

PAULINE AND OTHER
STUDIES

IN EARLY CHRISTIAN HISTORY

BY

W. M. RAMSAY, HON. D.C.L., ETC.

PROFESSOR OF HUMANITY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN

HODDER AND STOUGHTON

LONDON MCMVI

X

QUESTIONS

PLATE XI.



FIG. 17.—American Missionary on the Roman Road (Mrs. Christie of Tarsus).

To face p. 252.

See p. 280.

X

QUESTIONS

AT the urgent request of the Editor, I began to string together a few suggestions, or rather questions, about the interpretation of passages in the New Testament, which have been scattered over many publications; and, further, at his special wish, some disconnected impressions of some of our great scholars, now passed away, are interwoven, just as they rose to my mind and slipped to the tip of the pen.

I. The riches hid below the surface of the earth belonged to the Emperor. All quarries were managed and worked by his own private officers for his private purse. Every block that was quarried was inspected by the proper officer, and marked by him as approved.¹ Our knowledge of the subject has been for the most part derived from blocks actually found in Rome, and which, therefore, were choice blocks sent to the capital. But at the Phrygian marble quarries there have been found many blocks, which had been cut, but not sent on to Rome. These are never marked as approved; and some of them bear the letters REPR, *i.e.*, *reprobatum*, "rejected". These were considered as imperfect and unworthy pieces, and rejected by the inspector.

This explanation of the letters REPR, which passes under my name, was published in the *Mélanges d'Arché-*

¹*Probante.*

ologie et d'Histoire of the French School of Rome, 1882; but I am glad to take the opportunity of giving the credit where it is due. It was suggested by that excellent scholar, the late Father Bruzza; but, as the proof-sheets of my paper passed through his hands, he did not allow the acknowledgment to stand in print. It was he who perceived that this custom of testing, and sometimes rejecting, blocks for building purposes was connected with the words of First Peter, "the stone which the builders rejected," ii. 7.

These words (derived from *Psalms* cxviii. and applied to himself by Christ, *Matthew* xxi. 42) are quoted by Peter in his speech to the Sanhedrin, *Acts* iv. 11. But in *Acts* he uses the verb ἐξουθενέω, "to despise and regard as valueless," while in the *Epistle* he uses the verb ἀποδοκιμάζω, "to test and reject". It is an interesting point that the former is the more accurate translation of the Hebrew word, while the latter is the word used in the Septuagint.¹ Why should Peter sometimes use the one word and sometimes the other? The view is, apparently, held by some that Luke is here translating from a Hebrew authority, and that he is responsible for the rendering. But Luke can hardly have been ignorant of the Septuagint rendering; and it is improbable that on his own authority he should have selected a different word. On the view which I have maintained of Luke's character as an historian, I feel bound to think that he used the verb because Peter used it; and, therefore, Peter addressed the Sanhedrin in Greek. But further, Peter must have been thinking of the Hebrew text of *Psalms*, and have rendered the Hebrew word direct into Greek.

May we not infer that the change of verb in the *Epistle*

¹ See Hort's notes on *1 Pet.* ii. 4 and 7.

corresponds to a change that occurred in Peter's mind and circumstances in the interval between *Acts* iv. 11 and *1 Peter* ii. 7? He had become more Græcised; he now used the Greek Bible in place of the Hebrew (or at least in addition to it), and he recognised that the verb ἀποδοκιμάζω, "to reject after actual trial," though not a strictly accurate rendering of the Hebrew word, corresponded better to the actual customs known to those whom he addressed.

Further, may this progress towards Greek and Western ways and speech be taken as a proof that Peter moved westwards in the direction of Rome, and did not go away to the East and direct his work to the city of Babylon? Had that been the course of his life, there could have been no such progress as is evinced in this little detail and in many more important ways.

It is satisfactory to see that Dr. Hort decisively rejected that most perverse of ideas—that this Epistle was written from the city of Babylon. They who hold such a view, however great they may be as purely verbal scholars, stamp themselves as untrustworthy judges in all matters that refer to the life and society of the Empire. The Jew who wrote this Epistle must have lived long amid the society of the Empire; and he could never have acquired such a tone and cast of thought, if he had spent his life mainly in Palestine and Mesopotamia.

II. The variation in the power and success of missions in different countries is obvious to the most casual observer. Missionary work does not radiate steadily forth from a centre. It moves along the lines of least resistance, and its course is determined by many conditions, which the historian must study and try to understand, while the men who are actually engaged in the work obey them, or are com-

pelled by them, often without being fully conscious of them.

