no longer at his side when he wrote Philippians, it is quite evident that Philippians was written as the last of the prison epistles. We have further evidence which indicates that it was written near the close of the Roman imprisonment.

Paul writes as if he thought his case would be decided soon, 1, 20-26; 2, 23. He seems to be facing his final trial. He is not sure of its outcome. He may die a

martyr's death, but he expects to be acquitted and then to be at liberty to again visit the Philippians. There was not any immediate expectation of his case being decided when he wrote the other epistles from Rome, and there is more eagerness manifested for the issue manifested in Philippians and more touches of depression caused by the increased strain, so that we cannot but conclude that Philippians was written toward the close of the imprisonment, so early in the year 62.

Philippians is noteworthy because it is the last of Paul's epistles to the churches. True, the pastoral epistles came later, but they were written to individuals. But here Paul addresses a church for the last time to record his instructions and exhortations. It is not a treatise, as his Epistle to the Romans was, nor an encyclical, as his Epistle to the Ephesians was, but a real letter which rambles along just as any real letter would. It has been termed a love letter, for it was addressed to Paul's favorite church. In it Paul has nothing but praise for his beloved Philippians. There is nothing to correct, save the difference of opinion between Euodia and Syntyche. Paul would only have the Philippians rejoice in their spiritual possessions and to abound in these. It is truly an epistle of joy, the keynote being "rejoice in the Lord always: and again I say, Rejoice," 4,4. It was Bengel who said, "Summa epistolae, gaudeo, gaudete,"--sum of the epistle is, I rejoice; rejoice ye."

Now to return to the story of Paul's imprisonment, we ask what became of the appeal of the apostle? Luke does not tell us, for he closes his second book with Paul in prison, enjoying limited freedom which enabled him to prosecute his work. He does tell us that this state of affairs went on for two years. Such a long delay is not surprising since the accusers resided in distant Judaea, and because Paul's shipwreck and delay in reaching Rome must have thrown a lot of confusing into the case. It is possible that when the ship was wrecked at Malta the document which Festus had given to the centurion Julius regarding the case was lost, and a new one had to be procured from Caesarea. Perhaps documents had to be obtained from the leading cities where Paul had preached because Paul had been accused of disturbing the peace there, Acts 21, 28. It may be, too, that Paul's enemies, realizing that their chances of winning the case were slim, concentrated their efforts on bringing about postponements of the hearings and the decision. Or it may be that the attention of the Jews at Jerusalem were diverted from him once he left the shores of Palestine and that they sent none to Rome to press the charge against him. Now a few years before Claudius had laid down a law to free a prisoner if accusers did not appear in, say, eighteen months. Two years had now passed by, which may indicate that the court had waited all that time for witnesses to appear. At any rate, at the expiration of that time the trial was held, either before the emperor himself, the unspeakable Nero, or before his representatives (Ramsay believes the two prefects of the Praetorian Guard). Mommsen in his "Roemisches Staatsrecht" states that the emperor had a Council of Justice to help him in the exercise of his judicial functions. These counsellors handed down their opinions, the emperor generally sanctioning their judgment except in cases where his passions or his caprices were at stake. The conclusion forced itself upon the court that the prosecution had failed by default, and, influenced by the favorable report of Festus, they acquitted the prisoner. This was in the spring of 62. There is no reason for supposing that Paul was not freed from the Roman imprisonment, but rather suffered a martyr's death at the expiration of it. We have first of all Paul's own confident expectation of the outcome of his trial. A further strong line of evidence pointing to his release are the Pastoral Epistles which are full of evidence of later missionary labors on the part of the apostle. Then, finally, there is a strong tradition to the effect that he was acquitted. Eusebius refers to this when, writing in the fourth century, he says, "There is a tradition that the apostle after his defense again set forth to the ministry of his preaching, and having entered Rome a second time was martyred" (Hist. Eccl., II, 22).

## Chapter XI Last Years.

Here we must leave the realm of certainty and chronological order that we have been so happily following during the first three great missionary journeys of the apostle and for his further mission labors enter largely upon the realm of conjecture. Yet we have sufficient testimony to enable us to piece together a rough sketch of his last years. The apostle's eyes had been so fixed upon Asia during the latter months of his imprisonment as to make us infer that as soon as he was liberated he would turn his steps in that direction. And yet many suppose that he first made his long cherished journey to Spain, Rom. 15, 28. We cannot countenance that view. Though it had been but long standing ambition to carry the Gospel as far west as Spain, yet we feel that Paul felt constrained to postpone that trip for another year because of the pressing necessity of revisiting the churches of the East. It must be remembered that he had been prevented from visiting any of them for five long years now, the period of his imprisonment. While during that time he had endeavored to keep his converts faithful to the truth of the Gospel by sending his trusted messengers to visit and counsel them and had even written two epistles to the churches of Asia to counteract the false teachings that had taken root there, yet he must have felt it necessary and expedient to again visit the whole field as soon as possible. So Paul flew as a bird set free from the cage and hastened first of all, we think, to Macedonia. In Phil. 2, 24 we have Paul's expectation expressed that he would come "shortly" to Philippi. And in the verses preceding, 19-24, the apostle wrote that he would send Timothy a little in advance, "so soon as I shall see how it will go with me." Macedonia would be the logical province for him to visit first, since the land route from the West to the East ran right through it. Paul would, of course, not only visit the church at Philippi, but the other churches in Macedonia as well. From Macedonia he would quite likely proceed directly to Asia. In Philemon 22 Paul directed Philemon to have a lodging in readiness for him, which indicates that he expected to go to Colosse in the not too distant future. Because of the Colossian heresy, which had called forth the Epistle to the Colossians during the later part of his imprisonment, Paul would want to get to Colosse as soon as possible in order to further combat it. Whether Paul went from Asia to Galatia, or perhaps next to Greece, or perhaps to some new territory at this time, as Crete, we just do not know. About all that we can definitely say is that he spent the year following his imprisonment in the East, the year of 62 to 63.

