

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

## Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

---

Bachelor of Divinity

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

---

4-15-1926

### The Last Years of the Life of St. Paul

Walter Heyne

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir\_heynew@csl.edu

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



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

---

#### Recommended Citation

Heyne, Walter, "The Last Years of the Life of St. Paul" (1926). *Bachelor of Divinity*. 711.  
<https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv/711>

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 Bachelor of Divinity by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact [seitzw@csl.edu](mailto:seitzw@csl.edu).

**THE LAST YEARS  
OF THE  
LIFE OF ST. PAUL.**

**Thesis presented by**

**Walter Heyne**

**for the degree of Bachelor of Divinity.**

**April 15, 1926  
Class of 1926.**

THE CLOSING YEARS  
OF THE  
LIFE OF ST. PAUL.



The question of Paul's last years is one which has been agitating the minds of Bible scholars for many years. The failure of Holy Writ to give us any definite information as to the time and place of his death is to a great extent responsible for this controversy. Tradition, likewise, while it is unanimous on some points relating to the Apostle's last days and death, leaves us in the lurch when we approach the question of the exact date of Paul's death. The result of this uncertainty is not merely a contention regarding the date of Paul's martyrdom, but it involves much more, namely, the question whether the Book of Acts records the end of Paul's activity, or whether there is a release from the captivity, a subsequent activity, and a second imprisonment, in which the Apostle met his death; for we may say now that the death of the Apostle in a Roman captivity is the one point on which tradition is unanimous.

The chief source-book for the life of St. Paul is the Book of Acts, as written by Luke. We have in this record almost a short biography of the great missionary, from his conversion to the time of his Roman captivity. But there the account ends very abruptly, neither directly stating, nor even plainly intimating, what happened after those two years spent by Paul as a captive in Rome.

To the cursory reader of Scriptures, the abrupt close of Acts would prove very puzzling, and, indeed, it has proved puzzling to many a theologian. But if the reader then heard that tradition relates that Paul suffered martyrdom under Nero, and that this captivity also falls into the time of Nero, he would believe to have found the key to the situation, even though he could not explain why the Book of Acts failed to record the death if it followed upon the captivity there mentioned.

If the question were indeed as simple as that, we could stop here, and there would be no need of entering into the following rather lengthy discussion. But let us see whether there are any biographical records regarding Paul's later years which lead us to suppose that he did not die at the end of that captivity. We soon find that

t

there are traditions which evidently postulate a release from the first Roman captivity. That makes the question more complicated, and we shall now have to investigate these traditions to see whether they can possibly be fitted into the Biblical situation, or whether they are perhaps spurious.

But the Book of Acts is not our only Biblical source of information regarding Paul's career. There are also his epistles, from which we garner many facts, otherwise unrecorded. There are, all in all, thirteen epistles which we generally accept as definitely Pauline and as canonical, and all but three of these fit very well into the course of events as depicted in Acts. Those three are the so-called Pastoral Epistles, the two to Timothy and one to Titus. How about these three? If those three epistles were written by Paul, but we have difficulty in placing them into the known record of his life, when were they written? Evidently in some period not recorded in Acts. And so we shall also have to consider these Pastoral Epistles carefully to see whether they have any bearing on the question of St. Paul's last years.

So the question resolves itself to this:

Did St. Paul suffer death at the end of the captivity described in the Book of Acts, or was he released and did he enjoy another period of activity into which we can fit the traditions and the Pastoral Epistles?

It shall be not a small part of our program to test the genuine character of the epistles mentioned and the trustworthiness of the traditions involved, and, in the case of the unreliable character of the traditions, to look into the possibilities of finding a place for the epistles under consideration in the course of events as we know it definitely, in other words, into the period covered by the Book of Acts.

Before we begin with the main part of our discussion, however, let us note whether there are any statements in the New Testament which forbid the supposition of a release etc. If there were any such, they would, of course, change the hue of our investigation. While we are doing that, we shall at the same time take note of any indications outside of the Pastorals which suggest the possibility and the probability of a release.

So we shall consider the following topics:

1. Biblical evidence outside of the Pastorals for or against a release from the first captivity.
2. Evidence of the Pastorals.
  - a) Their authenticity.
  - b) Their historical situation, and what it demands.
3. Evidence from tradition.
4. On the basis of the above investigation, a short account of the Apostle's life after his captivity.

While this subject is generally treated in the reverse order from that which I have adopted, I feel that this is the satisfactory method. If we have established the authenticity of the Pastorals, we can quote their statements as absolutely authoritative, and we have sure ground underfoot. If we begin with the traditions, on the other hand, we must always limit our statements by the possibility of the untrustworthiness of the tradition, and the case would still have to be settled by Biblical evidence. We merely use the traditions to show that extra-Biblical writers corroborate Biblical evidence. On the other hand, the matter shall be presented so, that the case will not lose its force for anyone who refuses to admit the Pastorals as inspired authority.

The first point which we shall take up under the subject of Biblical evidence outside of the Pastorals is that of the close of the Book of Acts. The words read as follows: "And Paul dwelt two whole years in his own hired house, and received all that came in unto him, preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching those things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ, with all confidence, no man forbidding him." Acts 28, 30, 31. As mentioned in the introduction, this close is very abrupt and leaves us absolutely at a loss as to the possible outcome of Paul's imprisonment after the two years.

What, if anything, can we take out of this peculiar close? Some conclude that Paul met his death at the end of the two years there mentioned; for, say they, Luke would not have broken off so abruptly if Paul had been released and had continued his missionary activities. If asked why Paul's death is not mentioned in a few short words in order to make the account complete, they reply that it was only the author's purpose to show the spread of the gospel thru the Roman Empire, and that purpose had been accomplished. Some also answer that Luke did not wish to close his book, which had recorded the triumph of the Gospel, with something akin to a defeat, something that would becloud the else so cheerful and sanguine atmosphere of his account. Those who see in Luke's work an attempt to show the relation of harmony which existed between the civil authorities and Christianity explain his omission of a death-notice by saying that his execution would have contradicted this purpose. As to the argument advanced <sup>that</sup> Luke did not know of Paul's death, that is almost ridiculous; for, surely, if he could definitely say "two years", he must have known what brought those two years to a close. All these answers fail to satisfy.

On the other hand, people have drawn the opposite conclusion from this ending. It is clear, they say, that a change came about in the Apostle's situation at the close of the two years, as indicated a few lines above. If that change was brought about by Paul's death, it would indeed be difficult to explain why Luke did not record it as a fitting climax to his narrative. The other possibility is that he gained his freedom. And there the other side asks why Luke didn't record that. That question is also not so easy to answer, but we can say that there was no special reason for relating the liberation as long as he did not wish to continue Paul's history. If he had closed his book with the deliverance of Paul, one might again ask why he didn't continue.

In my mind, the close of Acts is less peculiar under the assumption of Paul's release than under the assumption of his Martyrdom.

In this connection, we might mention the very interesting hypothesis of a third book to be written by Luke. This theory, advanced, or rather championed by men like Zahn, Conybeare and Howson, and Frey (Die letzten Lebensjahre Pauli.), takes up the idea of a continued activity of Paul and says that Luke had the intention of recording Paul's release and his subsequent labors in a third book. While this theory has no hold in the realm of fact, it is based on the τὸν μὲν πρῶτον λόγον of Acts 1,1. It is true, that one would expect πρότερον of a finished writer like Luke, but one must also not forget that in many cases the superlative encroached upon the rights of the more correct comparative, and no absolute argument whatsoever can be drawn from the words in question.

Outside of its closing words, Acts also speaks for Paul's acquittal. The entire judicial proceedings, from Jerusalem to Rome give not so much as a hint that Paul is facing death. Yes, there is not a single feature of the description of the journey to Rome that would point to its being a death-journey.

