

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

XIV

THE PAULINE CHRONOLOGY

## XIV

### THE PAULINE CHRONOLOGY

NEW TESTAMENT chronology in general is exceedingly uncertain and obscure. This is no proof that the history which the New Testament records is unhistorical or uncertain. Owing to a variety of causes ancient chronology as a whole is full of doubtful points; and the reasoning on which the commonly accepted dating depends is in most cases complicated and in many cases very far from certain. But in profane history the uncertainty whether an event commonly assigned to B.C. 301 may not have occurred in 302 or 300, is of little consequence and rouses no strong feelings; and the popular books on history give many dates which are known to the accurate scholar to be mere rough approximations, but which are accepted for want of better. But in New Testament history the issues are of grave importance, and touch the deepest feelings in our minds. No date here is accepted—no date ought to be accepted—without the severest scrutiny. A false chronology often causes apparent inconsistencies in the narrative, which disappear when the chronology is corrected.

It is certain that Pauline chronology has suffered from being generally handled by scholars who had no special training in ancient chronological studies, but merely dipped into the subject for the single purpose of fixing early Christian events. The present writer ventures to think that great

part of the history of Paul can be dated with a precision and certainty rare in ancient history, by a series of reasons, drawn from the most diverse sides, all of which point to the same result. In ancient history, as a whole, new discoveries are being constantly made, which sometimes alter an accepted date, sometimes render precise a date that previously could be stated only with the saving word "about". Practice in these questions will enable any one to appreciate the strength of the arguments by which Pauline chronology can be settled. Dates on coins or inscriptions, given by the number of years from an accepted era, are generally the surest form of evidence; but even they can often be cavilled at, for the era has to be fixed, and this is often possible only by a long and perhaps uncertain argument. The coin may date an event in the year 316; but what was the year 1? And what was the opening day of the year? In ancient times the first day of the year was placed in different seasons by different nations, even by different towns. New Year's Day might be 1st January in one city, while neighbouring cities celebrated it in spring, or summer, or autumn.

One great cause of difficulty may be at once set aside. The incidence of the annual Passover has been the subject of probably more controversy, and elicited more elaborate and tedious discussion, than any other question in ancient history. It has been proved repeatedly by the most learned in Jewish archæology that the day of Passover might vary between several days of the month, and even between two months, according to the phases of the moon; and that it was only fixed by the High-priest after observation of the appearance of the new moon in the month Nisan, in which the feast was held. It is contended by these scholars, and has been almost universally accepted in modern times,

that until about fourteen days before Passover was celebrated the day and even the month of its incidence were uncertain. We need not spend time in explaining the causes of this uncertainty: they have been explained over and over again without adding one iota to knowledge or advancing in any degree the solution of the question.<sup>1</sup>

It was possible to be content with about twelve days' advertisement of the Passover, while the Jews lived only in Palestine. But in the Dispersion, when the Jews were scattered over the Greek and Roman and even the Barbarian world, this could not be permitted. It was the common Passover that held together the scattered nation; the Jews came back for the Passover from great distances. Any uncertainty as to the month would have made this impossible. Even uncertainty as to the day would have seriously detracted from the value of the feast as a unifying power. The feeling that all Jews, even those who could not go to Jerusalem, celebrated the feast and uttered the sacred words at the same moment and instructed their children in the mystic and historic meaning of the ceremonies on the same evening—that feeling was an essential element in the influence which the Passover exerted on the whole race. No one can read Acts xx. 3-6 without feeling that Paul and his friends knew the Passover to be the same, whether at Philippi or at Jerusalem.

With the slow communication of ancient times, it was necessary that, if the exact incidence of the Passover were to be known universally to the Jews in the whole world with

<sup>1</sup> The latest and perhaps the clearest exposition of this uncertainty is by Professor Bacon of Yale in the *Expositor*, 1899 and 1900. Mr. C. H. Turner, in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, i., p. 420, takes a more reasonable view, but even he allows too much for supposed uncertainties, and (as I venture to think) spoils his chronology thereby.

certainty and in good time, the date must be fixed on scientific principles during the previous year. The century before and after Christ was the age of calendar reform. The required scientific knowledge was available; and no historian can doubt that it was used for this great purpose before the time of Paul's journeys.

