

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

“For there are some who wish for knowledge only for knowledge’s sake, and that is unworthy curiosity.

“And there are some who wish for knowledge that they may be known to possess it, and that is unworthy vanity.

“There are, too, those who wish for knowledge as a source of gain, and that is unworthy trafficking.

“But there are also those who wish for knowledge that they may edify others, and that is charity.

“There are, too, those who wish for knowledge that they may be edified, and that is wisdom.”

WALTER LOCK.

A CRITICISM OF THE NEW CHRONOLOGY OF PAUL.

(Concluded.)

OUR argument in the two preceding articles has issued in the following conclusions: 1. The positive argument of O. Holtzmann and his followers is valueless; 2. The Eusebian chronology advocated by Blass, if at all admissible, must be modified, not by the subtraction of a year to make it agree with the results of Holtzmann, as proposed by Harnack, but by the addition of a year. This will not only satisfy the three synchronisms which Ramsay has shown to be still valid, but will also meet the true requirements of the calendar argument, in regard to which he has been misled by a too exclusive dependence upon Lewin. Curiously, the two alternative dates for Paul’s arrest, 55 or 58, which our review of the calendar argument has left as the only possibilities, are just the two between which we should be forced to choose according as we adopted the (properly modified) Eusebian dating, or were influenced by the objections of the dominant school of Wieseler, Lewin, Schürer, Lightfoot, Ewald, Weizsäcker, Wendt and others

to reject entirely his authority in favour of an independent reckoning of their own.

We are justified in speaking of the date 55 A.D. for Paul's arrest as supported by "the authority of Eusebius," in spite of the fact that strictly his date, "the second year of Nero," for the accession of Festus, would imply Pentecost 54 for the arrest, because, as Harnack observes (*l.c.*, p. 238), "Even with the best chronologers we must frequently allow a margin of error of *one* year, as they have different reckonings of the years of the emperors."¹ And if it be permissible to subtract a year with Harnack from Eusebius' dates and still appeal to his authority, we have equal warrant for appealing to it after adding a year in order to bring them into conformity with the statements of Orosius, Tacitus, Seneca, and Josephus, and the requirements of the calendar argument.

The question thus becomes much simpler. It resolves itself into the following: Can the Eusebian chronology, as vindicated by Blass with the able support and full supplementation of Harnack, and as modified by ourselves in accord with the foregoing considerations, be still maintained? or have the objections of the dominant school so much weight that we must cut loose from the direct testimony of antiquity, declaring, with the blunt frankness of Schürer, "The statements in the Chronicle of Eusebius are often quite arbitrary, and so prove nothing"?

If Harnack has shown wisdom in bringing to the support of Blass the weight of his wonderful industry, insight, and erudition, he has also proved his wonted keenness, in spite of some superficial oversights, in resorting to O. Holtzmann for an independent and parallel argument against the dominant school. For Holtzmann, although unfortunately mis-

¹ We might cite in illustration the well-known case of Josephus, who notoriously produces confusion by his vacillation between the years of the consuls (Jan. 1-Jan. 1) and the years of the reigning emperors.

led in relying upon Josephus for his positive argument in a passage where the Jewish annalist certainly errs, has rendered admirable service on the negative side by his concise and lucid exposure of the surprising weakness of the modern objections to Eusebius' dating. With Harnack we may avail ourselves of this rebuttal, since no objections of importance appear save those which Schürer advances.¹ Says Harnack (*l.c.*, p. 235), "So far as I can see, all that restrains Schürer from going back so far [as 56 A.D. for the recall of Felix, *i.e.* 54 for Paul's arrest] is the following. He says (1) that Josephus places almost all he has to relate of the activity of Felix under the reign of Nero (*Ant.* xx. 8, 1-9; *Bell.* ii. 12, 8-14, 1). Felix accordingly must have still held office for at least some years under Nero. But Eusebius himself does not place his recall earlier than the second year of Nero, and it cannot be maintained that what Josephus relates cannot have taken place within this limit of time."²

¹ In Zahn's *Einleitung in d. N.T.*, the first volume of which has just appeared, we are promised a discussion of the Problem of the Chronology in Excursus II., to appear in vol. ii. Here we may expect full and able restatement of the objections to the Eusebian chronology, for the dates adopted in vol. i. make it clear that Zahn supports the dominant view.