The words of Paul, Acts 20, 25, have always been considered a stronghold by those who oppose the second captivity. They point to the fact that Paul is there expecting death, and that he says, "I know that ye all - - - shall see my face no more." These people stress the οἶδα of this passage, and they claim that the Apostle is here speaking with Apostolic prescience. Especially do they say that Luke would not have recorded those words if they had not come true. But let us note that Paul is expecting death in Jerusalem and not in Rome. So why did Luke record that expectation, since, as every one must confess, it was not realized. Almost the same argument might be applied to the statements of Paul, Rom. 15, 24, 28. in regard to his going to Rome, which, if they were fulfilled, would speak for the second captivity. The difference is, however, that the words in Romans were not written post eventum as were those of Acts. The strongest point against those who insist that this had to be realized, is the οἶδα of Phil. 1,25., where we read the strong statement, καὶ τοῦτο πεποιθώς οἶδα, ὅτι μὲν ἔτι καὶ παρεμένω πᾶσιν ὑμῖν. So we will have οἶδα against οἶδα, which will, at best neutralize the argument. One should expect, however, that the second οἶδα would rescind the former. The οἶδα-argument is good only for such as believe that Luke invented the speeches of Paul after his death. (Note 1.)

In the above paragraph we mentioned the Epistle to the Philippians. This epistle contains another

strong indication that Paul was released from prison. This epistle is quite generally admitted to have been written near the end of Paul's two years' captivity in Rome. Now, anyone reading Phil. cannot escape the spirit of optimism which pervades this letter, and he must be struck by the confidence with which Paul hopes to again see the Philippians. (Note esp. Phil. 1,25; 2, 24) So The letter to Philemon, also written from the captivity shows a similar situation, for there Paul make reservations for his lodging during his projected visit to Colossae, Philemon v.22.

As a possible indication of further journeys one might quote the previously mentioned passages from Romans.(15. 24. 28.) While it is admitted that these words contain no proof of a visit to Spain, they, nevertheless, show that such a journey was in Paul's mind, and that he would not consider his mission finished until he had reached Spain.

To sum up, we would say that Biblical evidence outside of the Pastorals speaks strongly for a possible release from the Roman captivity, and there is no positive indication against it.



And now we shall proceed to a consideration of the Pastoral Epistles of St. Paul. As was mentioned before in passing, the Pastorals present all sorts of difficulties when we attempt to place them into the period of Paul's activity covered by Acts. It shall now be our object to examine these epistles closely to see what bearing they have on our subject. Due to the fact that these epistles have been more widely rejected than any other of Paul's epistles, it will be well to first look into the matter of their authenticity, so that we may have firm ground on which to base our arguments.

The criticism of the Pastorals was really begun by Schleiermacher, who denied the authenticity of 1 Tim. He was followed by Eichhorn and DeWette, who went him one better and rejected all three letters of this group. Baur was the next one to take up the hammer, and after he was through, the letters had not been written before the middle of the second century, in fact, could not have been written before that time. DeWette, while he had denied the Pauline character of the letters, still admitted the possibility of their having been written in the first century.

Let us, in the first place, now answer the objections of these critics. One of their first arguments is that the historical situation which they demand cannot be fitted into the life of Paul. But they themselves are beginning with the assumption that Paul died in the first Roman captivity, which is almost equivalent to begging the question. In the second place, however, that is just a reason why they should be genuine, for surely a forger would <sup>fit</sup> his writing to the actual facts.

The critics maintain that the language is unlike that of the other Pauline writings. They point to the "hapax legomena", which occur in these letters with unusual frequency. But that can be explained by the change of time and circumstances, by difference in subject-matter and addressees. Smith has a very interesting argument in regard to these words. He calls attention to the fact that twenty-eight of the "hapax legomena" in the Pastorals are words otherwise found only in Luke, and he points out that many of them are medicinal terms, which perhaps went over into Paul's vocabulary due to his frequent intercourse with Luke, the beloved physician, during his last years. The Dictionary of the Apostolic Church (Vol. II, p. 143f) remarks that Paul has more "hapax legomena" the longer he writes. Thus, there are five per chapter in Thessalonians, seven in Romans, eighteen in Eph. and Col., ten in Phil., and thirteen in the Pastorals. Thus, a really conclusive argument might have been drawn if the number of these words had been small.

It can also <sup>not</sup> be denied that there is a decided change of style in the Pastorals. Shouldn't Paul have the privilege of changing his style in the course of years, and according as he is writing to one person or to another, and upon one subject or another. A. T. Robertson says very well in his article on St. Paul in the Inter. Stand. Bible Ency., "Style is a function of the subject as well as a mark of a man. Besides, style changes with one's growth. It would have been remarkable if all four groups (of Paul's letters) had shown no change in vocabulary and style. . . . The Past. Eps. belong to Paul's old age and deal with personal and ecclesiastical matters in a more or less reminiscential way, with less of vehement energy than we get in the earlier epistles, but this situation is what one should presumably expect."

Alford, in his Prolegomena to the Pastorals, believes to find striking evidence for their genuineness just in their language. He believes these letters to have been written by Paul's own hand, and he gains his argument by comparing them with other supposedly autographic epistles. While I do not think much of this argument for the genuineness, it does go to show that one can prove almost anything by means of the "Sprachbeweis".

Zahn points out in this connection that a forger would have betrayed himself by trying to imitate Paul, in which process some blunders would have crept in. But we do not find such blunders. He likewise stresses the fact that 2 Tim. has a peculiar stamp and character of its own, which would be hard to explain if all three were the work of a forger, but easy to explain if 2 Tim. were written by Paul under different circumstances.

So we see that the argument from language by no means settles the unauthentic character of these epistles.

An argument advanced especially by DeWette is that the Epistles are without a definite object, or that they do not keep that object consistently in view. This objection need scarcely be answered since it is difficult to ascertain where DeWette gets the right to arbitrarily set up an "object" as he does, for each epistle. For example, he says that the object of the 1 Tim. is to fight against heretics, that of the 2. to tell Timothy to come to Rome. We shall lose nothing by admitting that Paul does not always keep DeWette's object consistently in view.

It is opposed to the Pastorals also, that more emphasis is laid on the hierarchical element of the church than in Paul's other epistles. We should, however, expect this close to the end of the Apostolic Age. We know that in the period following it was, humanly speaking, saved from destruction by its admirable organization. Paul foresaw this necessity in the threatening heresies. Moreover, as the Apostles were about to be withdrawn, Paul had to see to the preservation of that order which they themselves had supplied hitherto.

It was formerly maintained with great vehemence that the state of ecclesiastical government in the Pastorals was much too far advanced for Paul's time. This argument has, however, been dropped even by many negative critics. Alford shows clearly that there are no traces of the later monarchical episcopacy in these epistles, as was claimed by some opponents. The simplest government is referred to here. Ramsay says in an article in the Expositor pertaining to this subject, "The organization of the Church in the Pastoral Epistles, therefore, is not advanced apparently one step beyond that of the churches in Philippi in A. D. 61."

The institution of an order of widowhood (1 Tim. 5, 9) is not probable in so early a period, say the critics. But we say that "the institution, (as far as it is implied in 1 Tim) is just what might be expected to arise immediately from the establishment of a class of widows supported by the church (Acts 6, 1.), such as existed from the very earliest period of the church." (Conybeare and Howson App., No. 8, ¶, 16). (On Baur's confusion of this order with the order of widowhood mentioned by Ignatius, Smyrn. c. 13, see also the above reference.)

The argument that Timotheus could hardly have been considered young after the first captivity is, of course, a very doubtful and subjective one, due to the relative meaning of the word "young" or "youth". While Timothy was, no doubt, over thirty, he might still be young for the responsible position which he held, a position in which he had to deal with many who were much older.

The somewhat depreciatory tone in which Paul speaks of Timothy, as opposed to the good opinion which he expresses of him otherwise, is urged against the Pauline authorship. But Paul has, no doubt, seen so much defection (2 Tim. 4, 16) that he would expect it of anyone. Timothy may even have shown some reluctance about unnecessarily exposing himself to danger. Above all, however, what interest would a forger have in thus depicting a man, whose memory was probably held sacred by those to whom he was writing.

But the favorite subject of Baur was the <sup>j</sup> Gnostic heresy, which he says is attacked in the Pastorals whereas it didn't exist till towards the close of the first century. Yes, Baur even claimed that Marcion was attacked, and he came much later. On this latter point, he has again been forsaken by many of his friends. We say in regard to this entire argument, however, that gnosticism is not attacked, but only an incipient form of it. cf. 1Cor. 8, 1. The heresies can - so says Purves - be well explained if we assume Jewish false teachers similar to those of Colossians.