Just when Paul set out on his journey to Spain we also cannot state. It may well have been in the spring of 63, again it may not have been till the following spring. In view of the fact that the apostle had been away from his churches for such a long time and false teachers from without and within had been preying upon them, Acts 20, 29, 30, he may have spent two full years in the work of again confirming the churches in the faith. More likely, however, it was only one year. When conditions warranted, he set out for distant Spain to carry out his long-cherished design, voiced as early as 57 when he wrote to the Romans, Rom. 15, 28. Some might question whether solely on the basis of this expressed intention we can assume that Paul accomplished his desire and reached Spain. Well, we know that Paul was a resolute man if ever there was one and that there was nothing to hinder him from going to Spain. But our assumption is not based on conjecture alone, but is amply supported by tradition. Clement of Rome, who is perhaps identical with the Clement mentioned in Paul's Epistle to the Philippians, wrote in his epistle to the Corinthians only thirty years after Paul's death that the apostle had preached "on the confines of the West". Spain was the western-most province of the far-flung Roman Empire and represented "land's end" to the ancients. Further testimony we have from the Muratorian Fragment, so-called because it was published for the first time by Muratori.

This fragment of an ancient Latin translation of an early Greek manuscript, written about 170 A. D. at the latest, contains a list of the New Testament books. Lines 37 and 38 mention in express terms Paul's mission to Spain, "ad Spaniam." Jerome and Chrysostom, in the fifth century, followed by Theodoret and many of the church fathers, likewise tell us that Paul preached in Spain and that he labored there. Unfortunately, however, not a trace of his activities have come down to us. As to his mode of travel, we can infer that he journeyed from Rome to Spain by means of the coasting vessels which plied their trade between Italy and the far West. His boat passed along the shores of Gaul (France). It must have put into some of the ports of Gaul, which would have given Paul a chance to land. The cities on the eastern shore of Spain contained Jewish settlements. It was in these most likely that he began his work, extending it then to the Gentiles, as was his practice on the former missionary journeys. We wonder what success he had, whether substantial congregations were founded. Did he have Timothy with him, his son in the faith and constant assistant, or perhaps Luke, who had been with him so much before and was so close to him, or perchance Titus, that stalwart Christian warrior? Again we must say, we don't know, although it may almost be taken for granted that Paul had some companion with him as was his wont. How long Paul remained in the far West we also can only conjecture. It could not have been less than a year. More probably the sojourn was for a two-year period. That would give us the period of 63 to 65 for the journey to Spain.

Paul was providentially kept away from Rome during the terrible persecution that broke out there under Nero. It was the great fire of Rome which led to the persecution. The fire broke out on July 19, 64, near the Jewish quarters in the neighborhood of the Circus Maximus. It was one of the greatest conflagrations of history, destroying the greater part of Rome, and causing considerable loss of life and indescribable suffering. Nero, who by this time had become the mad emperor and whose reign we cannot take time to characterize, had been at the bathing resort of Antium when the fire broke out. At first he paid no attention to it. But later, on learning that the fire was sweeping through one district after another, threatening to destroy everything, he hastened homewards, and at the outset was evidently occupied with the endeavor of combating the awful scourge. It was also finally by his order that, after six days of ineffectual efforts, the great battering rams were brought out and used to make an open space amid the crowded buildings, the measure which checked the flames. But that monstrous passion of his for artistic effect made itself evidenced during the burning. It is probably not merely a rumor that during one night Nero stood on the tower of Maecenas watching with delight the horrible yet grand spectacle of the conflagration, and, with cittern in hand and clad in his theatrical costume, recited verses from "the Burning of Troy." No doubt the emperor was filled with delight when he saw so much of the city being destroyed, for he recognized that here was his chance to clear away the center of the city to make room for his own great projects. Shortly before, in a drunken revelry, he had boasted that he would destroy his "temporary residence" and rebuild it on a grander scale. He wanted to be able to prepare a proper setting for the "Golden House" of his dreams. It is not surprising, therefore, that the people almost immediately accused him of having started the fire. The historians Suetonius, Pliny, Dion Cassius, and Tacitus all accuse him of the crime of incendiarism. Nothing that Nero could do after the fire served to erase the outraged sense of injury that smoldered in the hearts of the people of Rome. So at all costs the emperor must needs find some victim to serve as a scapegoat.

The eyes of men were directed to the Jewish quarters, near which the fire had started, a fact in itself suspicious. The main Jewish section in the quarter Trastevere and around the Porta Capena had been spared. The Jews soon realized that they were marked out for victims and to save themselves straightway cast all the odium of the conflagration upon the Christians. One line of Clement's establishes this fact beyond doubt. "This persecution," he writes, "was due to jealousy." The Jews were always



carrying on their intrigues at court. In Poppaea, half Jewess as she was, and now acknowledged by all as mistress of the court, they had a powerful ally. The emperor dashed like a hound upon the new scent and seized upon all the sinister accusations brought against the Christians. He publicly announced that the Christians, the enemies of human society, had caused the conflagration. He is said to have uttered: "Christiani non sint"--Let there be no Christians. Thus began the cruel and bloody persecution. We need not narrate its horrors, how the Christians, who by this time had become a "multitude" in Rome according to Tacitus, were covered with wax and pitch, placed in the imperial gardens and set afire, that they might burn as torches, how they were sewed into the skins of wild beasts and then thrown to dogs who tore them to pieces, nor of the other excruciating torments devised for them by bestial Nero. Happily it did not last long in Rome. There was a series of massacres in the month of August, and then it was over. The persecutor had found a more advantageous use for the victims that remained in prison. In his haste to see the city of Rome rebuilt there were not enough workmen to meet his demands, and so the Christian prisoners were thrown in to speed the work to completion. Persecution of Christians had been extended beyond the walls of the capital and beyond the boundaries of Italy itself. The example of Rome was followed and, although we don't know of any wholesale massacres breaking out anywhere in the provinces, the Christians were subjected to insults and at times to acts of violence and even bloodshed. The crime of which they were accused was as Tacitus tells us, "hatred of all mankind." With this nothing else can be meant than the secluded life and withdrawal from the world which the Christians practiced. To avoid idolatry and immorality they shunned religious festivals and other public functions. They were therefore generally supposed to be a party of malcontents, social misfits, and hence dangerous to the state. Nero undoubtedly issued an edict of persecution which transformed the mere profession of Christianity into a crime. <sup>6</sup> ~~the edict was not consistently carried out, the~~ <sup>7</sup> ~~persecution apparently being pushed forward more or less actively according to the good pleasure of the individual magistrates or the fickle demands of the mob.~~