² The events related by Josephus (*l.c.*) of the administration of Felix under Nero are the following: 1. Capture of certain robbers and impostors, including Eleazar, son of Dinæus, whom he sent to Rome. 2. Felix procures the assassination of Jonathan the high priest by the Sicarii, who thereafter commit murders at the feasts almost with impunity. 3. Among other impostors and agitators there comes to Jerusalem "about this time" an Egyptian "false prophet," whom Felix attacks with a body of cavalry and puts to flight, together with his followers, four hundred of whom are slain. 4. Felix interposes in a quarrel between the Jewish and Syrian citizens of Cæsarea, both parties sending delegates to Nero. The Syrians bribe Burrus (*sic*), but the Jews would have won their case and secured redress for the violence done them by Felix save for the intervention of Pallas, who was then in the height of favour with Nero. [This is the debated synchronism of Holtzmann. It will be observed how very dubious is the connection in which it stands: The Jews would have been shown quite in the right against the Syrians and Felix but for the bribing of Burrus, Nero's secretary, for his Greek letters, and the paramount influence of Pallas! We have seen that if this controversy in Rome be assumed to have taken place after the accession of Festus, as is implied in

The other (2) objection of Schürer to the Eusebian dating is the reference of Paul in Acts xxiv. 10 to Felix's experience as a judge in matters of Jewish law, ἐκ πολλῶν ἐτῶν. To this Harnack merely replies that if, as Eusebius states, Felix had been appointed in A.D. 51, and Paul stood before him in 54, the expression is justified, because 3-4 years for a procurator are not few, although longer administrations are known, and Schürer himself admits that less than six years would suffice. It seems strange, however, that Harnack should not avail himself of the defence of Holtzmann, especially as the date for Paul's appearance before Felix, which Harnack himself is really upholding, is not the Eusebian 54 A.D., but 53, which certainly does not justify the expression ἐκ πολλῶν ἐτῶν if Felix was appointed in 51. Holtzmann, however, is justified at least in assuming that Felix's experience in Palestinian affairs is not limited by this date; for not only was his appointment obtained at the solicitation of the high priest Jonathan above-mentioned, who must accordingly have had opportunity of knowing him, presumably in Palestine, but there is explicit testimony of Tacitus on this point, which is preferred by Mommsen to that of Josephus. Prof. Ramsay, in fact, expresses what we judge to be the mind of scholars on this point in his note on the Procuratorship of Felix, appended to chapter xiii. of *Paul the Traveller*, which we transcribe. "The remarkable contradiction between Josephus (who

Ant. xx. 8, 9, the date of Pallas' fall makes the allusion to his favour with Nero a pure anachronism. But in *Bell.* ii. 13, 7, Josephus represents that the delegates of both parties were sent to Nero by Felix himself, which agrees better in some respects with the account in *Ant.* xx. 8, 9. In either case the recall of Felix was subsequent to the fall of Pallas.] 5. "About this time" Agrippa II. gave the high priesthood to Ishmael ben Fabi, which resulted in unrestrained strife of the priestly factions and seizure of the tithes. It is obvious that Harnack is justified in his assertion that Eusebius' date leaves room for these events, though it is not so easy to see how there would be room *after subtracting a year*, as Harnack proposes. The *addition* of a year, as we propose, will of course leave ample room for all five of the above-mentioned events, especially as the fifth cannot be far separated from the second.

makes Cumanus governor of Palestine 48-52, Felix being his successor in 52), and Tacitus (who makes Felix governor of Samaria [and probably of Judæa], contemporary with Cumanus as governor of Galilee, the latter being disgraced in 52, and the former acquitted and honoured at the same trial), is resolved by Mommsen in favour of Tacitus as the better authority on such a point; and most students of Roman history will agree with him." We may add that Josephus, in more than one instance, shows greater exactitude in his earlier work, and that here the singular omission of Judæa in *Bell.* ii. 12, 8 from the list of provinces put under Felix after the removal of Cumanus, in contrast with *Ant.* xx. 7, 1 *seq.*, where Judæa stands for all three, may possibly indicate that Josephus' disagreement with Tacitus on this point may have been occasioned by simple misunderstanding of Justus of Tiberias, who seems to have been his authority for the dates of accession of the procurators.