Now, let us apply this to the book of Acts. One of the most striking features in the book is the apparently restricted view that is taken of the spread of Christianity. We read of the way in which it was carried north to Antioch, and then north-west and west to the South Galatian cities, to Macedonia and Achaia, to Asia and to Rome; and when we have crossed the limits of the land of Rome, and approach the city,¹ the brethren come forth many miles to welcome us, and convoy us into the midst of an already existing Church in Rome. The news has reached the heart of the Empire long ago.

There is no reasonable possibility of doubting that Christian missionaries went in other directions and by many other paths than those described in Acts. We can trace the activity of nameless missionaries in many places, *e.g.*, in *Acts* xi. 19, in *Acts* xxviii. 15. Among them we must class the Judaising missionaries who troubled Paul, in South Galatia, in Rome, and probably everywhere. These unknown workers doubtless tried literally to "go forth into all the world".

The question is whether we are to class the silence of Luke about almost all this mass of active work among the "gaps," which so much trouble many scholars, or whether we should not rather look to discover some reason for his silence? It is plain that, in Luke's estimation, all the other missionaries sink into insignificance in comparison with the one great figure of Paul. They become important in proportion as they agree with his methods, and are guided

¹ Ὅστως εἰς τὴν Ῥώμην ἤλθαμεν *Acts* xxviii. 14, and εἰσῆλθαμεν εἰς Ῥώμην xxviii. 16. On the distinction between these two phrases, which with singular blindness the commentators still persist in regarding as exactly equivalent, see *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 347.

by his spirit. When they differ from him, they become secondary figures, and disappear from Luke's pages.

Was Luke's vision restricted in this way merely because he was dazzled by the brilliancy of Paul? Or may he have had some better ground to stand on? One may speculate on these alternatives in an abstract way; but the more profitable method is to seek for some concrete facts on which to found an hypothesis. Some facts bearing on the subject are, I think, furnished by the distribution of second and third century Christian inscriptions in Central Asia Minor. Elsewhere it is pointed out that these inscriptions fall into three groups, clearly marked off from one another both by geographical separation and by style and character, pointing to "three separate lines of Christian influence in Phrygia during the early centuries".¹ . . . "It seems beyond question that the first line of influence spread from the Ægean coastlands, and that its ultimate source was in St. Paul's work in Ephesus, and in the efforts of his coadjutors during the following years; while the second originated in the earlier Pauline Churches of Derbe, Lystra, Iconium and Antioch." The third belongs to the north-west of Phrygia, and, by a remarkable coincidence, to the country which Paul traversed between Pisidian Antioch and Troas (*Acts* xvi. 6-8).

We possess only one document long enough to show anything of the spirit of these early Churches, the epitaph which a second-century presbyter or bishop² wrote "to be an imperishable record of his testimony and message which he had to deliver to mankind"; and it mentions (besides

¹ *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, pt. ii., p. 511.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 722 ff., where the voluminous literature about Avircius Marcellus is described.

the main truths of his religion) the ever-present companionship and guidance of Paul. It has survived to bear witness that the Churches of Central Asia Minor continued to look to Paul as their pattern and their guide more than a century after his death.

Must we not take these facts as a sign that, so far as Asia Minor is concerned, Luke perceived the truth? It was the influence of Paul's spirit, acting directly or through his followers and pupils, that was the really powerful force in the country. Everything else becomes insignificant in comparison. So Luke thought: and so the facts bear witness.

Further, may this not have been the case elsewhere? Perhaps Luke perceived the essential facts, and recorded them. Perhaps it was only in the Roman world that men's minds were ready for the new religion. If that religion came "in the fulness of time," was not that "fulness of time" wrought out by the unifying influence of Roman organisation, and by the educating influence of Greek philosophical theory, so that it was only within the circle of these influences that the Church grew? May it not be the case that the pre-Pauline Church in Rome was recreated by Paul, and acquired its future form and character from him; and that thus the historian is justified in leaving its earlier existence unmentioned until it came forth to welcome him as he was approaching the gates of Rome? Certain it is that Christianity was made the religion of the Roman Empire by Paul, and by Paul's single idea; that Luke's mind, as he wrote, was filled with that idea; and that he fashioned his history with the view of showing how that idea worked itself out in fact. Hence after A.D. 44 all other missionary work, except what sprang from Paul, was unimportant in his estimation.