We have an unmistakable testimony of the presence of persecution in Asia Minor in the First Epistle of Peter. The trial which Peter describes the Church as undergoing lowered over all the Asiatic provinces,--Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Proconsular Asia, and Bithynis, in all of which the Church had gained a firm foothold by now. Yes, the persecution is said by Peter to be world-wide, 1 Pet. 5, 9; see also 3, 15. Peter evidently is speaking of a persecution of far greater proportions than the riots which followed Paul's footsteps in previous years. It was because of this very fact that Peter was constrained to write his epistle. He wanted to help the faithful bear the terrible tests they were put to after massacres at Rome. The fact that Peter also addresses the churches which were founded and supervised by Paul, those in Galatia and Asia, as well as his own, indicates very plainly that Paul must have been in Spain at this time. All of the apostles followed the rule expressed by Paul, Rom 15, 20 not to build upon another man's foundation. But Paul was no longer at hand to speak words of encouragement to his converts, so Peter did so for him. This was a time of persecution and the Christians needed strengthening.

In the Epistle to the Hebrews we have evidence that persecution was also raging in Palestine, particularly in Jerusalem, at this time. It was persecution, however, which sprang from other causes. That this epistle to which the most ancient manuscripts give the title "To The Hebrews" was written to the Jewish Christians of Jerusalem and Palestine is proved by such features as ~~the writer reminding his readers that they were the first to receive the Gospel, 5, 12, and the fact that the persons addressed were evidently living under the very shadow of the temple services.~~ It was upon the death of Festus at the close of 60 and before the coming of Albinus in 61 that a wave of persecution broke upon the Christians in Jerusalem by instigation of the Jewish authorities. Eusebius tells us that the Jews were enraged over Paul's appeal to Caesar and his being sent to Rome, and determined to seize James during the

interregnum. Since King Agrippa also chanced to be away from Jerusalem, it was a unique opportunity for the Sanhedrin to wreak vengeance upon the Christians. It was an easy matter to apprehend and slay some of the Christians of lowly rank. But it was more difficult to lay hands on James whom the whole city revered. He was called "the Just" even among the unbelieving Jews, not only because of his righteous life, but also by reason of his strict observance of the Jewish ceremonial laws. This is the James who some few years previous had written an epistle to the Jewish Christians of the dispersion to counteract the dead orthodoxy and moral depravity that was creeping upon them. The Sanhedrin was constrained to lay a trap for this most prominent member of the Christian church, the sole leader of note remaining in Jerusalem. During the Paschal season James was approached on the terraces of the Temple and urged to testify against Jesus to the multitudes gathered in the Porches. When he fearlessly proclaimed Jesus as the Messiah and the Son of God, he was cast down from a pinnacle of the temple. While he lay on the ground, sorely injured, but still alive, the mob began to stone him; finally, a tanner slew the martyr with a club. The arrival of Albinus after a few months put a stop to such executions. However, he confined himself merely to insisting upon his right of passing the death sentence. There was not even a semblance of law and order maintained by him during his rule. The Sanhedrin was left free to continue to harass the Christians. Many were no doubt despoiled of their property and thrown into prison. The whole populace, it is true, suffered many injustices from their rulers with the Christians. The whole country groaned under the crushing weight of heavy taxes. There was extortion and pillage.

Sometime during these years of ill omen there appeared a document destined to revive the courage of the faithful, the Epistle to the Hebrews. That it was written to warn the Jewish Christians of the homeland against the danger of relapsing into Judaism is evident. That a secondary purpose was to encourage them in persecution appears especially from 10, 32-39. We note from v. 34 that the writer had himself been in prison, perhaps in Jerusalem. In chapter 13, 23 we have another reference to imprisonment, that of Timothy—"know ye that our brother Timothy is set at liberty?" And in the same verse the writer states that he hopes to come to see them with Timothy. These items might lead one to conclude that Paul was the author of Hebrews. Indeed, from earliest times many have come to that conclusion. However, we are convinced that Paul could not have been the author of the epistle. Aside from the diversities that exist between this epistle and those that we know are from the pen of Paul, there is one particular consideration which obviates the possibility of Paul having written Hebrews, and that is the one pointed to by Luther in his introduction to Hebrews in these words: "That the Epistle to the Hebrews is not from Paul or any other apostle is proved by the fact that we read in chapter 2, 3 that 'this doctrine came to us and remained with us through those who have themselves heard it from the Lord'. Thus he plainly speaks of the apostles as a disciple to whom this doctrine came from the apostles, probably long thereafter. For Paul declares powerfully in Gal. 1, 1 that he received his Gospel not of men, nor by men, but of God Himself." It would seem quite certain that this epistle was written by some co-worker of the apostles, possibly by Apollos or Barnabas. It was evidently written from some point of Italy outside of Rome, 13, 24. The reference to Timothy would seem to suggest the period of Paul's activity in Spain as the time of writing. Since Timothy suffered imprisonment and was about to be freed, the time of Nero's persecution is a further indication.