If any doubt remains in the reader's mind as to the propriety of Paul's congratulating himself in 54 that he had in Felix a judge of "many years'" experience in Jewish affairs, we must refer him to the argument of Holtzmann (*l.c.*, § 16, 5). In any event, there can be no difficulty in the ἐκ πολλῶν ἐτῶν for those who *add* a year to the Eusebian dating, and think of Paul as speaking in 55 A.D.

If we defer the application of our dates to the relative chronology, these two are actually the only objections to the Eusebian dating which Harnack is able to discover in Schürer's exhaustive pages. Nor can we ourselves add anything of consequence from other representatives of the dominant chronology.¹ But if these objections are insig-

¹ It is generally admitted that no chronological inference can be drawn from Josephus' employment of the term γυνή of Poppæa in *Ant.* xx. 8, 11. True, she was not married to Nero until 62 A.D., but her influence began in 58, and might avail for the deputation which sought a revocation of Festus' order requiring the demolition of the wall built to frustrate the curiosity of Agrippa

nificant as against the chronology of Eusebius taken strictly, or even when modified by the subtraction of a year, they can have no weight whatever against a dating which brings it down by the addition of a year.

But Schürer considers the relative chronology of Paul's life to be an insuperable obstacle. In view of the chronological arrangements of the life of Paul on the basis of the Eusebian or even an earlier chronology, already current, it would seem almost superfluous to point out that the periods enumerated in our first article, as to which a general agreement exists, are not incompatible with this form of the Eusebian dating. Nevertheless, it will be well to cast a glance over the result.¹ Starting from Paul's arrest in Jerusalem at Pentecost 55 A.D., the five-year period back to his arrival in Corinth will bring us to the same season of the year 50, which agrees exactly with the inferences of our second article, drawn from the synchronisms of the Orosian date for the Claudian edict and that obtained from Seneca and Tacitus for the proconsulship of Gallio. In the latter case our inference was that "the arrival of Paul in Corinth was *not earlier* than the beginning of A.D. 49." In the

II., at any time between these dates. It would seem to have been exerted toward the close of Festus' administration; and, were it possible to hold, on the ground of the paucity of events assigned to it by Josephus, that this administration was very short, we might argue hence with Holtzmann (*l.c.*, p. 129), that "its beginning should apparently be placed not later than 55, its end not earlier than 58." But "blessed is the people whose history is short." The appointment of Festus was one of those excellent ones which made the early years of Nero's reign a "golden quinquennium," and few of those disturbances Josephus is concerned to narrate can have marred its tranquility. As against the silence of both Tacitus and Josephus as to the length of this and the preceding and following administrations, we have the positive statement of the Eusebian Chronicle that "Albinus succeeded Festus in the seventh year of Nero" (=A.D. 61; Jerome the same; *Arm.*, A.D. 60), and this date is accepted by Schürer ("at the latest, A.D. 62"), so that the administration of Festus would really have been of the rather exceptional length of 4-5 years. No inference, accordingly, can be drawn from the passage.

¹ For the periods here referred to, see the first article of this series, *EXPOSITION*, v. 38, p. 125.

former we found a positive date for Claudius' decree, said to be derived from Josephus, though not now extant in that author. In consequence of this decree, Aquila and Prisca had left Rome, reaching Corinth shortly (*προσφατώς*) before Paul (Acts xviii. 2). For their journey from Rome we need allow but a week; for the interval covered by the *προσφατώς* but a few weeks more. Orosius' date for the decree, after the necessary correction of one year already explained, is 50 A.D., precisely the year to which we are carried back by our five-year period before the arrest.

The second visit of Paul to Jerusalem (third of Acts), referred to in Galatians ii. 1 *seq.*, commonly spoken of as the occasion of the Apostolic Convention, is generally placed "some seven or eight years" earlier than the arrest.¹ Our modified Eusebian dating would give us accordingly the spring of 48 or 47 A.D., to which there can be no objection, even if Prof. McGiffert's suggestion were adopted, which identifies this visit with that of Acts xi. 30. Paul's *διακονία* will then have occupied the winter of A.D. 46-47 or 47-48; for, as we have seen in the preceding article, even the winter of 47-48 is not excluded from the possibilities. For the present we can only say an error on the part of the writer of Acts is made certain by the positive and emphatic assertions of Paul; but whether he erred in taking two versions of the same visit which lay before him for two separate visits, or in assuming that Paul must have been one of the administrators of the relief sent by the Antiochian believers to those of Jerusalem, we cannot now decide. The modified Eusebian chronology admits both possibilities.