Is it so certain as many seem to hold that Luke's conception was inadequate? Would any extra-Roman spread of Christianity have been permanent? Would even the non-Pauline propagation southward towards Egypt (which may be assumed as certain) have been successful and lasting, had it not been reinforced by the Pauline spirit? Is not the case of Apollos in *Acts* xviii. 24 ff. really a typical one, as Luke evidently considered it?

A phrase which often occurred to me when, as an undergraduate, I was studying Greek philosophy for the schools, bears on this. As I tried to understand the character of those later systems in which the earlier and more purely Greek thought, when carried by the conquests of Alexander into the cities of the East, attempted to adapt itself to its new environment by assimilating the elements which the East had to contribute and which the Greek mind could never supply, the expressions often rose to my lips that these were the imperfect forms of Christianity, and again that Paul was the true successor of Aristotle.

The phrases were probably both caught from some source that I was studying (though I was never conscious of having read them); and, if so, I should be glad to learn where they occur. At the time, in 1875-1876, the writers who most influenced me were T. H. Green and Lightfoot. To both I owe almost equally much, though in very different ways. My debt to Green is similar to that of many Oxford students; though I never heard him lecture, and only twice or thrice was so far honoured as to be allowed to talk with him. The quality in Lightfoot's work that most impressed me was his transparent honesty, his obvious straining to understand and represent every person's opinion with scrupulous fairness. In him I was for the first time con-

scious of coming in contact with a mind that was educated, thoughtful, trained in scholarship, perfectly straight and honest, and yet able to accept simply the New Testament in the old-fashioned way, without refining it into metaphysical conceptions like Green, or rationalising it into commonplace and second-rate history like my German idols. The combination had previously seemed to me impossible in our age, though possible at an earlier time ; and its occurrence in Lightfoot set me to rethink the grounds of my own position.

III. Why is Peter silent about Paul, when he is writing to so many of the Pauline Churches? This question is briefly touched by Hort ; and, while saying nothing positive, he obviously inclines to the view that Paul was dead. He explains away the obvious remark, that some reference to the recent death of their great founder would seem imperatively demanded from Peter in writing to the Churches, by the supposition that the "sad tidings of Paul's death had been already made known to the Asiatic Christians by their Roman brethren or by St. Peter himself".¹

But is it not clear in this Epistle that the writer is clad with authority, as the recognised head to whom the Pauline Churches looked for guidance and advice in a great crisis? The writer evidently speaks with full and conscious deliberation, because he feels that a serious trial awaits the Churches, and that he is the person to whom they look. This is distinctly inconsistent with the idea that Paul was living ; and we need not doubt that this was the argument which weighed with Hort, and made him place the letter after Paul's death. The authority which Paul exercised over his Churches, and the discipline on which he laid such stress, would be violated,

¹ Hort, *First Epistle*, p. 6.

if another stepped in to address and comfort and encourage them, without a word of apology or explanation, without even a reference to Paul. That would be the act of a rival and not of a friend ; but it seems to me beyond all question that Peter was the most cordial and hearty supporter of Paul among the older Apostles, and the one with whom Paul felt most kinship in spirit. Especially is it clear that the author of this Epistle, whoever he was, must have been in the most cordial relations with the Pauline policy.

But is this letter conceivable even after Paul's death, except at some considerable interval? An analogy will help us in this question. Paul's silence about Peter in the letters to and from Rome is, in my estimation, a conclusive proof that Peter had never been instrumental in building up the Church of Rome, until after the last of these Epistles was written. Similarly, Peter's silence about Paul is to me conclusive that Peter was now the recognised successor to Paul's position in relation to the Asian Churches ;¹ that he is not simply putting himself into that position without a reference to his dead friend ; but that he can look back over a lapse of some years, during which his standing had become established, and Paul's followers, Silas and Mark, had attached themselves to the company and service of his successor. So Rev. F. Warburton Lewis pointed out to me.

This view is not wholly inconsistent with the theory that First Peter was composed before the Apostle suffered under Nero, supposing that Paul suffered in 62 or even in 64, and that Peter survived till 67 or so. But, for my own part, I can see no ground for believing that Paul died before 66 or

¹What ground is there for the general view that Peter was older than the Saviour, and much older than Paul? It might be argued that he was four or five years younger than Christ, and nearly of an age with Paul.

even perhaps 67; and in that case the life of Peter must have lasted into the time of Vespasian, as no persecution can have occurred while the wars of the succession absorbed Roman attention.