The old empirical method was not disused. It was a religious duty that the new moon of Nisan must be observed and reported to the High-priest. But the ceremony was now formal, and its results were mapped out and made known to the Jewish world months beforehand. Later, as the Christian element in the Empire ill-treated the Jews, the latter were thrown into opposition; and as the Empire became Christian and anti-Jewish the Jews revolted from the science that was learned from the outer world; and there was a resolute ignoring (seen in the Talmud) of all that they had owed to Greek and Roman science in the happier times of the early Empire.

The subject is so complicated by many diversities of eras and of new years, etc., that, to give a brief sketch of it, we must omit all delicate points of difference and speak through-out roughly in simple terms, according to years of the Christian era beginning on 1st January. Especially the relation of Eusebius's dates to Jerome's is a complicated question; and we compare them roughly. As the Eusebian chronology is fundamental in our sketch, we must explain that Eusebius's lost *Chronica* is known: (1) through an Armenian translation; (2) through the use of it made by Syncellus and others; (3) through the Latin translation, expanded and modified in some cases by Jerome, a learned but not an accurate man. When we speak of Eusebius's dates we refer generally to the Armenian translation.

The chronology of Paul is most conveniently treated by regarding the two years' captivity in Cæsarea (Acts xxiv. 27) as the central point. From that most of the rest of his life can be readily reckoned backward or forward. The beginning of the captivity was shortly after Pentecost, in June, two full years before the end of Felix's administration. The end of the captivity coincided with the arrival of Festus to succeed Felix as the Roman governor of Palestine, about June of a certain year.

Among the various chronological systems the following will engage and reward our consideration :—

1. The Eusebian System (so-called).<sup>1</sup> Eusebius places the coming of Festus to Palestine in the last year of Claudius, A.D. 54. Now Eusebius knew perfectly well (as he says in his *History of the Church*) that Festus came after Nero's reign began; but the explanation of this seeming inconsistency is that the plan of his chronological tables made him call the entire year in which Nero began to reign the fourteenth of Claudius, and the next whole year the first of Nero.<sup>2</sup> Apparently, then, he thought that Festus came after Claudius's death, in October, 54, but before the year ended. Eusebius, however, made some mistake. Even those scholars who cling to what they call the Eusebian dating have had to acknowledge that he was wrong by one or more years.

The prejudices and predilections of the present writer were all in favour of the Eusebian dating; but the evidence against this date is overwhelming. Must we then conclude that Eusebius committed an inexplicable blunder, making

<sup>1</sup> It will be shown in the sequel that this is not the Eusebian system, but a deviation from the Eusebian system, owing to a mistake made by Eusebius himself.

<sup>2</sup> So, *e.g.*, he puts two early acts of Caligula as Emperor in the last year of Tiberius.

his chronology for this period quite untrustworthy? This conclusion long seemed inevitable, until recently a German scholar, Dr. Erbes, gave the explanation—so simple that it seems marvellous how one failed to see it sooner. Eusebius in his reckoning of the kings (which he liked to make continuous, disregarding any *interregnum*), counted A.D. 45 as the first year of Herod Agrippa II. (Acts xxvi.), because his father, Herod Agrippa I. (Acts xii.), died in A.D. 44. From an early authority he learned that Festus came in the tenth year of Agrippa II., and wrongly counting from 45 he set down in his tables the coming of Festus in A.D. 54. But the years of Agrippa were really counted from 50, so that his tenth year was 59.<sup>1</sup>

The supposition that Eusebius made such a mistake in using his authority is quite in accordance with his practice. There are several other cases in which he has failed to observe that his authority reckoned on a different principle from himself, and identified the "tenth year" of a king in his authority with the "tenth year" in his own mistake. For example, he rightly gives fifty-six years six months as the total duration of Augustus's power. That estimate was counted from the spring of 43, when Augustus attained high office. But Eusebius counted Augustus as following Julius Cæsar without any interval, and he thus goes wrong by an entire year; and when we count back from Tiberius to Julius we find that Eusebius has dropped one year. The present writer had repeatedly been baffled by this mistake in Eusebius, until Dr. Erbes's observation about the years of Agrippa set him on the right track.

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Erbes (*Todestage Pauli und Petri* in Gebhardt and Harnack's *Texte und Untersuchungen*, xix., 1), who does not like the plain issue of his own theory, has an elaborate and futile argument to show that the eleventh year was mentioned by Eusebius's authority, making the coming of Festus in 60.