The same applies to the period between Paul's conversion and the Apostolic Convention. Whether it be taken at the maximum of seventeen or at the minimum of fourteen

¹ McGiffert (*l.c.*, p. 359).

years will make no difference to our dating. In the former case the conversion will have taken place in 31 A.D., within two years of the Ascension. But even so, there is time enough in two years for such a degree of ecclesiastical development as appears in Acts vi. 1 *seq.*, and for "the persecution which arose about Stephen." We can hardly say as much for the dates which subtract a year from the Eusebian.

Of course no obstacles are encountered by this chronology in the relative chronology of the time after Paul's arrest. Its two periods of two and one-half years each bring us respectively to the fast of Acts xxvii. 9, spent near Crete, and to the end of the two years in Rome of Acts xxviii. 30. We thus lose sight of Paul in the early spring of A.D. 60, with ample time for a release and second imprisonment before the Neronian persecution of the fall of 64, in case the data of the Pastoral Epistles should seem to require it.

All that could properly be asked of the Eusebian chronology is that it should encounter no serious obstacle in the relative chronology of the life of Paul. The result of our cursory review, adopting the generally accepted intervals, goes much further. The year 55 A.D. for Paul's arrest affords exactly that happy medium which avoids the crowding of the events of Acts i.-viii., incurred under the chronology of Holtzmann, Blass, Harnack and McGiffert, and the crowding out of the possible journeys to Spain, Crete, Ephesus, and Troas, and other events witnessed to by tradition and perhaps by the genuine material of the Pastoral Epistles, necessitated by the needlessly late dating of the dominant school. In short, there is no dating which, while all the debated questions are left open, so readily adapts itself as this to the requirements of the relative chronology. Until further evidence is forthcoming we can but consider that the objections raised to this form of the Eusebian

dating are without foundation, and that as between the two possible years for Paul's arrest left open by the calendar argument, A.D. 55 and A.D. 58, the former is that which most nearly meets the historical requirements.

Thus far in the present article we have simply undertaken to defend the chronology of ancient tradition against the objections of the dominant school. We have still to consider certain positive evidence in its favour, in addition to that of the date of the Claudian edict in Orosius, and to apply our results to the relative chronology upon our own interpretation of the Scriptural data.

It was intimated at the close of our first article that Josephus, even if guilty of an anachronism in his report of the intervention of Pallas with Nero (*Ant.* xx. 8, 9), might still afford some indication of date through the limit of error he would be unlikely to overpass. As our choice of dates for the recall of Felix rests between the years 57 and 60, it is surely more probable, considering the importance of the events, that in the clause *μάλιστα δὴ τότε διὰ τιμῆς ἄγων ἐκείνον* Josephus makes a slip of something over one year than one of over four years. But we have noted also that Josephus' own representation of the matter in *Bell.* ii. 13, 7 is inconsistent with that of *Ant.* xx. 8, 9. The intervention of Pallas is not referred to, but the delegates of both parties to the Cæsarean dispute are sent by Felix "to Nero." This, then, was after the beginning of 55, but, as we may possibly infer from the boldness of Felix's action, before he had received word of the downfall of his powerful brother, *i.e.* early in 55. Whether Pallas intervened or not, the decision of Burrus on this occasion was unfavourable to the Jews of Cæsarea who "went up to Rome to accuse Felix," and Nero's letter, written by the advice of Burrus, was therefore a vindication of Felix to this extent. His recall can therefore scarcely have taken place earlier than 56. But the question arises: How long could the appointee of

Claudius, a man notoriously base and corrupt, the typical example of the Claudian régime of slaves and freedmen, maintain himself in office after the downfall of Pallas? That he should have been tolerated for another year, even under the dominant influence of a Burrus and Seneca, is not inexplicable : but that he should have continued undisturbed in office throughout the golden quinquennium Neronis, and even beyond it, in spite of the loss of support in Rome and increasing complaints from his province, and *then* been followed by an excellent appointee, is surely a much less probable supposition. On this additional ground the year 57 for Felix's recall must be preferred to 60.