IV. Now that Hort has laid down with a precision characteristic of himself, and with a decisiveness and finality that is almost rare in his work, the principle that the Churches of Asia Minor are classified according to the provinces of the Roman Empire, and not according to the non-Roman national divisions, and has stated positively and unhesitatingly that the Pauline Churches in Phrygia and Lycaonia¹ were classed by St. Peter as Churches of Galatia, it is to be hoped that the progress of study will no longer be impeded by laboured attempts to prove that it was impossible or inaccurate for Paul to class them as his Churches of Galatia, or by equally futile attempts to prove that the name Galatia was never applied to the great Roman Province of Central Asia Minor, stretching across nearly from sea to sea. It will remain as one of the curiosities of scholarship that in this last decade, after these points had long been taken as settled by all historical students, so many distinguished theologians, after casting a hasty glance into the antiquities of Asia Minor, should print discussions of the subject proving that that which was could not possibly have been.

But if Peter, as Hort declares, classed Antioch, Iconium, Derbe and Lystra among the Churches of Galatia, must not Paul have done the same thing? Is it likely that First Peter, a letter so penetrated with the Pauline spirit, so much influenced by at least two Pauline epistles, composed in such close relations with two of Paul's coadjutors, Silas and Mark,

¹ Hort, *First Peter*, pp. 17, 157 ff.

should class the Pauline Churches after a method that Paul would not employ?

Further, Hort lays down as a matter of certainty that Asia throughout the New Testament means the Province, therein contradicting the recent ideas of Professors Blass and Zahn. Must we not then take Galatia in Paul on the same analogy, and admit that when he wrote to the Churches of Galatia he included among them all Churches within the bounds of the Province?

It has just been said that Hort speaks on this subject with a decisiveness and finality that is not so common in his work. It is characteristic of him, rather, never to reach decisiveness. He seems always to have been keenly conscious how much subjectivity is liable to be admitted into the judgment of the most careful, cool and mature scholar, and to have often shrunk from feeling confident in his own best proved conclusions. One of our best scholars told me in a different connection a story which illustrates this quality. Speaking of the authorship of Second Peter, he said he had once spoken to Hort on the subject. Hort replied somewhat to this effect: My first impulse is to say that the same hand which wrote the first epistle could not have written the second. But, then, my second impulse is to doubt whether I can be right in thinking so.

Was it not this quality, which is closely connected with his love of perfect truth and his unwillingness to leave the smallest trace of error in his work, that prevented him from writing more, and deprived us of much that we had almost a right to expect from his admirable scholarship, his wide range of knowledge, and his clear judgment? He that is never content till he has risen superior to the weakness of humanity, who is unwilling to print anything till he has

purged it of the minutest trace of error, will write little. But, worse than that, it is very doubtful whether he will ever write his best. While he spends his time polishing up the less important details, he sometimes loses his grasp of the essential and guiding clue. Truth will not wait to be wooed after we shall have finished the accessories. We must press forward, when the goddess allows a glimpse of her face to be visible for a moment; it will be veiled again immediately; it may be never again unveiled to the too cautious seeker. He who attempts the pursuit must be content to arrive bearing the stains and mud and dust of travel; and, if he is too careful to avoid soiling his feet, he is less likely to reach his aim.

It seems a sort of retribution on the man, whose too delicate and overstrained love of perfection deprived the world of the work it had always expected from him, that his manuscripts should be published after his death by the piety of his pupils—a piety so reverent that they apparently shrink even from the thought that anything in his work could need correction. For example, in his too short edition of the opening chapters of First Peter, there is an essay on the provinces of Asia Minor. It was written, apparently, in the year 1882, for I see no reference to anything not accessible in that year. Hort was lecturing on the Epistle as late as 1887; but it may be doubted if he did anything at this essay during the intermediate years. He evidently studied carefully the inscriptions bearing on this subject, while preparing the essay; but he studied them in 1882, and shows no knowledge of several inscriptions which (with Mommsen's commentary on them) would have materially modified his statements on some points. The essay is, indeed, remarkably accurate, considering when it

was composed. It is, of course, founded on Marquardt's *Römische Staatsalterthümer*; but it tacitly avoids several of Marquardt's mistakes, and shows an admirable tact in selecting what was permanent and true in the views current at that period. There are few statements that could have been called erroneous at that time;¹ but, surely, there might have been found among his pupils some one who would take the trouble to look over at least the parts of the Berlin Corpus that have been published since Hort's death; and mingle sufficient courage with his piety to correct (or at least to omit) the statements which the progress of discovery has shown to be inaccurate. Thus, for example, the old statement (founded on Dion), that Claudius instituted the province of Lycia-Pamphylia in A.D. 43, appears on p. 162, though the difficulties of this view are plainly stated. It is now established by Mommsen's commentary on a recently discovered Pamphylian inscription that Pamphylia was a distinct procuratorial province for some time later, then was connected with Galatia for a short time, and at last was united to Lycia by Vespasian.