We have been permitting ourselves to digress a bit from the confines of our narrative in the interest of historic perspective, and for this reason should also proceed to roughly trace the first uprising in Jerusalem. The persecutions against the mother church lost much of their violence in the period which followed the despatch of the

epistle to the Hebrews, in fact chapter 19, 32.33 indicates that they had already subsided at the time of writing. The aristocracy, which had always instigated the persecutions, now in turn were tormented by the lower elements of the population and became involved in the rebellion which took place at this time. This was when Gessius Florus became governor in 66. There was always an uneasy and turbulent element among the lower class of the populace. Among this group revolutionary preachers instigated uprisings. The poor of the land had little to lose and many no doubt thought that by deeds of violence they were hastening the coming of the kingdom of God. Bands of adventurers and brigands ravaged the land and were in such strength that the Roman magistrates were often forced to compromise with them. In company with sincere Zealots they were continually inciting Jerusalem to revolt and led in acts of violence. Just at this time, too, certain prodigies caused great excitement among the populace. Tacitus, as well as Josephus, records them. "Signs of our approaching liberty!" cried the Zealots.

Florus was utterly unable to pacify and control his province, simply because he was the worst governor ever sent by Rome. He seems to have had no other end in view save the speedy accumulation of a fortune. He pillaged citizens and cities so completely that many places became depopulated. His prestige at the imperial court insured him perfect immunity. Finally he gave orders for the levying of seventeen talents upon the treasury of the Temple, hitherto held inviolate. This led to the first open uprising in Jerusalem, which resulted in 3600 of the people perishing by the sword or being trampled to death. On the following day when Florus with all the legionaries at his command began to march on the Temple, evidently to rob the treasury, he was met by such an infuriated mob that he called a halt and withdrew to Caesarea. Josephus tells us that Florus was actually anxious to foment rebellion in order to cover up for his own acts of rapacity. After a vain attempt on the part of Agrippa and his wife Bernice, who was loved by all, to placate the people, the fanatics found the field free for their campaign.

Next the fiercest of the Zealots stormed the fortress Masada on the shores of the Dead Sea and butchered the Roman garrison. The former high priest Ananias, however, still succeeded in holding the seditious element in check in Jerusalem. Foremost among them was his son, Eleazar, captain of the temple, who now persuaded to the Levites to proscribe the usage of accepting gifts and sacrifices from foreign princes. This was a mortal insult to Rome. The members of the moderate party appealed to Florus and once more to Agrippa for aid in staying the tide of insurrection. The procurator was eager to add fuel to the flame, but Agrippa sent three thousand of his cavalry to help the better class retain the upper quarter of Jerusalem in their possession, the lower town and the Temple being in the hands of the rebels. After a few days a veritable battle was fought in which the insurgents were the victors. On the next day these stormed the Tower of Antonia and put the garrison to the sword. And now reinforcements from the fortress of Masada reached the rebels, led by Manahem, son of the famous Judas of Galilee, who sixty years earlier had been the first to attempt to arouse Judaea against Rome, Acts 5, 37. Manahem assumed command and pushed the assault upon the besieged in the Upper Palace so vigorously that they were forced to capitulate. Agrippa's cavalry were allowed to retire from the city; but the Romans were massacred. Ananias was discovered hiding in an aqueduct and was hacked to pieces, a fate well deserved by this ruthless ruler, and one which had been foretold by Paul, Acts 23, 3. But this violent end was so shocking to the people that they seized upon Manahem, cruelly slew him, and forced his Zealots to make their way back to Masada. So Jerusalem was lost to the Romans, and with it almost the whole of Judea, for all the garrisons roundabout made haste to capitulate. Florus had abandoned Jerusalem to its fate sometime during the month of May, 66, and the last Roman guard there succumbed about the end of September. That is as far as we need trace the history, for that was the time that Paul was engaged in his final ministry.

When the Spanish expedition had been carried out, Paul again returned unto the East. This was, we think, in the spring of 65. While still in the distant West he must have heard reports of what was transpiring elsewhere in the Roman world. When hearing of the Neronian persecution which first broke at Rome, we can imagine his wanting to rush to Rome to sustain and console the Christians there in their sufferings. Perhaps he was dissuaded from entering the city by friends, or realized himself how disastrous that would be. Yet it seems quite likely that he traveled from West to East by way of Italy, and that not so long after the outbreak of the persecution. Perhaps he avoided Rome itself, but lingered nearby for a while to rally the Christian survivors. But he would not stay longer than necessary, for he must have been anxious to see how his churches were faring in the East.

Alas! corrupt teachers had again exerted their destructive influence during Paul's absence in Spain. We heard how it had become necessary for Paul to write to the Colossians and to the Ephesians a half year before quitting his prison in Rome in order to warn them especially against the speculative heresies that were creeping into the churches of Asia. These churches and those of the other provinces of Asia Minor continued to be a fertile field for the pernicious influence of false teachers. The Epistle of Jude, which seems to have been written before the return of Paul from the West particularly to the churches of Asia Minor, bears out this fact. From its similarity to a portion of Peter's Second Epistle we gather that Jude's epistle, though it is one of the catholic group, addressed to the Christians in general, was intended to combat the growing heresies of Asia Minor. Second Peter according to chapter 3, 1, was addressed to the same circle of readers as his First Epistle. And this we know from I Pet. 1, 1 was the churches of all the provinces of Asia Minor. Now, in the description of the false teachers in the second chapter of 2 Peter and in Jude there are quite a number of close parallels of expressions, indicating that one of the two had the other's epistle before him and made some of the words his own. Second Peter was evidently written shortly before the apostle's end, indicating that it was Jude who wrote first. By the time Peter wrote his last letter Jude's letter had become so well known in the East that he could conceive of no better way to touch the hearts of his readers than by repeating and amplifying Jude's cutting denunciation of the false teachers. So we conclude that the Christians addressed by Jude as well as Peter included the churches of Paul in the province of Asia. Jude's letter, which preceded that of Peter by a couple of years or so, was quite likely written before Paul returned from the West and had a chance to personally make another visitation of the Asiatic churches. If this supposition be taken for granted, we can ascertain from the epistle the type of error that had reared its head in his absence. The ungodly men who were perverting the churches are charged in v. 4 with "lasciviousness" and later with "walking after their own lusts" and being "sensual." These teachers distorted Paul's doctrine concerning the Christian's freedom from the law into free license to satisfy the appetites of the flesh. To succeed in their ungodly propaganda they had to first undermine the faith of their hearers. To do so they did not hesitate to deny the authority of God and the divine Saviour, v. 4. They were vicious deceivers of the worst kind, and Jude, his attention being called to their corrupting work, at once raised his voice in indignant protest.