In fact, they suit the first century better than the second. As Zahn shows very well, there is a Judaizing tendency in these heresies which is opposed to the later gnosticism. The similarity of these teachers with those of Colossians is also a refutation of the negative argument. Alford explains that both tenets and practices predicated of them will best find their explanation by regarding them as the marks of a state of transition between Judaism through its ascetic form and gnosticism proper, as we afterwards find it developed. They are not the Judaizers of former epistles, nor the gnostics of a later day.

The fact that the heretics are vaguely described as future, yet occasionally as present, the present and future seeming to be blended, is easily explained by the fact that the heresies were still in their incipient form, and that worse was still to come.

Having thus answered the main arguments advanced by the impugners of the genuine character of the Pastorals, let us now turn to a consideration of the internal testimony for their authenticity.

In the first place, the opponents have not been able to find a sufficient reason for their forgery. If they are directed against gnosticism, this is not evident. There is no organization suggested different from that which was usually found in the churches, and which might be especially fitted to cope with the dangers of the gnostic heresy. At least, this does not appear from the remarks of these epistles.

The early date is proven, rather than disproven by the synonymous use of the terms *ἡλικιωνοὶ* and *ἐπίσκοποι*.

There are about twenty people mentioned in the epistles. If these letters were written about 90 A. D., were not some of these people still living, who might have shown up the forgery?

Again, the entire manner in which the author refers to personal matters points to the fact that he is not a forger. It is generally admitted that the circumstances of these letters do not fit into Acts. Now, if a forger were trying by his writing to establish new conditions, or, let us say, to prove that Paul was active after his first Roman captivity, it is inconceivable that he should not have made this object more evident, instead of merely casting down casual remarks from which we must with difficulty deduce the historical situation which his writing implies. On the other hand, if he wished merely to gain Apostolic authority for his letter, would it not have been simpler for him to fit his letter into some known portion of Paul's life, which he, no doubt, knew as well as we do?

Again, if a man were trying to artificially place himself into Apostolic times, he would have had to emphasize the nature of heresies to make himself understood in his time, when those conditions no longer prevailed. We find, however, that the conditions are only referred to in such a manner as though they were well known. Furthermore, if a man were trying to influence the church government of his time, and would, in order to avoid anachronisms refer to the church government of Paul's time, the intention to avoid anachronisms would stand in direct conflict with the intention to influence the present by the assumption of Paul's name. To use Lincoln's famous phrase, it would be a house divided against itself.

In short, a comparison of the congregational conditions and officers in the Pastorals with actual conditions shows that they can well fit into Paul's time, that they must have been written before 100 A.D., and since a forgery would surely have been detected if made before the year 100, there is no reason for doubting the genuineness of the Pastorals.

Let us now turn to the external testimony. Here we find that the external testimony is equally as strong as that of many other accepted epistles, e.g. Romans.

They are contained in the Peschito Syriac version which was made in the second century, and in the Canon Muratori. They are counted among the epistles of St. Paul. Irenaeus begins his preface with a citation of 1 Tim 1, 4, adding, *καθώς δ' ἀποστόλος φησιν*. He also quoted 2 Tim 4, 9-11 and Tit 3, 10. Clement of Alexandria quotes them directly, and quotations are found in Tertullian. Eusebius includes all three among the universally accepted canonical writings (homologoumena) H. E. III, 25. We likewise find various allusions more or less clear in the earlier Fathers, some of which are however doubtful. A good collation of quotations will be found in Alford's Prolegomena.

In view then, of this strong external evidence and in view of the fact that only the gnostics are known to have rejected them, and they for obvious reasons of their false doctrine, and in further view of the fact that the arguments advanced against the Pastorals can either be demonstrated to be false or, at least, shown to be merely subjective hypotheses, and that, on the other hand, the epistles bear no earmarks of forgery, but have all the marks of a bona fide letter, and that the conditions presupposed fit in very well with Paul's time, we see no reason why we shouldn't accept them as truly Pauline epistles.

And now we shall devote ourselves to a consideration of the historical situation of these writings. And there we find that the Pastorals demand a later time than the activity of Paul previous to his first imprisonment. It is impossible, without committing violence on the text and on all rules of common-sense to place them in that portion of Paul's career recorded in Acts.

The difficulties have been stated more clearly by no one than by Zahn, and we shall follow him quite closely in our exposition.

### The First Epistle to Timothy.

Of the three epistles, 1 Tim has the least personal references, but even at that, these few references, when combined with the data of the other two epistles, suffice to show the impossibility of placing it before the first captivity.

Before we proceed any farther, however, let us state that it is a quite generally accepted opinion among critics to-day, both on negative and positive ground, that because of the great similarity of the three epistles in thought, form, and diction, and the great points of difference from the other Pauline epistles, these three letters cannot be widely separated. This is especially true of 1 Tim and Tit, and in a lesser degree also of 2 Tim. So says Alford, e.g., on the positive side, and Julicher on the negative side.

The chief crux in 1 Tim is the statement of 1Tim 1, 3. *καὶ οὗτος παρεκλήθη ὡς προσημίται ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, περιεβήμενος εἰς Μακεδονίαν.* This trip cannot be that of Acts 20, 1, for at that time Timothy had not been in Ephesus for some time, as is presupposed 1Tim 1, 3.; But Timothy, who had just returned to Ephesus from a trip to Macedonia and Corinth, accompanied Paul on this journey to Macedonia and Greece. (2 Cor 1, 1. 9; 7. 5.) And so Timothy also accompanied Paul on his return, Acts 20, 3. 4. *ἔτ.* It can therefore not well be placed in this journey. 5.)

Some place it in the three years activity at Ephesus. So Mosheim would place it in the early part of this activity, and he says that this journey lasted nine months, the difference between Acts, 19, 8. 10. and the three years of Acts 20, 31. Wieseler, however, thinks that the false teachers could not have gotten so strong in that time. of 1 Tim 1, 3ff. Schrader thinks that Paul stayed in Ephesus to Acts 19, 21, then took journey hinted at through Macedonia to Corinth, then to Crete, where he left Titus, to Nicopolis in Cilicia (from there 1Tim and Tit.), to Antioch, and so through Galatia back to Ephesus. The great

objection to this theory, besides its rather fanciful character, is the insertion of so long a journey (two years according to Schrader himself) between Acts 19, 21 and 19, 23, without any intimation from Luke that this plan was carried out then. Wieseler himself, who has gathered the various data for placing the Pastorals before and in the first captivity, believes that 1 Tim is to be placed in an unrecorded visitation-tour which took place in the latter part of Paul's stay in Ephesus. This tour took him to Macedonia (he might very likely go that way in view of his desire to see the Thessalonians), then to Corinth, returning via Crete, where he left Titus, thence back to Ephesus. He then wrote 1 Tim from Macedonia or Achaia and Titus from Ephesus. Dr. Davidson has the same view, only that he assumes a separate visit to Macedonia and a separate one to Crete, which we shall consider later. Wieseler places these letters into the latter part of Paul's stay in Ephesus because of the advanced stage of the heresies. He, however, places them before the first Epistle to the Corinthians.

If we had only 1 Tim to deal with, this explanation might sound feasible, but even at that there are grave objections. 1) It makes Paul write 1 Cor soon after his unrecorded visit, and this is necessary to give false teachers a chance to arise. 2) In Acts 20, 29 we find Paul prophesying the false teachers, whereas here they have already done their damage. 3) The whole character of the epistle shows that it belongs not to a brief absence, but to one originally intended to last for a long time. 4) Why should Paul write this letter to Timothy after he had just left, unless Timothy sent him some questions, which is, however, not implied in the letter? 5) Davidson's theory would insert a trip to Macedonia purely for the sake of 1 Tim, while Wieseler's hypothesis would require a trip of such proportions that the silence of Acts would appear peculiar, yes, it would make the record of the Ephesian activity appear inaccurate. (Acts 19, 8-10; 20, 13. 31) 6) The presence of many tried Christians militates against the theory of an early composition. 7) How could the false teachers have gained such prominence if Paul had just left, and how could Paul have left if conditions were so bad?