Thus we gather that the coming of Festus to Palestine was placed in A.D. 59 by the early historian, who served Eusebius as the authority for his dating. This authority, who lies behind Eusebius, was probably a first-century historian, and Dr. Erbes suggests that he was Justus of Tiberias (the rival of Josephus). We may for convenience speak of this date as the Justine-Eusebian, recognising that the connection with Justus is only conjectural, but that the date rests on some old and good authority, whose numbers were wrongly understood by Eusebius owing to the mistake above described.

2. Jerome recoiled from the obviously false date given by Eusebius, and in his translation of the *Chronica* he brought down the coming of Festus and some connected dates by two years. With this we may associate other modifications of the Eusebian dating: some German scholars advocate 55 as the year when Festus came; Professor Bacon of Yale advocates 57. The latter date has absolutely no ancient authority in its favour; and it is a mere misnomer to call it Eusebian. These all assume that Eusebius made a blunder, and fail to give any reasonable explanation why he fell into it. He had access to good authorities; and if (as they dated) Festus came under Nero in 56 or 57, it is inexplicable why Eusebius should have carried him back to the last year of Claudius.

3. The great majority of scholars accept the date 60 for Festus; but they confess that it is only an approximate date, and that there is no decisive argument for it. But, being accepted for want of a better, it stands firm and has possession of almost all the books on the New Testament, many of which do not mention that it is admittedly uncertain. We shall prove that it is entirely impossible.

Let us now accept the Justine-Eusebian date, and see where it leads us. We shall find a series of arguments confirming it—arguments which had led the present writer to advocate it for years before Dr. Erbes's discovery. On this system the captivity in Cæsarea lasted from about June, 57, to about midsummer, 59; and Paul must have travelled from Philippi to Jerusalem in March and April, 57. The following arguments confirm this date:—

I. A direct inference from Acts xx. 5 ff. Paul celebrated the Passover of 57, Thursday, 7th April, in Philippi. He remained there through the days of unleavened bread, 7th to 14th April, and then started for Jerusalem. He “was hastening, if it were possible for him, to be at Jerusalem the day of Pentecost”; and Luke is clear that, with the chances of the long journey before him,<sup>1</sup> he stayed only till the feast was ended, and forthwith started on the morning of Friday, 15th April. The journey to Troas lasted “until the fifth day”;<sup>2</sup> the time is long (only three days were needed in Acts xvi. 11), but the company had to find a boat at Neapolis. They reached Troas on Tuesday, 19th April, and stayed seven days there. Now the regular custom in ancient reckoning is to include both the day of arrival and the day of departure, even though both were incomplete.<sup>3</sup> The company, therefore, stayed from Tuesday, 19th April, to Monday, 25th April, in Troas, and sailed very early on the Monday morning, as Luke describes.

The year which our ancient authority assigned agrees exactly with Luke's precise statement of days. On the other hand, if we suppose that Paul travelled in 58, Passover

<sup>1</sup> At that time travelling was easy and sure to a degree unattained again till this century, but it was very slow.

<sup>2</sup> Such is the exact force of the Greek expression, Acts xx. 6.

<sup>3</sup> See Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. v., p. 474 f.

in that year fell on Monday, 27th March; and Luke's statement of numbers and days is inconsistent with that. Similarly, the other years around 57 are excluded. We come then, to the conclusion that if Luke is accurate, Paul's journey to Jerusalem was made in 57.

If Paul was hastening, why did he stay on in Troas till the following Monday? Either he stayed because he could not find sooner a convenient ship bound on a rapid voyage (which is the probable and natural explanation), or because he wished to make some little stay in Troas, where on his former visit he had found "an open door" which at the moment he was not able to take advantage of (2 Cor. ii. 12 f.). In either case it is plain that he dare not linger in Philippi after the feast; and the supposition of some chronologists that he did not start immediately after the feast seems mere cavilling at the plain interpretation of Luke, in defiance of the needs of the situation.

II. Our next argument is founded on Josephus, made more precise by dates on contemporary coins; and it places the coming of Festus not later than A.D. 59. Some coins of Agrippa II. are dated by an era, which has been recognised by numismatists as the foundation and naming of Neronias (evidently a great event<sup>1</sup> in the career of that King). The coins show that the foundation occurred in 61-2. Now Josephus says that the foundation nearly synchronised with a feast in Jerusalem, some time after Albinus had succeeded Festus as governor of Palestine—probably (as we shall see) the Feast of Tabernacles, 18th September, A.D. 61. We put the coming of Albinus in May-June, 61 (see III.).

<sup>1</sup>For Agrippa his relations to the Roman government were of critical importance; and permission to name his capital after the Emperor was a mark of Imperial favour.