Soon after the dissemination of this brief, but biting epistle, the apostle Paul himself again entered upon the scene in Ephesus and adjoining territory. For this closing period of his ministry, the years 65 and 66, we can be guided only by hints gleaned from the pastoral epistles, 1 Timothy, Titus, and 2 Timothy, which were written after Paul's release from the first Roman imprisonment and presumable also after his return from Spain. Where did he go first after returning from the West? We do not know. Some think he went direct from Italy to the island of Crete, where he evidently labored for some time, as we see from the Epistle to Titus. But we think it much more probable that he would have wanted to visit his old churches again before taking up any new work, ..He must have suspected, even if he did not have any definite information,

that heresies were apt to have sprung up since his last visit some three years before, and that particularly in the Asian churches, which seemed to be a soil where the seeds of false doctrine readily sprouted. So we imagine Paul going from Italy to the East either by the land route through or by Macedonia or by the sea route, in which case he would be likely to go by way of Greece.

But as soon as possible he would make his way to Ephesus, where we have definite knowledge of his stopping, 1 Tim. 1, 3. Here he must have made a long stay, stopping at <sup>least</sup> several months. There were knotty problems and troublesome controversies to be settled. Above all, there were the developing heresies which had to be rooted out. There was also the same necessity for visiting the other congregations of the province, especially that at Colosse. Despite the difficulties of the work, Paul's stay at Ephesus must have been a season of rejoicing and of mutual refreshment for him and his Ephesian friends. There were the memories of Paul's first stay in Ephesus, which lasted more than two years, to recall, and the apostle had so many later experiences to relate. We gather from 2 Tim. 4, 19 that his old friends Aquila and Priscilla, had again removed to Ephesus from Rome, driven there by the persecutions. Here, as also in 2 Tim. 1, 16-18, Onesiphorus is mentioned as another one of the apostle's outstanding friends.

From 1 Tim. 1, 3 we note that Paul went from Ephesus into Macedonia, leaving Timothy as his representative at Ephesus. There he undoubtedly visited the leading churches again. How he must have been reminded of his second missionary journey when he had first planted the Gospel on European soil! We wonder if his old converts at Philippi were still living, Lydia who had received him and his co-workers into her house, and the jailer, whom he had saved in a double sense. At Thessalonica, too, where the church had first met in the house of Jason, and at Berea, where he had found a Bible-searching people, he must have remembered under what difficulties the Church had been founded and must have fervently thanked God for preserving it through the years. Again he passed through magnificent Athens, where a cloak of mental brilliance concealed abject spiritual poverty. And finally he reached Corinth with its large and flourishing congregation. What a joy to be once more the guest of Gaius, and to see Erastus and Quartus and his many other friends there again, Rom. 16, 23. It is not at all unlikely that Paul spent that first winter after his return in Corinth, the winter of 65-66, as he had once before toward the close of the third missionary journey in 56-57. What leads us to think this likely is that it seems probable that he set out to labor on the island of Crete the following Spring.

Paul had always before embarked on a new venture in the spring of the year, when voyaging again became possible. So it was quite likely in the spring of the year when he set out with Titus for the island of Crete just south-east of Greece, where we imagine him to have spent the winter. Crete had played an important role in the history of the people living on the shores of the Aegean and the eastern Mediterranean 1500 years earlier. At that time it was the center of an empire and of the so-called Minoan civilization. It is only in recent years that through excavations the remains of the ancient civilization have been brought to light. But Paul would not have been greatly interested in any ruins of that civilization which he might have been able to view, for he had come to Crete to make a systematic effort at evangelizing the island. Previously he had briefly stopped at the island when being taken a prisoner to Rome, Acts 27, 13, but, of course he had no opportunity to preach the Gospel there. We think it probable, though, that there were a number of Christians on the island when Paul went there with Titus. Cretans are mentioned in the Acts among the eye-witnesses of Pentecost, Acts 2, 11. In later years the seed of the Gospel was very apt to be wafted there from the coast cities of the Aegean, where it was blossoming so luxuriously. It would be strange also if the

Christians on the island had not already gathered themselves together in little groups here and there. True, Paul, as he traveled from city to city, may have planted the cross in new places. It seems that no apostle or apostolic helper had ever been on the island to evangelize it. This Paul now succeeded in doing, evidently organizing a number of Christian congregations. All this we gather from the epistle which Paul wrote to Titus, whom he left on the island to complete what was still wanting in the organization of the churches, which was mainly the selection of pastors for the churches, Tit. 1, 5.

v We think that it was some time before leaving Crete that Paul wrote to Timothy in Ephesus the epistle we call 1 Timothy. We have heard that Paul left Timothy in Ephesus as his representative when he went into Macedonia, 1 Tim. 1, 3. That was perhaps in the former fall. It was now more than half a year since Paul had parted from his co-worker. He knew the difficulties of the appointment with which he had entrusted Timothy. And though he hoped to return to Ephesus shortly himself to see how things were faring, yet it seems probable that he will be delayed, 1 Tim. 3, 14, 15. Hence Paul decides to write a letter of instruction to his deputy, so that he may be guided and encouraged in his work. These facts would point to spring or the early summer of 65 as the time of writing and Crete as the place, although we must recognize that there is the possibility that it was written sooner, while Paul was still in Macedonia or in Greece. We think, however, that if the supposition that Paul went to Crete at this time is correct, then the words of 1 Tim. 3, 14, "hoping to come unto thee shortly" point to Crete as the place of writing. We must remember that the chronology of this period rests largely upon conjecture.