But enough of the ungrateful task of pointing out faults! Yet it is regrettable that Hort's work should be treated with such undutiful dutifulness; and that English scholarship should be exposed to the just criticism of the foreigner, that it seems to be ignorant that some errors have been eliminated between 1882 and 1898 and that these should not appear any longer in print under the patronage of an honoured name.²

¹I quote one to justify the criticism. On p. 162, note 3, he treats as part of the reorganisation of the East by Pompey in B.C. 64 the gift of parts of Pamphylia to Amyntas, which was really made by Antonius in 36.

²In i. 7 Hort sees that an adjective is needed, and is inclined to accept the poorly attested reading *δοκιμον*. Why should not an editor indicate that Deissmann has discovered the adjective *δοκιμιος*, and thus justified Hort's inclination in an unexpected way.

V. Did early Christian travellers pack their baggage? This question is suggested by *Acts* xxi. 15, where Dr. Blass rejects the reading *ἐπισκευασάμενοι*¹ on the ground that (1) there are no other cases where this verb means "collecting one's baggage" (*sarcinis collectis*), and (2) it is strange that packing up should be mentioned here and nowhere else on the journey. But, on the contrary, it seems only natural that the equipment should be mentioned here and nowhere else. Dr. Blass has taken too narrow a view of the process of equipment. The company was changing from sea-voyage to landfaring. Equipment was needed to perform the journey of sixty-four miles to Jerusalem in two days, and this was provided in Cæsareia, and was brought back to Cæsareia by the disciples from the night's halting-place. Let us look into this carefully and from the proper point of view, and not as travellers in trains or by Cook's excursions, for whom everything is arranged with the minimum of exertion on their part. The company had spent in Cæsareia the time during which they might have been making their journey quietly and easily to Jerusalem; yet they were pressed for time, if they were anxious to arrive before a near day. If they waited till the last moment at Cæsareia, as they obviously did,² this implies that they were calculating their journey very nearly, and reckoning it to a matter of hours. Now it is an elementary principle of right

¹ He proposes the conjecture *ἀσπασάμενοι*, but wisely refrains from putting it in the text.

² On the one hand it is clear that the fifty days had not elapsed between the start from Philippi and the arrival at Cæsareia, and that, after reaching Cæsareia, they had it in their power to reach Jerusalem in time for Pentecost. On the other hand, by waiting several days (*πλείους ἡμέρας*) at Cæsareia, it is equally clear that they were running it very fine, and were leaving themselves no margin.

living in southern countries that one must avoid those great exertions and strains which in northern lands we habitually take as an amusement. The customs of the modern people show that this principle guides their whole life ; and it may be taken for certain that in ancient time the same principle guided ordinary life. Moreover, Paul was accompanied by his physician, who fully realised the importance of the principle, and knew that Paul, subject as he was to attacks of illness and constantly exposed to great mental and emotional strains, must not begin his duties in Jerusalem by a hurried walk of sixty-four miles in two days.

In a word, they arranged for horses or conveyances to take them without fatigue over a great part of the long journey ; and they had been able to stay so long in Cæsareaia because it had been settled with the disciples there that this should be done. The whole journey must have been discussed and planned ; and it is just because the method was unusual for that company of travellers, and because it had therefore taken time to settle details, that it is so pointedly mentioned in the narrative.¹ The horses then conveyed the company rapidly along the level coast road to a point where the ascent to the highlands of Judæa began,² probably to Lydda, a distance of forty miles. The disciples returned to Cæsareaia, taking the animals with them ; and Paul's company could safely perform the twenty-four miles' walk

¹One other case occurs in which, as I think, Paul's disciples sent him on by horse or carriage (see *Church in Rom. Emp.*, p. 68), where the evidence is contained, not in *Acts*, which was written by one who had not been present, but in Paul's own words to his entertainers. In this case, also, the conveyance was, I doubt not, provided by the Cæsarean disciples, and not hired by Paul himself. They brought Paul to the village, and took home the horses.