Now Festus had died suddenly in office; news had to be carried to Rome; Albinus was appointed to succeed him; his appointment was known to the Jews in Jerusalem some time before he arrived, so that they could send messengers to Alexandria to meet him; all this occurred in the winter season, when communication was slow; this carries back the death of Festus to the end of 60.

Having now established approximately the end of Festus's procuratorship, we have to fix the beginning, which nearly coincides with the end of Paul's imprisonment. It is certain and agreed that Festus came to Palestine in the course of the summer in some year. The date commonly accepted in modern time is A.D. 60. But between his coming and his death events had occurred implying a much greater lapse of time than between mid-summer and December, 60. Not to mention his successful operations against the assassins, he had been involved in an envenomed dispute between his friend, King Agrippa, and the priests at Jerusalem about the King's action in building a tower overlooking the holy precinct of the Temple. After considerable quarrelling Festus allowed the Jews to send an embassy to Rome, including the High-priest, who certainly would not be able to go away from Jerusalem on such a long journey within a few months before a Passover, as he must necessarily be present at that feast. Taking that fact in conjunction with the necessities of ancient navigation, we have a moral certainty that the embassy would start in late April or in May,<sup>1</sup> for the season of thoroughly safe navigation began only on 15th May. The voyage and the negotiations in Rome must have occupied several months. At last the embassy gained

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Erbes regards this as certain, though it forces him to strange shifts.

its cause ; but the High-priest was detained in Rome, when the rest were allowed to depart. The news reached Jerusalem ; a new High-priest was needed, and Joseph was appointed.

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

After Joseph was deposed Ananus was appointed High-priest in his place (early in March, 61). Ananus held office three months, and was then deposed (late in May, 61), some short time before Albinus came to Palestine.

III. That Albinus came in 61 and not in 62 to govern Palestine as procurator is established with certainty by the following reasoning. Josephus mentions that, some time after Albinus came to Jerusalem, there occurred a feast, and

the city of Cæsareia Philippi was refounded by Herod Agrippa II. about the time of that feast under the name Neronias. Now this was a highly important event in the reign of Herod. Neronias was his capital; and an era was counted from its foundation. The numismatists have determined this era. The year I was A.D. 61-62. The year may be confidently assumed to have begun in the spring-time, as was customary in Southern Syria; and the custom with such new eras was to count the current year as I (not to make the new year start from the day of the foundation). The feast at which Neronias was founded, therefore, fell in the year beginning in spring 61 and ending in spring 62; and therefore it was either the Feast of Tabernacles, in autumn 61, or the Passover, in spring 62. No other feast can possibly be taken into account. Albinus, therefore, who had been in Jerusalem some time before the foundation, must have come to Palestine in the spring or early summer of 61.

In the uncertainty between the Feasts of Tabernacles, 61, and Passover, 62, several reasons combine to give the preference to the former; but this is unimportant for our purpose. Either of them would give the result that, if Albinus came in the early summer, he must have come in A.D. 61, not in A.D. 62. No other year has the slightest claim to be considered, or has been thought of by any recent scholar.

Now, as to the time of year when Albinus came, that is certain. In the first place, it was usual for officials to arrive to take up office at this season, though sometimes arrival was delayed till midsummer, and doubtless exceptional cases of arrival at other seasons occurred.

In the second place, our argument has placed Ananus's three months' tenure of the high-priesthood between March

and the end of May, 61. Soon after his deposition Albinus arrived; and after his arrival the tithes were collected from the threshing-floors, as Josephus tells. That would take place about late June or July, and confirms our dating of Ananus's high-priesthood. Later than that Josephus mentions the feast (Tabernacles, 61), and afterwards the foundation of Neronias (fixed by coins in 61-2).

In the third place, the coming of Albinus is fixed in the very end of May or in June by another argument of very illuminative kind, which has never before been observed, and which confirms the previous reasoning in a striking and conclusive way. When the news of the death of Festus reached Rome, Nero nominated Albinus to succeed him. News of this was carried (of course by the Imperial post) to Jerusalem. In the interval King Agrippa deposed Joseph and appointed Ananus High-priest in his place, during February or early March, A.D. 61. Thereafter the news that Albinus was appointed reached the Jews.