From an examination of 1 Timothy, and 2 Timothy as well, we gain a little insight into conditions in the church at Ephesus at this time. We are pained to note that the church continued to be bothered by false teachers. In fact one main reason why Paul wrote was to exhort Timothy to counteract the ever-threatening heresies. Again their complexion has changed somewhat. These new deceivers desired to be "teachers of the Law." They brought up the old heresy that the Gospel was not sufficient, but was to be supplemented by the loftier teaching of the law. Abstaining from marriage and from meats was one of their recommendation, 1 Tim. 4, 3. Yet when it came to stating their positive beliefs, they themselves had but a vague idea of what they were trying to assert, 1, 7. They spoke in a proud, opinionated manner, but they were in reality ignorant, trying to cover the poverty of their religious knowledge with endless disputations, 1 Tim. 6, 4. Their crude teachings were compounded of a mixture of Bible genealogies, and false science, 1 Tim. 1, 4; 4, 7; 6, 20; see also Titus 1, 10. 11. 14. Their strange doctrine is merely described in general terms, so that we cannot identify it more closely, but Timothy, of course, knew just what it was. It was nothing but a lot of fantastic ideas gathered from the rubbish heap of a decadent Judaism and heathenism. In endeavoring to foist these upon the Christians, they did not hesitate to deny some of the very fundamentals of the Christian faith, as the resurrection, 2 Tim. 2, 18. Perhaps they adopted the allegorical device in denying the resurrection of the body, saying that it is merely the resurrection of the soul from the death of ignorance to the life of truth and hence was already past. There were not perhaps many of the Ephesian Christians influenced by these perverters of the truth, yet they were able to seduce some of the weak, women especially, 2 Tim. 3, 6. They were making trouble and stirring up strife. Therefore Timothy was to counteract their influence. That he was to do first by admonishing them, 1 Tim. 1, 3. He was, however, to refuse to be drawn into debate with them, 1 Tim. 4, 7, but was rather simply to proclaim the sound doctrine unto which he had attained, 1 Tim. 4, 6; 16. If these measures should fail to silence the errorists, then Timothy should withdraw himself from them, 1 Tim. 6, 5. This is but a way of saying that such should be separated or excommunicated from the Christian congregation. In 1 Tim. 1, 20 Paul reminds Timothy

that when he was yet at Ephesus, he had delivered Hymeneus and Alexander to Satan; see also 2 Tim. 2, 17; 4, 17. Timothy should deal similarly with all unrepentant and hardened sinners. Besides this instruction as to how he was to deal with false teachers, Paul in 1 Timothy gives particulars concerning Timothy's other duties as the superintendent of the church at Ephesus. But it would lead too far afield to go into these other matters. We must rather turn to a brief consideration of the Epistle to Titus.

We heard that when Paul felt constrained to leave Crete because his presence was more urgently needed in other places that he left Titus behind to complete the work of organizing the newly established churches. He was to ordain elders in every city so that the congregations might have properly qualified men to serve them, Tit. 1, 5-9. Titus himself was well qualified for the superintendency of the new field. He was one of Paul's most trusted lieutenants. Once before we have seen him sent on the difficult mission to Corinth with Paul's first Epistle when all was in a state of turmoil there. He handled the situation with the skill of a master, so that where he later met Paul in Macedonia the apostle could rejoice in his report. He then returned with Paul's second Epistle and finished the work he had begun so well. Years passed by in which we heard nothing of Titus though he was no doubt active. Now when Paul needs a tactful, firm, trustworthy administrator, he chooses his faithful friend Titus. From Titus 1, 10-16 and 3, 9-11 we see that the same heresies that had taken root at Ephesus were also threatening the churches of Crete. The false teachers are characterized as being "of the circumcision." So they were Jews who wanted to be Christians and yet gave heed to Jewish fables and commandments of men, and were occupied with foolish questions and genealogies, as well as contentions and strivings about the law. These vain talkers and deceivers succeeded in subverting whole houses. The Cretans were particularly susceptible to the influence of these false teachers because of their national traits. Paul quotes from one of their old poets who had the reputation of being a seer, Epimenides, who lived about 600 B. C., and stated (in his *ἑπι Χρησίου*) that the Cretans are always liars, evil beasts, idle gluttons. Then he adds, "This witness is true." Indeed, the Cretans had a general bad reputation among the peoples of antiquity. Lying was their most common fault. They were jealous and quarrelsome among themselves, though usually ready to unite against any common outside foe. And finally they were said to be gluttonous and sensual. But Paul evidently considered them far from hopeless. He exhorts Titus to rebuke them sharply. And as for the false teachers, their mouths must be stopped. These heretics are to be admonished a first and a second time, and then, if still unrepentant, they are to be rejected. Thus were the Christians to be safeguarded from error and preserved in sound doctrine.

These two sections of Titus, as well as the others in which the apostle informs Titus how he is to deal with certain classes of Christians remind us very much of 1 Timothy. Indeed, there are so many similarities between the two that we are forced to conclude that they were written not so far apart. If 1 Timothy was written in early summer of 66, then Titus was likely written in the late summer of the same year. When Paul had left Crete, he most likely went to Ephesus again, 1 Tim. 3, 14. Whether he wrote Titus from Ephesus, or whether by the time he wrote he had pushed on to some other city, we can't say. All of Paul's movements during this last year of his activity are veiled in obscurity. We have the notation, though, in Tit. 3, 12 that Zenas the lawyer and Apollos left Paul's side on a journey which would take them through Crete. This gave Paul the opportunity to write a letter to Titus and to send it to him by these messengers. He tells Titus in 4, 12 that he will send either Artemis or Tychicus to relieve him, and that he should then make his way to Nicopolis, where they would spend the winter together. If Paul had already decided where to winter, it must have already been at least late summer when he wrote. There were two cities by name of Nicopolis. One was

on the border of Macedonia and Thrace. The other was in Epirus, having been built by Augustus in memory of his great naval victory at Actium over Mark Antony and Cleopatra in 31 B. C., which made him master of the world. This Nicopolis was a Roman colony and a city of the first rank, and this was therefore the Nicopolis at which Paul most likely planned to winter. Perhaps from there he planned to set out for Dalmatia the following spring, for he had once visited neighboring Illyricum, Rom. 15, 19, and later from Rome he sent Titus to Dalmatia, 2 Tim. 4, 10.