So regardless of the other Pastorals, 1 Tim cannot be placed in any portion of Paul's activity prior to his imprisonment. There are, however, also relations between 1 and 2 Tim, which was probably written after 68 A.D. (as we shall see presently), that make an interval of five or six years seem impossible. We shall later see also how in combination with the letter to Titus it cannot be dated before 63. As to when and under what circumstances it was written, that question we shall reserve until we have investigated the other Pastorals. Of course, we cannot avoid the conclusion that if 1 Tim was written by Paul, as we have all reason to believe, and it cannot be placed in the record of Acts, it must have been written after that time, and that would require a release from his first captivity. But 1 Tim is the weakest link in the chain. Let us look at 2 Tim.

The Second Epistle to Timothy.

The first thing that presents itself to us when we study 2Tim is that it was written from a captivity. This at once suggests the idea of trying to place it with the other captivity letters. (Eph., Col., Phil., and Philemon) Let us see whether that is possible.

It appears that he has been in captivity for some time, 1, 8. 16; 2, 9., and at Rome 1, 17. The final cause was the fulfilling of his Apostolic duties, 1, 12. The situation is, however, altogether different from that of Eph, Col, and Philemon, and also from that of Phil. Every preaching activity is precluded. (This is not contradicted by 2, 9) 2, 9 we find him chained like a criminal. Zahn points out that Onesiphorus had trouble in finding him, and that he had to show great courage in order to bring Paul relief. This would agree with the tradition that Paul was confined in the Mamertine Prison during his second captivity, but it seems to me that Zahn takes a little too much out of the σπουδαίως ἐζητήσεν αὐτὸν of 2 Tim 1, 17, although the addition of the καὶ εὗρεν gives him some hold for his exegesis. It seems to imply that not even the Christians in Rome knew of Paul's exact whereabouts, for surely Onesiphorus would have inquired of them.

After Onesiphorus' visit, it seems that Paul's isolation has stopped. Luke is with him, 4, 11, and he would be able to enjoy the ministrations of Timothy and Mark, if they came in time, 4, 9. 11. 21. His personal condition is still such, however, that personal friends are tempted to deny any connection. Demas (Col 4, 18) has forsaken him, 4, 10. Timothy must be earnestly admonished not to be ashamed, but to endure, 1. 8. 12; 2, 3. 12; 3. 10-12; 4, 5. The whole context shows that Paul was in a captivity which at first isolated him, and which proved so dangerous that all unreliable friends thought it best to disavow all connections.

A further comparison with Phil will show that there the Gospel was benefitted by Paul's captivity, Phil 1, 12-18, the Christians were encouraged by the conduct of Paul's case. Paul's attitude at that time was one of assurance of release; he now sees no fate but martyrdom. Cf. Phil 2, 17, ἀλλὰ εἰ καὶ σπίνδομαι ἐπὶ τῇ θυσίᾳ καὶ λειτουργίᾳ τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν, "wo das Opfer als Ziel seines irdischen Lebens dargelegt wird" (Zahn), and 2 Tim 4, 6, Ἐγὼ γὰρ ἤδη σπίνδομαι, καὶ ὁ καιρὸς τῆς ἀναλύσεώς μου ἐφίστηκεν. He sees ahead only ὁ τῆς δικαιοσύνης στέφανος (v. 8) Although Paul expects his case to drag out several months - he hopes to see Timothy -, yet, an essential change in his situation seems precluded. The only release which he can expect is that which will take him to heaven. 4, 18. The fact that Paul has so many admonitions to



Timothy which he can scarcely execute on the way, seems to point to the fact that he is not so sure that he will see Timothy. He, however, does not wish to discourage Timothy by any dismal forebodings. He writes this letter like a sort of testament. Zahn points out that this conception agrees with the fact that Paul lets his mind wander back to his and Timothy's past so frequently. Under such facts of the past, of which Paul only reminds Timothy, Zahn also includes the statement, 4, 16ff.

We read in this passage, ἐρύσθην ἐκ στόματος λέοντος 417. These words state unequivocally that Paul was saved from the utmost danger by the help which the Lord gave him at that time. Zahn says that the ἡ πρώτη μου ἀπολογία, v. 16 cannot refer to a first trial in the present case, after which he remained in the severe durance described in 2 Tim, for then they would be meaningless, empty words. No matter how brilliantly he defended himself by the aid of the Lord, if he was still facing death, that could scarcely be termed an ἀπολογία ἐκ στόματος λέοντος. It must have been release of which the Apostle is here speaking. I would be disinclined to doubt the strength of Zahn's conclusion merely on the basis of the words themselves, and, in fact, many exegetes who hold that 2 Tim was written from a second captivity, do not refer it to release from the first captivity, but to an acquittal on a first charge in the present trial. So Congbeare and Howson, B. Weiss, Steinmetz. Yet we find some who share this opinion of Zahn, which is first found in Eusebius. So J. Weiss, Frey. What makes me decide for this opinion are the words, 4, 17, where the purpose is given to V. 16 as ἵνα δι' ἐμοῦ τὸ κήρυγμα πληροφορηθῆ κτλ. This end had evidently not been attained at the time of that apology. That it should be attained was an established fact for Paul as for any Christian. If Paul died, then it would be done by another. But that it might happen just through Paul and not through others, as the emphatic δι' ἐμοῦ shows, God helped him at that time and delivered him from the jaws of the lion. It couldn't refer to deliverance from the fanaticism of the Jews, Acts 25 and 26, for that did not have as a result the bringing of the Gospel to a single new people. Rome was also not the end of the world nor the goal of the missionary plans which the Apostle had cherished for years. On the other hand, he could not hope at that writing to still carry out his plan, as it is clear that he expects nothing but death.

Knoke's explanation explains the ἐρύσθην ἐκ στόματος λέοντος as a reference to Daniel's deliverance, where the ~~XX~~ has a similar phrase, to ἐρύσθην ἐκ σ. λ. Just as Persians, so says Knoke, learned of Jehovah through Daniel's delivery, so Paul was saved that by him (δι' ἐμοῦ), by his conduct and by the succor which he received, the proclamation of the Gospel might be fully and completely carried out. δι' ἐμοῦ Doesn't say that he did it personally, but that he personally received the aid which caused this. - This seems to me an extremely weak explanation for the term πληροφορηθῆ.

So it seems to follow from the passage under consideration that the plans of the Apostle, which had not been carried out before his captivity, had been carried out after he had been freed from the mouth of the lion, and now, in this captivity, had been attained; i.e. Paul resumed his mission-work after his release and preached the Gospel in countries previously untouched either by him or by some other missionary. 4, 7 gives immediate testimony to this. In Phil, he is sure he will be released. Here, τὸν δρόμον ἐπέληρα. And the difference between Phil and 2 Tim is not the result of a gloomy state of mind, it is the result of facts. Now, it is known from Rom 15, 15-29 that Paul had plans of going west of the Adriatic. Rome, however, was to be only a stopping-point. Thus we infer from Rom 15, 24, ὡς ἂν πορεύωμαι εἰς τὴν Σπανίαν. v. 28 ἀπελεύσομαι δι' ὑμῶν εἰς Σπανίαν. that if Paul wrote Rom 15 and 2 Tim 4, then 2 Tim 4, 7 shows that he was set free and also got to Spain.

The fact that he was deserted in the first apology is not in contradiction to Philippians, for the conditions there are the result of the favorable turn which Paul's trial had taken. In Phil also no friends are mentioned, he had to fight alone. Phil 1, 12ff; 16.

So if we assume the genuineness of 2 Tim, it seems a fact that the captivity in which Paul was at that time was not a continuation of his former captivity, but that he realized his hope of being freed and carried on his evangelizing work.

2 Tim also contains very strong evidence that Paul was in the Orient under other conditions than those of the account of Acts. The strongest argument for this is the statement 4, 20 that Paul had left Trophimus sick at Miletus. On the journey of Paul to Jerusalem, in the course of which he passed through Miletus, Trophimus had accompanied him, and he is expressly mentioned as in Jerusalem, Acts 21, 29. We take this as sufficient evidence that Trophimus was with Paul in Jerusalem, but if anyone does not wish to accept the testimony of Acts, we ask him why Paul should have written this to Timothy about five years later, whereas Timothy was also a companion of Paul on that journey, and had since then been with Paul in Rome. Col 1, 1; Phil 1, 1; 2, 19-23; Philemon 1. So Paul, we conclude, must have been in Miletus with Trophimus after his release from prison.