Finally, in addition to this and to Orosius' date for the Claudian edict, supporters of the (modified) Eusebian dating may properly avail themselves of the important suggestion of McGiffert (*l.c.*, pp. 358, 592 *seq.*) as to the traditional residence of the Apostle Peter in Rome. It is highly probable from the uniform testimony of antiquity that Peter suffered martyrdom at Rome under Nero, and to all appearance (Clem. R. VI.; Tertullian, *De Praescr. Haer.* 36; Origen, quoted by Eus. *H.E.* III. 1; Caius of Rome, *ibid.* II. 25) in the great Neronian persecution of the latter part of 64. Now the idea of a contemporary stay of Peter with Paul in Rome during the period known to us of Paul's life is really excluded by the Epistles of the Captivity; yet the figure of Peter is of so great importance among the Christians of Rome, so early even as the end of the first century, as actually to overshadow that of Paul himself. Prof. McGiffert justly argues that the fact is unaccountable, unless we allow some substantial basis to the tradition. Several years must have been spent by Peter in Rome, after the time when we lose sight of Paul, in establishing and building up that important church, which implies as many between the disappearance of Paul from the stage of Acts and the summer of 64 A.D. Neither in the relative nor in the absolute

chronology do we find, then, any valid objection whatever to the Eusebian chronology if modified by the *addition* instead of the *subtraction* of one year. On the contrary, the little that can be drawn from other sources—Orosius, the appointment of Gallio, the probable limit of error in Josephus, the tradition of Peter's stay in Rome, the relative chronology of Paul's life,¹ the intrinsic probabilities of Nero's administration—all tends to confirm this, rather than the dating which the calendar argument leaves open as the only alternative.

But have we the right to cite the tradition of antiquity in Eusebius' favour? Schürer has replied in an article in the *Zt. f. W. Th.* 1898, 1, which appeared subsequent to the completion and delivery of the present series of articles, to the argument of Harnack in favour of the independent value of Eusebius' dates. In justice to the great critical historian of New Testament times it must be admitted that his argument seems to remove all ground for the supposition that Eusebius had authority other than inference, often inaccurately drawn, from Josephus, for the secular dates of this period. The one date, however, which his argument admittedly does not touch, is just the date of essential and vital significance. Without any traceable basis in Josephus, or any assignable ground save Christian tradition, Eusebius states as an occurrence of the *second* year of Nero—not the *sixth*, as he should have said if the modern chronology were correct—"Festus was sent by Nero as successor to Felix."

We may grant every contention of Schürer against Harnack, grant that "Eusebius knows from Josephus that the appointment of Festus falls in the time of Nero, and fixes it by free (?) conjecture under the heading 'second year of Nero,'" and still the fact remains as we have stated it:

¹ For details see below.

the undisputed tradition of antiquity represents the arrest of Paul as taking place in 54 (better 55) A.D. It is not an answer to call this "free conjecture," though the weight of the testimony may be lessened. For some reason Eusebius places the arrest of Paul very early in the reign of Nero. No other reason has been suggested than the testimony of antiquity. There is no valid objection to this date. There are several independent considerations which support it. We cannot avoid the conviction that the now dominant chronology, which in modern times has undertaken to set it aside, bringing down the date of Paul's disappearance from the stage from about 60 A.D. to 63 or 64, is as erroneous as it is unjustifiable.

We have reached the conclusion of our main argument in finding an absolute chronology of the life of Paul, which, besides conforming to the verdict of antiquity, will also correspond to the relative chronology as usually adopted by modern authorities. This result we believe to be reached by fixing the arrest of Paul in Jerusalem at Pentecost 55 A.D., counting forward five years to his disappearance from the stage of Acts in 60, and backward five to his arrival in Corinth early in 50. But the assumption we have already made concerning the season of year of Paul's arrival in Corinth is at variance with the opinion of many excellent critics. This variation, and certain independent conclusions to which the course of our enquiries leads up, may justify us in asking the further attention of the reader for the few moments needful to present our own view of the history of Paul in its chronological relations.