But it is uncertain whether Paul got to winter in Nicopolis or not. Some think he was arrested after having spent the winter there, others think that he never got to winter at Nicopolis as he had planned. We favor the latter view. We suppose that either from Ephesus, where he may have been ever since leaving Crete, or if not, then from Macedonia he journeyed to Troas and that he was arrested in that city. Our reason for this view is found in 1 Tim. 4, 13, where he asks for his cloak, books, and parchment which he left there in the house of Carpus. On the basis of this direction the view has found favor with many that Paul was suddenly taken into custody by Roman soldiers while ministering to the church at Troas and taken away so suddenly that he did not have the opportunity of taking these belongings with him. It must be granted of course that Paul may simply have left these things with Carpus to be unencumbered and that the arrest occurred some other place. But we have additional bits of evidence to corroborate this view. From 2 Tim. 1, 16-18 it would seem that Paul was taken to Ephesus as a prisoner, where Onesiphorus ministered unto him in his bonds, as he also did later in Rome. Ephesus was the capital of Asia, and if Paul had been arrested at Troas, he would be apt to be tried before the pro-consul at Ephesus. It is suggested that the Jews, when they became aware of Paul's renewed activities in the East, brought new charges against him and through the influence of Poppaea, who wielded such an influence over Nero and was a convert to Judaism, were successful in having instructions sent out for his arrest. At Ephesus there is a tower still pointed out amid the ruins of that city which is called the Prison of St. Paul, and this, it is held, is the place where the apostle was detained while awaiting his transportation to Rome. Ignatius, the bishop of Antioch, in 150 likened himself to Paul in that he also was sent from Ephesus to Rome to suffer martyrdom. Possibly Paul again, as a Roman citizen, appealed to Caesar; possibly the governor did not like to execute Paul and, as Pliny did with Christians, sent him to Nero. At Ephesus, then, Paul bade farewell to Timothy and left him weeping bitterly, 2 Tim. 1, 4. If the notation of 2 Tim. 4, 20 concerning Erastus and Trophimus applies at this point, as it probably does, then Paul was taken from Ephesus to Miletus, where Trophimus, who had accompanied the party, was left behind sick, and then from Miletus to Corinth, where Erastus was left, being directed by Paul no doubt to look after that field. There is another tradition connected with Paul's last stop at Corinth which contradicts the sequence of events as we have conceived them. It is reported by Eusebius (Histor. Eccles., ii, 25) and is the passage in which Dionysius, one of the early bishops of Corinth, speaks of Peter and Paul as having met in that city to publish the glad tidings for the last time there, and thence "together departing for Italy, there terminating their apostolate together by martyrdom." From these words themselves are vague and this tradition, even though it be of the second century, may not faithfully report the facts. That Peter and Paul both suffered martyrdom in Rome about the same time may very well be true, but we doubt that they met by appointment at Corinth and traveled to Rome together.

But whatever the circumstances under which the arrest occurred, and whatever the causes that led to it, it is clear that Paul was again a prisoner at Rome. The Rome



which Paul beheld on his return in the fall of 66 bore little resemblance to the city which he left in the spring of 62. Two-thirds of the city had been consumed by the flames and a new city had arisen on the ashes of the old. Nero had spared nothing in hastening the reconstruction and in making the new city to outshine the glory of the ancient one. There were broad and regular streets instead of crooked lanes. The buildings were all of regular proportions. The "Golden House" of Nero was already renowned far and wide. The second imprisonment was not accompanied by any of the special privileges which had lightened the first one. This time he was incarcerated from the very first. So rigid was Paul's confinement that Onesiphorus, who had refreshed Paul at Ephesus, now found him only after a diligent search, 2 Tim. 1, 17. It should be recognized, however, that Paul does not complain of any harsh treatment and that his friends were free to visit him. These, though, had largely forsaken him and it was this circumstance which filled him with sorrow. Already in 2 Tim. 1, 15 he laments over the fact that the Asiatic converts were turned away from him; he had apparently at least counted on Phygellus and Hermogenes (the reference to "they which are in Asia" does not readily fit into the picture). But there had been far more illustrious disciples with Paul when he had arrived in Rome: Titus, Luke, Tychicus, Crescens, and Demas, 2 Tim. 4, 9-12. Of these Demas alone is branded by Paul for his abandonment. Three of the others had been sent away by Paul at the beginning of his imprisonment on missions, Titus to Dalmatia to evangelize that country, Tychicus to Ephesus, and Crescens to distant Galatia. There is no censure in Paul's mention of these three; he simply informs Timothy of their departure. Only Luke remained with him. When we think of the large circle of fellow missionaries whom Paul had about him at times (see Col. 4, 10-14), then we can well imagine how in this hour of his extremity a sense of distressing loneliness must have settled on him at seeing with no exception the place of his lieutenants vacant.

We have Paul's own account of the first proceedings in his trial, 2 Tim. 4, 16, 17. When he was arraigned before the court, he stood entirely alone. Whatever friends might have been with him in Rome at the time forsook him at the trial, for terror had frozen their courage. Prejudices were still rife against the Christians in Rome at this time and a public confession of faith might very well have invited arrest. Remembering this, the apostle, while feeling keenly the bitterness of their silence, besought God not to lay it to their charge. But though men forsook him, God stood by him and gave him strength to proclaim once more and thankfully the blessed Gospel, so that all the Gentiles might hear it. There was no doubt a great throng of curiosity seekers attending the trial, representatives of many nations. So ably did Paul conduct his own defence, and so impressively did he preach the Gospel, that his accusers were left speechless and he was delivered out of the mouth of the lion for that day, the court being adjourned. Some have thought that under the figure of the lion Paul referred to Nero. If his trial took place in the year 67, however, that could not be, for the emperor spent this year in Greece. The "lion" spoken of may have been one of the emperor's ministers, whom he left behind, Tigellinus, his prime favorite, who was Prefect of the Praetorium, or the freedman Helius, whom the tyrant had invested with full powers over Rome and the Senate. It is not certain however, that Paul's trial was conducted personally by any of Nero's influential ministers. Indeed, Clement of Rome would lead us to infer that the apostle had to do with a mere assembly of magistrates.