Knoke, one of the strongest exponents of the first captivity theory, gets around this difficulty by stating that the reading is wrong, and that ἐν Μιλήτῳ should read ἐν Μελίτῳ. It would then refer to the journey of Paul to Rome from Caesarea. This would alleviate some difficulty, but Knoke has, it seems, no other reason for changing the text than that the change might easily have crept into the text.

Wieseler's explanation is ingenious enough to demand a hearing. He explains the Trophimus passage of 2 Tim 4, 20

by referring to Acts 20, 2: ἐπιβάντες δὲ πλοίω Ἀδραμυττίνῳ  
 μέλλοντι πλεῖν εἰς τοὺς κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν τόπους ἄρ' ἢ Ἰθύναι.

The ship in which Paul was was one going to Adramyttum, near Troas, and they first intended to visit the cities along the Asiatic coast, and so they would have come to Miletus also. But when they got to Myra in Lycia, the centurion found a ship which was going directly to Italy, and he changed plans. Acts 27, 5ff. Trophimus had accompanied Paul to Myra, but there he became sick. So Paul left him on the other ship to be landed at Miletus. So Paul could say that he had left him in Miletus since he had left him at Myra with the express understanding that he was to be left at Miletus. While this is again a rather forced explanation, we can grant that it is a possibility of explaining this one passage.

The statement, 2, 20 that Erastus had remained at Corinth, presents another similar argument, since this also could not have been news to Timothy if Erastus had remained there on Paul's previous journey to Jerusalem. This argument Wieseler and Knoke answer somewhat better, by stressing the in sense of, he stayed there, i. e., he didn't come to Rome. Knoke says that Timothy thought that Erastus was in Rome and sent greetings. This is Paul's answer. Knoke does not have the difficulty of Timothy's being in Rome since he believes that Col, Eph, and Philemon were written from Caesarea, and that Philippians was written after 2 Tim. Wieseler accepts that Timothy was in Rome, and he suggests that Timothy, on his journey to Ephesus perhaps conveyed a summons from Paul to Erastus. In this letter, Paul tells Timothy that Erastus did not come. So while we take the two statements of 4, 20 in connection with one another, Wieseler and Knoke treat them as two altogether independent notices.

A further point in the study of 2 Tim is that the sending of Tychicus to Ephesus, 4, 12, cannot be identical with his being sent to Asia, Eph 6, 21, Col 4, 7., for Timothy would have known that also. Consequently, it must have been a later dispatching.

The stay in Troas, implied 4, 13, must be a later one than that of Acts 20. We can't imagine Paul's leaving those manuscripts there five years and then being so very anxious for them now. Tychicus had been sent to most congregations of Asia during the first captivity, and he probably returned to Rome. He could surely have gotten those objects. Outside of that, there would have been many opportunities to get those objects in five years. (Onesiphorus, Epaphras, Col 1, 7; 4, 12) The only logical conclusion, says Zahn, is that Paul was in Troas shortly before writing 2 Tim.

In conclusion, since we have seen that he was in Troas, Miletus, and probably in Corinth without Timothy shortly before he wrote this epistle, we conclude that the captivity must have been a different one from that of Acts 28.

The Epistle to Titus.

The Epistle to Titus presents a peculiar difficulty inasmuch as it speaks of a sojourn of Paul at a place in which he is never known to <sup>have</sup> labored, namely, on the island of Crete. We only hear of his having touched upon the island once, and that was on his journey to Rome. At that time, however, he did not land. So it is clear that he is not referring to that visit.

The difficulty of placing a visit of Paul in Crete does not appear so great when we consider all the hiatus which occur in Acts. But if we examine the epistle a little more closely, we shall see that it presupposes a personal connection between St. Paul and Apollos, 3, 13, and it also speaks of wintering in Nicopolis. Acts never tells us anything of a wintering in Nicopolis, and this is especially improbable after the time when Paul had gotten in touch with Apollos.

As to the Nicopolis here mentioned, it is most likely the Nicopolis in Epirus which is meant since that was the most famous. Any other Nicopolis would almost require definition unless the party writing happened to be in the city, which is evidently not the case, else Paul would not have written that he hoped to winter ἐκεῖ.

Several of the possibilities for placing Paul's visit to Crete before his first captivity were considered under 1 Tim, and indeed the problem is very similar to that of 1 Tim. For the sake of brevity we shall refrain from giving a detailed account of all the possibilities. Let it suffice to say that as in the case of 1 Tim we find ourselves thwarted at every turn when we try to place this epistle into the Book of Acts. And it will scarcely be necessary for us to enter into a lengthy discussion here, for 1 Tim and Tit are so closely related that the proof which applies to one applies to the other. If 1 Tim could not have been written before the first Roman captivity, the same must be said of Titus. One could <sup>mention</sup> also the relation between 2 Tim and our epistle. Since we found that 2 Tim was most likely written from a second captivity, Tit must have been written somewhere between the first and second captivity. We have also gained two new stopping-places for Paul on his trip to the Orient after his release, Crete and Nicopolis.

From our discussion of the Pastorals, we would now draw this conclusion. If the Pastorals are genuine, as we have seen good reasons to assume, then it is imperative that we accept that Paul was released from the first captivity, as is borne out by the expectations expressed in Philippians, by the attitude of the Roman officials in the account of Acts, - in order that he might continue his activity as implied in 1 Tim and Tit and in the τὸν δρόμον τετέληκε of 2 Tim 4 in relation to Rom 15, 24. 28. We also reach the conclusion from 2 Tim that he was re-imprisoned in Rome, and the whole spirit of this epistle leads us to believe that he suffered death in this imprisonment.

While we have no direct statements upon which to base these conclusions, the cumulative evidence is so strong that almost all exegetes and Bible-historians of the present time who accept the authenticity of the Pastorals, incline towards the second captivity theory. Weiss has stated the situation as follows: 1) Die Hypothese einer zweiten Gefangenschaft lässt sich nur durch die Pastoralbriefe, wenn sie echt sind, erweisen. 2) Die Echtheit der Pastoralbriefe lässt sich nur durch die Annahme jener Hypothese erweisen. Aus diesem Zirkel kann die Kritik nicht heraus." ( p 165) So Weiss also admits that the Pastorals prove the second captivity, but he denies that the authenticity of the Pastorals can be proven. But we Christians need no mathematical proof for the authenticity of a book of Scripture such as Weiss demands, and thus we can get out of Weiss' circle and accept both the authenticity of the Pastorals and the second captivity.

It should be stated, however, that the argument from the Pastorals is not wholly dependent upon their authenticity. From the entire mode of presentation it appears that the author is dealing with facts well-known to his readers. They understand the situation. This shows that there were extant at that time well-defined traditions supporting our theory. And there can surely be no doubt that a forger who shows as much ability as the writer of the Pastorals would have enough common-sense to fit his letters into conditions as they were known. Thus says Schaff: "Why should a forger invent difficulties when he might as well have fitted his fictions in the frame of the situation known from the Acts and other Pauline Epistles."

Granted then that our reasoning in regard to the various personal notices of the Pastorals was essentially correct, we have a good case for the second captivity if the Pastorals are genuine, for then our case would rest on divine inspiration; but even though the Pastorals were not genuine, we should still have a strong case.

- 3 -

Since we have now come to this conclusion by a consideration of divinely inspired sources, let us now look at the traditions and uninspired sources which pertain to the subject, to see to what extent they either corroborate or contradict our conclusions.

There is quite a general sentiment among all traditions that Paul died a martyr in Rome under Nero, but the exact time of his death is not so definitely settled. If we could settle this question that would aid us materially in deciding the question of the first captivity vs. the second captivity.

Before attacking this question, however, we must determine in what year Paul arrived in Rome as a prisoner. There has been much discussion on this point, due especially to an either false, or falsely understood, dating given by Eusebius. Comparing all sources, however, it seems best to date the arrival at Rome either in 60 or 61 A. D. Ramsay dates the beginning of Festus' procuratorship in 59 A.D., and he therefore places Paul's arrival in Rome in the year 60. Others seem to have good reasons for adopting 64, while some go as far as 62. We may be quite certain on this point then, that Paul's two years in Rome, Acts 28, fall somewhere between 60 and 64, and since only a few go as far as 62 for the arrival, we will go safe by adopting 61-63. (60-62 would not essentially change our conclusions.)