²Every reader of Professor G. A. Smith's *Historical Geography* will recognise how much his lucid pictures help in conceiving this journey properly.

to Jerusalem on the following day. So far, then, from *ἐπισκευασάμενοι* being used, as Dr. Blass thinks, in an unexampled sense here, it is probably used in its proper and commonest sense, "having equipped (animals)";¹ and, when we translate it in its ordinary sense in classical Greek, we find the journey described exactly as any common pagan traveller would have made it. But many people write and think about *Acts* as if the early Christians never could have lived or travelled like ordinary men.

VI. As this Article has been largely devoted to Dr. Hort, the following brief estimate and reminiscence of that great scholar may be added.

It may be not unbecoming for one who cannot pretend to estimate Dr. Hort's merits as a theologian, to venture to add a word on the loss which ancient history has sustained by his death. In an epoch of surpassing interest in the history of the world, his work is a sure and strong foundation for the historian to work on; and it could never have been so if he had confined his survey to the Christian documents alone, and had not been guided by a wide outlook over the whole field of contemporary history. The early Christian writers were environed by the Roman Empire; and one could not talk for half an hour with Dr. Hort without seeing how clearly he realised that fact and the necessary inference from it, that the want of a vivid and accurate conception of the Roman world as a whole is certain to produce distortion in one's conception of the historical position of the early Christian writers. Many of

¹ Chrysostom clearly understood the word so. He explains it as τὰ πρὸς τὴν ὁδοιπορίαν λαβόντες (i.e., ὑποζύγια); cp. Pollux, x., 14, quoted by Wetstein (with a misprint), ἐπισκευασμένα ἦν τὰ ὑποζύγια, οἷον ἐστρωματισμένα. The ellipsis of ὑποζύγια is natural, when we take the word, with Pollux, as "having saddled".

PLATE XIV.



FIG. 20.—Sarcophagus in the Ruins near the Arch of Severus
(Mrs. Christie of Tarsus).

To face p. 268.

See p. 281.

the modern so-called "critical" theories about them could never have been proposed, had the authors possessed a clear idea of the whole life and history of the period. From such falseness of view, and from other possible distortions in a different direction, Dr. Hort was saved, partly of course by his natural genius, but to a considerable extent by his university training; and I hope the day is far distant when theologians will start without such preliminary discipline in historical facts and method. Perhaps also one may express the hope, with which I know that Dr. Hort strongly sympathised, that the day will soon come when the historians will recognise how much they sacrifice by their almost complete overlooking of the early Christian writers as authorities for the general history of the period.

The first time that I had the opportunity of meeting Dr. Hort—in Dr. Westcott's house at Cambridge in 1887—was only sufficient for me to learn what a vigorous, sympathetic, wide and masculine intellect his was. But the only occasion on which I could really profit by his knowledge was in June, 1892, when his health was already broken. Dr. Sanday ordered me (for his advice I accepted as a command) to call on him, and had arranged that my call should not seem an intrusion. The conversation was entirely about the lectures which I had just had the honour of giving at Mansfield College; and I was much encouraged to find that many of the views I had expressed met with his cordial approval, and that his criticisms on matters of detail as a rule only strengthened the general position. In one point I owe him eternal gratitude. I mentioned that the period to which tradition assigned the New Testament documents seemed to me to be correct in all cases except one: First Peter appeared to me to be fixed inexorably to

a period A.D. 75-85. Before I could go on to state the inference which appeared to me necessary, and which I had drawn in one of my lectures—that the Epistle could not be the work of the Apostle—he broke in with much animation that he had always felt that there was no tradition of any value as to the date of Peter's death: the martyrdom was clearly and well attested, but its period rested on no authority. I caught from him at once the idea, which I have since worked out at some length, that First Peter, though composed about A.D. 75, is still a genuine work. At the time he seemed very favourably inclined to this date, and suggested several points bearing on it. Perhaps on subsequent reflection he may have seen objections to it which did not come up in conversation; nor do I wish to claim him as finally supporting this view, because he for a short time busied himself in suggesting circumstances that told in its favour, several of which were of a kind that I cannot myself use, as I restrict myself to external and archæological evidence. But certain it is that I left him (after he had kept me so long that I feared it would do him harm in his obviously weak state) with the impression in my mind that he would work out the idea in lines different from mine, and in a way that I could not attain to. Whether he afterwards rejected it or not will now perhaps never be known.

PLATE XV.




FIG. 21.—Looking up towards the Cilician Gates (Mrs. W. M. Ramsay).

See p. 282.

PLATE XVI.




FIG. 22.—In the Cilician Gates (Mrs. W. M. Ramsay).

To face p. 270.

See p. 283.