When Paul again entered his cell upon returning from his first hearing, he recognized the fact that the renewal of his trial would follow at no late date and would inevitably prove fatal to him. His foes were too powerful and the government was too prejudiced against the Christians for him to hope to escape a second time.

However, it appeared that he would languish for quite some time yet in prison, as he had on the occasion of his former imprisonment. The weary days of imprisonment were lightened somewhat by the presence of Luke, who we can be sure spent much of his time at the side of his beloved friend. It may very well be that Luke had been absent at the time of the first trial, having been sent away on a short mission. He was now assisted in his ministrations to the prisoner by some of the most distinguished members of the church of Rome, which was by now recovering from the persecution. In 2 Tim. 4, 21 Paul sends greetings from Eubulus, Pudens, Linus, and Claudia besides "all the brethren."

But these faithful disciples could not divert Paul's thoughts from the end, which he knew was inevitable. In reading 2 Timothy a person sees that Paul does not, as when he wrote Philemon and Colossians, expect to be acquitted. There are no plans for future trips. Paul's look is directed heavenward: "I am now ready to be offered and the time of my departure is at hand," 4, 6; also 7.8. In this solemn period of preparation Paul longs to see his best-beloved disciple again. It was toward the middle of summer. There might still be time for a letter to reach Ephesus and for Timothy to come before the end. One feels the ardor of his longing when he writes, "greatly desiring to see thee," 1, 4; "do thy diligence to come shortly unto me," 4, 9; "do thy diligence to come before winter," 4, 21. And it is pleasant to read that he longs also for Mark who had been restored to his confidence, 4, 11. The cloak and books and parchments which had been left at Troas Timothy should also bring along, The cloak he could make good use of in his chilly, damp cell. The books and parchments would help him pass the time, and when he would no longer need them, he would bequeath them to his friends. This letter is undoubtedly the most touching of all the epistles of Paul, for it reveals him to us as he was in prison on the eve of death.

Yet though Paul was weighed down with the burden of years and personal sorrows, yet he still takes thought for the welfare of the Church. Fearing lest Timothy, who was naturally gentle and a bit timid, should not govern with a firm enough hand, Paul endeavors in the epistle to strengthen and energize him so that he carries on as a good soldier of Jesus Christ. The foes whom the apostle warns his disciple so urgently to be on his guard against, are the same heretics that he had singled out in his preceding letters. Various counsels go to make up the epistle, in all of which Paul addresses Timothy like a father to his "dearly beloved son." In his tenderness Paul can never look upon Timothy otherwise, though he had now grown to man's estate and was an able Christian worker. And he must needs now recall those first days when he had first learned to love him there in back in Lystra with his pious grandmother ~~Leta~~ and his equally pious mother Eunice, 1, 5. And the apostle wants to arouse in him the fervor of those early days and to that end holds before him the model of his own ministry when he set out on his first mission and established the church amid many afflictions at Antioch, Iconium, and Lystra, 3, 10.11. Yes, Paul writes as a father to his son and does all he can to encourage him.

Paul himself needed but little encouragement, even though he was face to face with death. Though men may forsake him, yet God never will, 4, 16. 17. He says in utter confidence, "I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day," 1, 12. Though the time of his departure is at hand, he is ready to be offered, 4, 6. Triumphantly he can exclaim, "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith: henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day." And finally he can pen the exulting exclamation: "and the Lord shall deliver me from every evil work and preserve me unto His heavenly kingdom: to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen." These closing testimonies of the aged hero of the cross we could ill spare.

It was either late in 67 or early in 68 that Paul suffered a martyr's death. We do not know whether Timothy came in time to see him once more and to cheer his last days. It is likely that he did. Sometime not so long after his arrival Paul was hailed before the court again, found guilty, and condemned to death. A merciful ordinance of the Senate prescribed that ten days should elapse between the condemnation of a prisoner and his execution. We may suppose, then, that Paul had those ten days for his final preparation. Early one morning a centurian with a detachment of soldiers led the prisoner out of the city through the gate that now bears his name, down the Ostian Way for about a mile and quarter and then down another road for another three quarters of a mile to a little hollow, if ancient tradition is to be trusted in the matter. The place is now called *Aquae Salviae*, the Healing Waters. As a Roman citizen Paul was accorded death by decapitation. We can imagine him kneeling in prayer, then being speedily translated by death from the kingdom of grace, in which he labored so abundantly, to the kingdom of glory for which he so ardently longed, Phil. 2, 23; also 21.

It is said that Christians carried the body half way back to Rome and that it was buried by Lucina in her burial-ground about a mile from the Ostian Gate. In 258 an edict of Valerian put all the Christian cemeteries under the law of sequestration, and forbade the Christians to gather there. Owing to the dread of seeing the tombs of Paul and of Peter profaned (tradition states that Peter died on the same day and was buried close by the gardens of Nero.), their remains were transferred to a locality called "Ad Catacumbas" a little over two miles on the Appian Way, from which some years later they were brought back to their original resting places. Constantine, the first Christian emperor, encased the bones in solid metal and built a church over the grave. In 388 the work of enlarging the church was commenced, it being finished in 395. The magnificent church is adorned with twenty four columns of the wonderful purple-veined Phrygian marble. On July 28, 1838, during work on the new basilica, there was found an inscription on marble, which is supposed to date back to Constantine, consisting of three words which sum up the apostle's life and greatness--*Paulo Apostolo Mart.*, Paul Apostle Martyr.