Now, there is a late tradition which states definitely that Peter and Paul died in the Neronian Persecution, which began in the summer of 64. This tradition, however, does not appear definitely until the end of the 5th century. It was definitely established as the correct dating by Roman Pontiffs, who did not always investigate such matters critically and often pronounced rather unscientific anathemas. As we go farther back in history, we find that the tradition of Peter's and Paul's laboring and dying in Rome persists, but there is no clear statement as to when this happened. The truth of the matter is that if Paul arrived in Rome in 61, he would have had plenty of chance to escape before the Neronian Persecution broke out, assuming, of course, that he was released. On the other hand, those people who point to this tradition to prove that Paul died in the first Roman captivity will have difficulty in explaining how the two years carried him into the persecutions under Nero. They are almost forced to explain his execution in another way, which is, of course, not impossible. Huther tries to place Paul's post-captivity activity into the time between his release and

and the year 64 or the first part of 65. This, however, allows almost too little time to permit Paul to make the trips which we have seen it is necessary to place into this time. About the only thing definite we can ascertain regarding the dating of Paul's death is that reliable tradition knows nothing definite. The dating becomes more definite in the course of time. The first very definite date which we have is that of June 24, however without the year, for the death of both Peter and Paul. The fact, however that this date is clearly the result of a common burial of the true (or alleged) bones of these two Apostles, shows that there was no definite tradition as to the date extant in the year 258, when this performance took place. So, all in all, we may safely discount the tradition of Paul's death in the Neronian Persecution, in case we find from more reliable sources that his death could not have occurred at that time.

The first indication of the common working and dying of Peter and Paul we have in a writing of Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth, ca. 170., who calls Peter and Paul the "founders of the Roman and Corinthian Churches", and says that they both taught in Rome together and suffered martyrdom *κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν καιρὸν*. (Quoted in Eusebius, H. E. II, 25) We are inclined to discredit this report entirely due to the wild statement of Peter's and Paul's founding the Roman Church, and also of Peter's having had a share in the founding of the Corinthian congregation. There is an evident tendency in these words which weaken their argumentative value. Steinmetz believes, however, that one can safely take out of these words an indication that Paul died in Rome, but little more. It seems to me, however, that the main point with Dionysius is the "together".

After Dionysius, the legends become still more positive on this point, as in Irenaeus (Adv. Haer., III, 3), Tertullian (Scorp. 15 and Praescriptio adv. Haer. 36), and in others, until Eusebius accredits it, and Jerome says, "eodem die quo Petro", namely, did Paul die. From all this tradition we can merely establish that Paul's death in Rome is the generally accepted tradition, and they also all either point to or directly place his death under Nero.

For a closer discussion, we shall limit ourselves to a few statements of earlier Fathers, and since they give us no definite information regarding the death of Paul, try to piece what information they do give with the information gained from the Pastorals, and then to arrive at the probable date of Paul's death indirectly.

The passage which we shall consider first in this connection are the well-known words from the Epistle of Clement to the congregation at Corinth. The words which

concern us especially in this connection read as follows:

C. V. v. 3. λάβωμεν πρό ὀφθαλμῶν ἡμῶν τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ἀποστόλου,  
 4. Πέτρον, ὃς διὰ φῆλον ἄδικον οὐχ ἓνα οὐδέ δύο ἀλλὰ πλείονας ὑπήγαγεν  
 πόρου καὶ οὕτω μαρτυρήσας ἔπορεύθη εἰς τὸν ὀφειλόμενον τόπον τῆς  
 δόξης. v. 5. διὰ φῆλον καὶ ἔριν Πάβλος ὑπομονῆς Βραβείον ἐδειξεν. v. 6. ἑπτάκις  
 δέσμα φορέσας, φυγαδεύσει, λιθάσει, κήρυξ γενόμενος ἐν τε τῆ  
 ἀναστολῇ καὶ ἐν τῇ δύσει, τὸ γενναίον τῆς πίστεως αὐτοῦ κλέος ἐλάβεν.  
 v. 7. δικαιοσύνην δ. δάξας ὅλον τὸν κόσμον καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ τέλος τῆς  
 δύσεως ἔλθων καὶ μαρτυρήσας ἐπὶ τῶν ἡγουμένων οὕτως ἀπ' ἀλλαγῆ  
 τοῦ κόσμου καὶ εἰς τὸν ἄγιον τόπον ἔπορεύθη, ὑπομονῆς γενόμενος μέγιστος  
 ὑπογραμμός.

From these words of Clement we can draw several conclusions pertaining to our subject. That Paul died a martyr is indicated in several ways. Many maintain that the term *μαρτυρήσας* here means suffer martyrdom, and that is not contrary to the usage of the word. This word may, however, mean simply testifying, as before a court, of course, it would refer to testimony for Christ. But aside from this term the general context shows that Paul died a martyr, for the author is speaking of such as "strove until death" because of envy and strife, and among them he mentions Peter and Paul. The entire passage speaks very clearly for Paul's martyrdom, but since that fact is hardly to be disputed, we need not devote more time to that question. It further appears from these words, however, that the death occurred in Rome, but this is not indicated quite so clearly. The expressions *ἐπὶ τῶν ἡγουμένων*, before the rulers, however, speaks clearly for the Roman martyrdom. Is there any indication that it was under Nero? We should say yes, for in verse 8. we have a description which can refer only to the Neronian Persecution, and since the death of Peter and Paul is mentioned in connection with these deaths, the inference is that they suffered death under the same general conditions. The conclusion, however, that Peter and Paul died before the persecution, which conclusion is sometimes drawn from the aorist *πύθοισθη* in v. 8., for the grouping may be merely a rhetorical one. On the other hand, since Clement generally places Paul ahead of Peter but in this case names Peter first, this may be taken as a good indication that Peter's death preceded that of Paul. What concerns us here mainly is that the Clement passage indicates that Paul died a martyr in Rome, and most likely under Nero.

What interests us almost more than this in the quotation from Clement is the statement *ἐπὶ τὸ τέλος τῆς δύσεως ἔλθων*, which is predicated of Paul as something which preceded his death. The great question here is, What is meant by *τὸ τέλος τῆς δύσεως*? The "end of the west" might mean several things, and in fact opinions differ considerably on just this question. If we study contemporary literature, we find e.g. in Strabo, II, 1, that the Pillars of Hercules are called *πέρατα τῆς οἰκουμένης*, while Villeius Pater calls Spain "extremus nostri orbis terminus."



Therefore, there is no reason why the expression here used could not refer to Spain if there were any reason for that assumption. What other possibilities are there? Many say it means Rome, saying that there were two *τέρματα* to Paul's missionary activity, Jerusalem being the eastern *τέρμα* and Rome the western one. Others, in referring it to Rome, say that the expression in itself could refer to Rome. We admit that it might if it came from the pen of an Oriental writer, but coming from a Roman, it seems improbable that it would in itself signify Rome. Again we may say as to the former supposition, that Paul's western terminus was not Rome but Spain. Of course, Clement is here speaking in the light of fulfillment, and he would probably speak of the actual terminus and not of the intended terminus. But we have another reason for not accepting this explanation. In v.6 we read, *κήρυξ γενόμενος ἐν τε τῇ κίαστολῇ καὶ ἐν τῇ εὐσεί*. This would surely cover Rome, and even in a rhetorical passage such as this there could be no reason for such redundancy. The writer must have had a special object in view when he said, *ἐπὶ τὸ τέμα τῆς εὐσεως ἐλθών*, and this special object was to show that the Apostle had gotten as far west as the *τὸ τέμα τῆς εὐσεως* - Spain. This, in view of the expressed hope of Paul, Rom 15, seems to me is not imposing an undue burden upon the words of Clement, especially in the light of the preceding words, *ἐκαστὸν ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ ὁλοῦν τὸ εὐσεμον*.

Some people try to maintain that if we wish to insist on a literal interpretation of Clement's expression, we should have to refer it to Britain, but we leave it to them to prove that. The counter-argument that if these words indicate a Spanish journey, that then the *μαρτυρίας ἐπὶ τῶν ἡγουμένων* would also have to have taken place there, is not at all indicated in the text.