It seems to be generally held that the journey from Corinth *viâ* Ephesus to Cæsarea (and Jerusalem?) of Acts xviii. 21, 22, was on occasion either of Passover (Ewald, Renan), or Pentecost (Wieseler, Anger); and the idea apparently underlies the tacit assumption of Ramsay (*Paul*, 2nd ed., p. 264), Harnack and McGiffert, that Paul's

arrival in Corinth, eighteen months earlier, must have been in the early fall. But the clause in Acts xviii. 21, *δεῖ με πάντως τὴν ἑορτὴν ἐρχομένην ποιῆσαι εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα* of the Western texts cannot possibly stand against the testimony of \aleph A B, and is rejected by nearly all textual authorities since Mill and Bengel as an importation from xix. 21, xx. 16. None of our authorities, in fact, save Ramsay, consider that there was an actual visit to Jerusalem; McGiffert regards it, with Wendt, Weizsäcker, and H. J. Holtzmann, as intrinsically inconceivable, as well as excluded by Galatians ii. 1. Blass does not even so understand the text (*ἀναβάς* = "ex portu in oppidum"). But even if Paul did visit Jerusalem, and the visit was on occasion of a feast, so far as the text goes it might as well have been the feast of Tabernacles in the autumn as Passover or Pentecost. The grounds for placing the departure of Paul from Corinth in early spring, deduced from Acts xviii. 22, are therefore too slight to be considered; or, if there be any other, I am ignorant of it.

On the other hand, Prof. Ramsay himself informs us (*EXPOSITOR*, v. 5, p. 205) that the arrival of the new proconsul of Achaia "must have been in May or June . . . probably in May"; and if Gallio did not arrive before May, we are practically compelled by the narrative of Acts xviii. 11-18 to place the accusation before Gallio in the summer and Paul's departure in the early fall. This implies that his arrival was in early spring.

The result of this exacter dating of Paul's arrival in Corinth will be a limitation to five, instead of the five and one-half years which Prof. Ramsay allows, between this and the final departure from Corinth in 55 followed by Paul's arrest in Jerusalem. This we find in reality to be in much better agreement with the data of the Epistles and of Acts, particularly in regard to the year preceding Paul's last stay in Corinth (according to our reckoning the

year 54 A.D.) substantially all of which Prof. Ramsay takes to have been spent by Paul in Macedonia; for he dates the flight of Paul from Ephesus to Troas in January, the writing of 2 Corinthians in "summer" of the same year, and the arrival in Achaia in December. A moment's consideration of 2 Corinthians should suffice to show how utterly insupposable this is. From i. 8-10 it appears that Paul's frightful experience "in Asia" is so recent that his readers, but for his report, would still be "ignorant of it"; nor was he able to spend any time in Troas in spite of the promising "door there opened to him in the Lord." On the contrary, not meeting Titus there, as he had hoped, with news of the effect of his sharp letter to the Corinthians, he had pressed on into Macedonia (ii. 12, 13). But even when he and Timothy were come into Macedonia they found no relief from the torment of inward fears until "God who comforteth those that are in the depths comforted them by the coming of Titus," with such good news of the reception accorded the letter, that Paul, who in his anxiety had even regretted having written it, now regrets nothing but the sorrow he had been obliged to inflict upon them (vii. 5-16). Titus now retraces his steps, accompanied by two delegates of the Macedonian churches who had been intending to make the journey in company with Paul, bearing this letter of thankfulness and comfort, not to return again to Paul in Macedonia, but to make ready for his coming to Achaia by completing the collections which already for over a year have been in progress among the Corinthians (viii. 6, 10, 11, 16-19, 22-24; ix. 1-5).

What can be more obvious than that Paul has been spurred on throughout his journey from "Asia" to Macedonia by an anxiety to hear from the Corinthians amounting almost to agony, and that now that Titus has arrived bringing the good news, he will not keep them waiting for his promised coming (i. 15-ii. 1) longer than is absolutely