We lay much stress on the testimony of Clement, and why? Because Clement is in all probability a contemporary of St. Paul, and there is good reason for believing that he is the Clement mentioned Phil 4,3. Origen and others attest to this fact. His letter, according to the best dating, was written before the year 100. There were, therefore, at the time undoubtedly many living who would have exposed his lies in case he did not abide by the facts. The manner in which Clement merely refers to these events in so indefinite a manner, shows that he had no intention of conveying news, but he simply alludes to them as generally known examples, so generally known, in fact, that their mere citation stands as proof. That Clement has more information than we do is also shown by the statement *ἐπὶ τῆς δέσμης φερέσας*.

So while Clement does not directly state that Paul was released from the first captivity, yet his words imply that, yes, demand that, for a trip to Spain could not have taken place before his first captivity. Clement, therefore,

in no way contradicts the conclusions which we drew from Scripture evidence, but he does confirm our conclusion of the second captivity by his reference to Paul's trip to Spain. Paul's death in Rome under trying conditions is likewise attested by him. While critics cannot deny the age of the Corinthian Epistle of Clement, they discount it as far as the trip to Spain is concerned. We shall have to admit that without the Pastorals it furnishes only a weak argument, but the two together form a strong chain.

The strongest proof for the journey of Paul to Spain we have reserved until now, namely, a statement of the fragment known as the Canon Muratori. This fragment, which we have only in copy form, dates back in the original to the second century. (Steinmetz - pp. 65. 66) Its testimony therefore, in regard to the Canon of the New Testament, and also its witness in regard to the Spanish journey of Paul will be very important, at least, it will be worthy of closer consideration.

Steinmetz goes into a detailed exegesis of the words which speak of Paul's trip to Spain, and he finally decides upon the following as the most probable correct form of the text: ( I shall not quote the original, since the words can be found in many histories and books on Introduction) "Acta autem omnium apostolorum sub uno libro scripta sunt. Lucas optimo Theophilo comprehendit, quia sub praesentia eius singula gerebantur, sicuti et semota passione Petri evidenter declarat sed et profectio Pauli ab urbe ad Spaniam proficiscentis." He translates as follows: "Die Taten aller Apostel sind in einem Buch geschrieben worden. Lukas stellt sie fuer den vielvermoe-genden Theophilus kurz dar, weil sie in seiner Gegenwart im Einzelnen geschahen, wie er auch augenscheinlich dar-tut durch die Auslassung des Martyriums Petri aber auch der Reise Pauli, da er von Rom nach Spanien reiste." The sense of the passage in this reading would be that Luke wrote the Acts of all the Apostles as eye-witness because they happened in his presence. That he reports as eye-witness of happenings at which he was present, he clearly shows by not referring to two events which happened and which were surely worth mentioning.

Wieseler takes the opposite view and tries to prove the unhistorical character of Paul's trip to Spain from the canon Muratori. Otto, on the other hand, goes too far and attempts to prove from these words that the writer of the Canon is expressly trying to uphold the historical character of the facts mentioned, as an object in itself. I say Otto is going too far because it seems evident that the fragmentist is merely speaking of the books of the New Testament and is neither trying to prove or disprove any of these facts. We may, nevertheless, take this much out of these words that for the writer of the Canon it was not only an established fact personally that Peter died a martyr and that Paul journeyed to Spain, for else he would not have merely alluded to these events,

in so cursory a manner, but they must have been generally accepted facts with those people to whom he was writing; for he is trying to prove something, and in order to prove it, he could not refer to matters about which his readers were in doubt or ignorance, or, at least, he would have to enter into a proof of the facts themselves in that case. Only then could the failure of Luke to mention Paul's journey to Spain and Peter's martyrdom be an argument for his theory of the Book of Acts, if his readers were sure that those things had happened. We must grant, therefore, that there must have been a tradition of Paul's journey to Spain and, consequently, of his second captivity extant in the circles among which the writer of this fragment moved, (probably Rome or vicinity - Zahn, Steinmetz) or even in the church at large, at the end of the second century.

The question now arises whether this tradition of a Spanish journey might not be the result of the statement of Rom 15, 24. 28. This is claimed by most negative critics (DeWette, v. Soden), by positive impugnors of the second captivity theory (Knoke), and even by some defenders of the second captivity (Weiss). It is possible that such a tradition should arise from such a cause, but let us note whether the words contain anything which leads us to suppose that the author used other sources for his statement.

Steinmetz remarks that it is noteworthy that the writer does not speak of the death of Peter and the death of Paul, the omission of which must appear more noticeable than the omission of his Spanish journey. ~~This~~ This would lead us to suppose that Luke had a well-defined source at his command which stated that Luke did not accompany Paul on this trip, and to go a little farther, that he was probably present at Paul's death. Zahn refers especially to the Acts of the Apostles of Gnostic origin, and calls attention to the fact that they do not ascribe Paul's journey to Spain to Rom. 15 but to a special revelation from God. These Acta Petri relate the departure of Paul to Spain in close connection with the passio Petri. So it may be very likely that the author of the C. M. used these apocryphal writings. In addition, he may have employed the Acta Pauli, for in them it seems to be presupposed that Luke did not accompany Paul to Spain, but also that he was present at Paul's death. So there is no reason for supposing that the author of the C. M. was dependent upon Rom. 15 for his statement regarding Paul's journey to Spain, while there is some reason for supposing that he had other sources.

We have by this discussion of the Muratorian Canon gained added proof for the trip of Paul to Spain and thereby for the release from the first captivity. And so we find also new corroboration of the Pastoral Epistles, altho this evidence comes as a second source and is absolutely independent of the Pastorals, while supplementing them.

It may be mentioned that we lack references to the Spanish journey in some later Fathers (Irenaeus, Ignatius, Tertullian), while others again refer to it. While the silence of the Fathers of the third century is no negative proof against the Spanish trip, the testimony of later Fathers is also worthless as they almost all quote Eusebius. Chrysostom has a direct reference to this event in his remarks to 2 Tim 4, 20 which is noteworthy because he speaks of the trip to Spain as a sure happening while he is in doubt whether Paul ever re-visited the East.

The much quoted words from Eusebius follow:

Τότε μὲν οὖν ἀπολογησάμενον αὐθις ἐπὶ τὴν τοῦ κηρύγματος  
δικονίαν λόγος ἔχει στείλασθαι τὸν Ἀπόστολον, δεύτερον δ' ἐπὶ πάντα  
τῇ αὐτῇ πόλει, ἡὼ κατ' ἐλθὼν μαρτυρίῳ ἐν ᾧ ἔεσομαι  
ἔχοντες τὴν πρὸς Τιμόθεον δεύτεραν ἐπιστολὴν συντάξει.

One must here note that Eusebius does not quote a source for this statement, as e. g. Clement, as he would surely have done if he had had that letter, but he merely says *λόγος ἔχει*. This shows that there was a tradition regarding this matter and one which Eusebius followed. It has frequently been interposed that Eusebius proves the second captivity from the *πρωτῆ μου ἀπολογία* of 2 Tim 4, 16, and that would make his testimony only as reliable as his exegesis of that passage. The fact is, however, that he does not prove the fact from the Timothy passage, but he says *λόγος ἔχει*, and then quotes those words of St. Paul in substantiation.

A stock-argument of all opponents against the activity in Spain is the fact that there are no indications to be found in Spain that Paul had ever been there. We shall not go into that question but merely refer to Steinmetz's investigation of the matter. (*Die zweite roemische Gefangenschaft Pauli.*, P. 86ff.)

So in my estimation, the upshot of the traditional reports is this, that the best sources speak for a trip to Spain and indirectly, therefore, for a second captivity. Eusebius even makes reference to the release. On the contrary, there is no reliable source which opposes this tradition, and those few which do oppose it, can be readily shown to be the result of tendencies in the church.

This testimony then, which comes as a second source and wholly independent of the Pastorals, coupled with the testimony of the Pastorals concerning journeys in the East after his first captivity gives us a credible story of Paul's last years. This shows that these sources (Canon Mur., and Clement) must have had a common basis, namely, a generally known report of the fate of Paul's last years. To suppose that this account was a result of Rom. 15, 24 28, instead of a result of facts, is foolish.