necessary. In fact the three forerunners of his coming have need of diligence in their work, lest Paul coming after in company with certain Macedonians find them unprepared, and so "he (that he say not they) be put to shame" in regard to his boasting that Achaia has been ready since a year past (ix. 3-5). For short as has been his stay in Macedonia (i. 8 *seq.*) the collections there are already complete (viii. 1-5, 23). Even if we place at this time that further extension of the Macedonian field which carried Paul to the borders of Illyricum (Rom. xv. 19), it is utterly impossible to suppose an entire year to have elapsed between the escape from "Asia" to which 2 Corinthians i. 8 *seq.* looks back, and the arrival in Corinth to which ix. 4 looks forward. If we allow five or six months, we are extending the limits of this journey to the utmost. The escape from Ephesus must therefore have occurred about midsummer, A.D. 54. The reason why Paul did not go to Corinth direct as he had proposed, while he still had confidence in their loyalty (i. 14 *seq.*), but reverted to the plan formed more than a year before (1 Cor. xvi. 5-9; cf. xvi. 1 *seq.* with 2 Cor. viii. 10, ix. 2) is plainly and very emphatically stated in 2 Corinthians i. 23-ii. 1. The "visit in sorrow" threatened in 1 Corinthians iv. 21 had taken place, doubtless direct from Ephesus, with results which called forth the letter "written out of much affliction and anguish of heart" (2 Cor. ii. 4, vii. 8), sent after Paul's return to Ephesus (by the hand of Erastus? Cf. Tit. iii. 12; Acts xix. 22; 2 Tim. iv. 20; Rom. xvi. 23), not long before the catastrophe which drove the apostle to Troas and Macedonia. To us the arguments identifying this letter with 2 Corinthians x. 1-xiii. 10 have long seemed convincing; but even if, with Zahn (*Einleitung*, IV.), we place the whole correspondence of Paul with the Corinthians within the limits of this single year, regarding our 1 Corinthians as the letter whose sharpness Paul had him-

self regretted, we must still conclude with this admirable scholar (*l.c.*, § 19, p. 221), "From 2 Corinthians viii. 9 we can only infer that Paul will not keep them long waiting for his coming, for he does not expect Titus to return. The two deputies of the churches make the first part of the journey it had been intended they should make in company with Paul, somewhat earlier than he, and in company with Titus instead of Paul."

If the departure from Ephesus be placed in the summer of 54, there can be little difference of opinion as to the three-year period of Paul's activity in Asia (Acts xx. 31) counted, so far as appears, by all our authorities as dating from the arrival by ship from Cenchreæ (Acts xviii. 18), and inclusive of the periods of "three months" and "two years" respectively of Acts xix. 8 and 10, as well as the (nine months?) journey of confirmation to the churches of Syria, Galatia and Phrygia (Acts xviii. 18-23).¹ Three months in Achaia (Acts xx. 3), 5-6 months for the journey thither from Ephesus, three years or slightly less for the Ephesian period, and eighteen months for the stay in Corinth will complete the five-years interval we have assumed between

¹ To us the reasoning of Zahn (*l.c.*, p. 133) seems conclusive against the contention of Ramsay limiting the phrase of τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ Γαλατικὴν χώραν of Acts xvi. 6, and the corresponding τὴν Γαλατικὴν χώραν καὶ Φρυγίαν of xviii. 23 to the region of the churches of South Galatia. Acts xvi. 1-6 seems to us, on the contrary, to describe a missionary tour of Paul and Silas from the already established South-Galatian churches as a base, northward through the region of "Phrygia and Galatia" (in the Lucan sense) as far as the borders of Asia on the west and Bithynia on the north. If there is evidence of "haste" in the narrative, it is quite as likely to reflect the haste of the author hurrying from comparatively unknown events to the full light of his incomparable "we source" in v. 10, as the haste of Paul and Silas for inexplicable reasons on their journey. It is this extension of the South-Galatian mission field as well as the original churches of Lycaonia and Pisidia which Paul revisits and confirms, καθ' ἑξῆς, in Acts xviii. 23, viz., "both the Galatian and the Phrygian," or "and Phrygia." The time at his disposal, even after a lengthy stay in Syria (v. 23a) was adequate; for the events which, according to Acts xviii. 24-xix. 1, were taking place at Ephesus and Corinth in the meantime can hardly be supposed to occupy less than 6-9 months.

Paul's first coming to Corinth early in 50 A. D. and his final departure thence shortly before Passover in 55. If this does not meet the conditions of the relative chronology of the second and third missionary journeys, the alternative must be to take the date of Orosius for the Claudian edict as it stands, without correction, and place the coming of Paul to Corinth in the autumn of 49. In either case we have obtained an absolute chronology for the entire period of Paul's literary activity, centering in his arrest at Jerusalem, Pentecost 55 A. D., extending forward five years to his disappearance from the stage of history at Rome in the spring of A. D. 60, and backward another five years to his arrival in Corinth on his second missionary journey in the spring of 50 A. D., or possibly a few months earlier.

Whether we carry back the Jerusalem Conference two years or three before this time is of secondary importance, and will depend principally on the length of time required for the stay in Antioch after the Conference, Acts xv. 30-35, during which occurred the painful incident of Galatians ii. 11-21; and for the portion of the second missionary journey not covered by the Travel Document (Acts xv. 36-xvi. 8; see note above).

The possibility suggested by McGiffert that the writer of Acts is in error regarding the *διακονία* of Paul in Jerusalem (Acts xi. 29, 30, xii. 25), only in regarding it as a separate occasion from that of the Jerusalem Conference (Acts xv. 1-29), is still admissible, since the winter of the famine (dated by Orosius in 45) will have been 46-47 or 47-48. According to Ramsay (*Paul*, 2nd ed. p. 51) it "set in when the harvest of 46 failed." But it is conceivable that the relief from Antioch should not have come until the pressure of a second complete failure of the crops of 47 made assistance still more imperative in the winter of 47-48, and Queen Helena of Adiabene under (Cuspius Fadus and?) Tiberius Alexander (A. D. 46-48) had set the example (*Ant.*

xx. 5, 2). The possibility or impossibility of this suggestion depends upon Prof. McGiffert's analysis of the sources of Acts, with which we have not yet been favoured. But be this as it may, the second journey of Paul to Jerusalem of Galatians ii. 1 *seq.* must have occurred from two to three years before the opening of the year 50 A.D. A further two and one-half to three years before this journey to Jerusalem were occupied by the first missionary journey in Cyprus, Pamphylia and South Galatia, *circa* A.D. 43 (44)–46 (47) (Acts xiii. 1–xiv. 28). The rest of the eleven, or fourteen, years which separated it from the first visit to Jerusalem were occupied by missionary labours "in the regions of Syria and Cilicia" (Gal. i. 21). Paul's base of operations for the first portion of this time we take to have been Damascus, as in the preceding period of "three years" between his conversion and the visit to Jerusalem "to become acquainted with Peter" (Gal. i. 18). This earliest field of Paul's missionary labours we understand to have been permanently closed to him by the episode so vividly reflected in 2 Corinthians xi. 32, 33 (somewhat differently placed by Acts ix. 23–25) which would seem to have occurred in A.D. 39 or 40. Is it only coincidence that the great vision and revelation, the account of which immediately follows in 2 Corinthians xii. 1 *seq.* (written in the autumn of 54), is said to have been given him "fourteen years ago"?

The next field of Paul's activity, if we may trust the account of Acts xi. 25, 26, was his native city of Tarsus, which doubtless became the base for his missionary work "in the regions of Cilicia"; but for some time previous to the coming of Agabus (45 A.D.?) Paul had been occupied in Antioch, whither Barnabas had brought him, and where the two laboured jointly for a year before their great missionary expedition. The resultant chronology of Paul's career will be as follows:—

	A.D.
Conversion	<i>circa</i> 31 (34 ?)
First visit to Jerusalem	,, 33 (36 ?)
Escape from Damascus	,, 39
Work in Cilicia	,, 40-42
Work in Antioch	,, 42-43
First Missionary Journey	,, 44-46
Second visit to Jerusalem	,, 47
Journey with Silas from Antioch to Macedonia	48-49
Arrival in Corinth	early spring, 50
(Epistles to Thessalonians and Galatians)	
Departure from Corinth	early autumn, 51
Tour of Syrian, Galatian and Phrygian churches	51-52
Return to Ephesus	early summer, 52
(2 Cor. vi. 14-vii. 1 and 1 Cor.)	
Visit to (Crete ?), Corinth and return	May-June, 54
(Titus-fragments (?) 2 Cor. x. 1.-xiii. 10)	
Flight from Ephesus	July-Aug., 54
Macedonia	autumn, 54
(Fragments in 1 Tim., 2 Tim. iv. 9, 11-18, 20, 21a (?) and 2 Cor.)	
Achaia	January-March, 55
(Romans)	
Arrest in Jerusalem	May, 55
Defence before Festus	midsummer, 57
Voyage to Rome	August, 57-February, 58
Imprisonment in Rome	until end of 59
(Epistles to "Ephesians," Colossians and Philemon)	
Defence before Nero	60
(Epistles to Philippians and 2 Timothy [i. 13, 14; ii. 14-iii. 17; iv. 3, 4, interpolated])	
Death of Paul	?

BENJ. W. BACON.