- \* -

After we have thus reached these various conclusions concerning the activity of Paul in his last years, there remains for us to form some sort of picture of the events which entered into this activity in the order in which they probably occurred. The peculiar thing, is, however, that after we have gone through this long discussion, we still have so very few sure facts that it is almost impossible to establish an itinerary with any degree of assurance that it is correct.. We can merely present one theory or the other which will take care of all the facts that are known and be content with the fact that it is possible to place all the facts into the time at our disposal.

Let us note Zahn's solution of the problem, which while it is a very sane one, yet takes care of all the data. One might suppose, says Zahn, that in accordance with his promise expressed in Phil and Col, Paul would go east at once. But this consideration must take a back-seat before the circumstances that 1) the statement of 2 Tim 4, 13. 20 would appear most unnatural, if between the there-mentioned facts, the stay of Paul in Miletus and Troas, and the writing of 2 Tim, not only the winter in Nicopolis but also the activity in Spain, which must have taken, at least, several months, should have taken place.

Now, if Paul didn't leave Rome at once (Phil 2, 19-23), but waited for the return of Timothy from Philippi, then, at best, he could have gone to Spain in the fall of 63, perhaps not until the spring of 64. In neither case would the winter have been that of 63-64, scarcely that of 64-65, for then one should have to press the Spanish and Oriental activity into one year and perhaps less than a year. So, if the winter in Nicopolis is, at the earliest, that of 65-66, then the winter before which Paul wished to see Timothy was, at best, that of 66-67. If he then realized his expectations, then he will have seen the beginning of that winter and then have died soon after. - In order to visualize the result of his investigation, Zahn gives the following as the probable order of individual events. If Timothy returned to Rome in the fall of 63, then he left for Spain in the fall of 63 or in the spring of 64. If the reference of the Acta Petri is correct, he spent a year in Spain. From there, in the fall of 64 or in the spring of 65, he left for the East. Whether he hit Rome on this trip or not cannot be determined. The order in which he visited the eastern cities is not to be definitely fixed. In the course of these visits, however, he wrote 1 Tim and Tit. The winter of 65-66 he probably spent in Nicopolis in Epirus, together with Titus. When he left there,

in the summer of 66, Titus may have left for Dalmatia. In summer of 66 came the new captivity, the visit of Onesiphorus to Rome, the writing of 2 Tim. At the earliest in 66, Paul met his death. But we shall <sup>^</sup> this question later.

Conybeare and Howson present a much more detailed and elaborate itinerary, which is, of course, very problematical. They have Paul visit the East immediately after his release, and then Spain. In order to eliminate the difficulty of having too long a time between the facts mentioned in 2 Tim and the writing of the epistle, they have Paul revisit the East in 66, and it is during that second visit that 1 Tim and Tit are written. In order to allow more time for the happenings of the second captivity, they assume that Paul did not spend the whole winter in Nicopolis, but that he was taken captive in Nicopolis in mid-winter and then taken to Rome at once.

David Smith agrees with Conybeare and Howson on the twofold visit to the East, but he indulges in many more suppositions as to possible stopping-places, thus having him go as far as Antioch. He adduces some reason for all his assumed stopping-places, but nothing will be gained by giving a detailed account of his itinerary and of his reasons.

As to Paul's second imprisonment and death, we have very little definite information. How he happened to fall into the second captivity is nowhere even hinted at, and it is useless to indulge in all sorts of hypotheses. We do know, however, that the conditions of his second imprisonment were much more severe than those of the former one. We learn this from 2 Tim. There is a report that during this second period of confinement he suffered in the Mamertine Prison. Besides agreeing with the general situation of 2 Tim, this would also lend color to Zahn's hypothesis regarding the *σπρωξίσις* of Onesiphorus.

There can be no doubt that Paul died in Rome. Tradition is unanimous on that point, beginning with Clement, where it is only implied. This also agrees with 2 Tim. In accordance with Paul's rights as a Roman citizen, tradition has him meet his death by decapitation and not by crucifixion. Thus Orosius, Hist. VII, 7, says, "Paulus gladio occidit." Jerome's statement is the most explicit: "Hic ergo decimo quarto Neronis anno (eodem die quo Petro), Romae pro Christo capite et truncatus sepultusque est in Via Ostiensi." (Catal. Script.) This statement loses some force by the parenthesis, but since there is nothing in the rest of the statement which opposes former tradition, we may accept its testimony, especially since it does not claim that Paul died in the Vatican with Peter. As Jerome states, so the best tradition speaks for a martyrdom suffered along the Road to Ostia, about two miles from the city walls. The basilica of St. Paul's, outside the gates of Rome,

commemorates the place of the execution, while the traditional spot of the martyrdom is the "tre fontane" near the basilica.

The question of the date of Paul's death is an uncertain one, and we can only approximate it by a reckoning from other known dates. The martyrdom in the Neronian Persecution we have seen to be merely romish fiction, as also the synchronistic martyrdom with Peter. This would not allow for his activity in Spain and the East, and would also not agree with his being beheaded. Under the excitement of a persecution, we cannot imagine that a Roman citizen would receive any special consideration, although it is not impossible. Yet, the other reason is sufficient to show that he could not have died in the persecutions of 64. This much does seem to be true, however, that he died during the reign of Nero, as is intimated by Clement and expressly stated by other Fathers. From the discussion of the order of events of the last activity, we saw that his death could scarcely have occurred before 66, and since Nero died in June 68, we may safely place Paul's death between 66 and 68 A. D. Eusebius' date of 67 for the martyrdom is not reliable, due especially to the fact that the remark is added that it occurred in the Neronian Persecution, which had however already taken place in 64-65. It may be that Eusebius had the date 67, and that his mistake lies only in placing Paul's death in the persecution. At any rate, 67 seems to be the best conservative dating.

- - - - -

Thus closed the life of the greatest missionary since the days of him who said, "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations". His end is veiled in comparative obscurity; but what matters it to us whether we know just the hour in which he died. We know that he was faithful unto the end, and we are sure that he gained the *ὁ τῆς δίκαιότητος στέφανος*, which the great Shepherd of the sheep, under whom he had been a trusted under-shepherd, had reserved for him in heaven. May his untiring zeal, his unflinching courage, his whole-souled devotion inspire many to follow in his footsteps. Who thus serves the Master with his whole heart, and in the very face of death can not cease preaching Christ, and Him crucified, need not care when or how he dies. His death may be an ignoble one, there may be no one to mourn, but he can be sure of one thing, namely, that for him also there is reserved a crown of righteousness in heaven.

## B I B L I O G R A P H Y.

- Theodor Zahn** Einleitung in das Neue Testament.  
**Conybeare & Howson** Life and Epistles Of St. Paul.  
**Hans Lietzmann** Petrus und Paulus in Rom.  
**Charles F. Kent** Work and Teachings of the Apostles.  
**Johannes Weiss** Das Urchristentum.  
**Carl von Weizsaecker** The Apostolic Age of the Christian Church. (English translation)
- Adolf Juellcher** Einleitung in das Neue Testament.  
**G. T. Purves** Christianity in the Apostolic Age.  
**James Vernon Bartlet** The Apostolic Age.  
**Arthur C. McGiffert** The Apostolic Age.  
**Karl Knoke** Kommentar zu den Pastoralbriefen.  
**Von Soden** " " " " "  
**Bernhard Weiss** Lehrbuch der Einleitung in das Neue Testament.
- W. M. L. DeWette** Lehrbush der Historisch-kritischen Einleitung.
- David Smith** The Life and Letters of St. Paul.  
**W. M. Ramsay** The Pauline Chronology, from Pauline and Other Studies.
- James Moffatt** An introduction to the Literature of the New Testament.
- Alford** Prolegomena to the Pastorals.  
**Friedrich Bleek** Einleitung in das Neue Testament. 4te Auflage, von Mangold.
- Karl Wieseler** Chronologie des apostolischen Zeitalters.
- Dictionary of the Apostolic Church**  
**International Standard Bible Encyclopedia.**  
**Philip Schaff** History of the Christian Church.  
**Meusel** Kirchliches Handlexicon.  
**Herzog-Plitt** Enzyclopaedie.  
**McClintock & Strong** Encyclopedia.
- Volumes VII and IX of Series VII and Volume I of Series VIII of the Expositor. Articles on the Pastorals, by Ramsay.**
- J. D. Michaelis** Einleitung in die goettlichen Schriften des Neuen Bundes.