In the article on "Roads and Travel" in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, v., p. 385, I have calculated the post time between Rome and Jerusalem as fifty-two days. We must double this and allow five to fifteen days for Nero to consider and to register and publish the appointment. Now Ananus held office only three months, March-May, and the news about Albinus reached Jerusalem probably about the end of March or the beginning of April, at least a full month before Ananus was deposed.<sup>1</sup> Festus then must have died (as we have already seen) early in December, A.D. 60.

<sup>1</sup> It must of course be understood that all these calculations are approximate. The perfectly normal rate of travelling could not be always maintained. But, approximately, this reckoning may be accepted; the actual facts would not be very far from the reckoning.

IV. Ananus, soon after he became High-priest, brought James the Just and some other Christians before the Sanhedrin and had them stoned to death. His violent and even illegal conduct roused strong disapproval even among the Jews. Some of them sent secretly to King Agrippa, asking him to forbid such conduct in future. Apparently after this they learned of Albinus's appointment, and sent messengers to meet him in Alexandria, denouncing the action of Ananus as illegal inasmuch as it had been carried out without the procurator's approval (a good and valid ground of accusation likely to carry great weight with the new procurator).

Two questions here suggest themselves. In the first place, why was Ananus's action so strongly disapproved by the Jews in Jerusalem, who seem to have approved of previous action against the Christians? A Christian historian gives the answer to this.

Hegesippus, an excellent authority, describes the martyrdom, and says that it occurred while there were in Jerusalem many persons who had come up for the Passover. Further, the Hieronymian Martyrology, also an excellent authority, gives 25th March as the day of the martyrdom. We have been compelled by the preceding argument to place Ananus's high-priesthood in the spring of 61, and 24th March was the Passover in that year. In 62 the Passover was on 12th April, in 60 on 4th April, in 59 on 15th April, which are all quite inconsistent with the Martyrology. But in 61 the day of martyrdom was the day after the Passover; and this coincidence, justifying both Hegesippus and the Martyrology, furnishes a strong argument in favour of our dating. It was, of course, against the law to put a criminal to death during the feast; but Ananus was bitterly accused by the Jews



themselves (as Josephus tells) for illegal and outrageous conduct on this occasion.

In the second place, why did the Jews send to Alexandria to lodge a complaint with Albinus? Formerly, I supposed that Albinus had been an official in Egypt, and that when Nero appointed him to Palestine, instructions were sent to him, on receipt of which he would hand over his Egyptian office to a successor and travel to Palestine to take up his new duties. The correct answer became clear to me while writing an account of "Roads and Travel in New Testament Times" for Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. v., pp. 375-402. The usual way of travelling from Rome to Syria was by the corn-ships returning from Puteoli to Alexandria, and thence by coasting-vessel to Cæsareia on the coast of Palestine or Berytus (Beirut) on the Syrian coast. So, *e.g.*, went Maecius Celer in A.D. 95, when he was about to assume office in Syria, as Stadius, *Silva* iii., 2, describes. So the Roman troops destined by Nero to co-operate with the Syrian armies in the proposed Parthian war went first of all to Alexandria, and were thence recalled: they returned by the long voyage *viâ* Cyprus and the south coast of Asia Minor and Crete; and suffered severely from the sea.<sup>1</sup> So when Agrippa in A.D. 38 was going to take possession of his Palestinian kingdom, which Caligula had given him, he was advised to avoid the long, toilsome journey by Brundisium and Syria, and take the quick route by ship from Puteoli to Alexandria. Those ships were large, the sailing-masters were skilful and experienced, and the voyage was regularly performed with speed, ease and certainty.<sup>2</sup> But such voyages were made only during the season of open sea from about 27th May to

<sup>1</sup>Tacitus, *Hist.*, i., 31; cp. i., 70, and i., 6.      <sup>2</sup>Philo in *Flacc.*, 5.

15th September; and the very best season was while the regular Etesian winds were blowing.<sup>1</sup> Albinus, appointed about the end of January, A.D. 60, waited at Puteoli for the first voyage of the season in the latter part of May. Couriers going by the land road took about fifty-two days from Rome to Jerusalem, and the Jews heard of his appointment about the 1st of April. But officials could not travel like couriers; and Albinus was likely to arrive sooner *viâ* Alexandria than *viâ* Brundisium, as well as with less fatigue. Thus the Jews were able to send to meet him in Alexandria. His arrival in Palestine may be dated in June, A.D. 61.

V. The Eusebian chronology as a whole confirms our dates. Eusebius makes Albinus succeed Festus in 60, Jerome puts this in 61; we have placed the death of Festus at December, 60, and the coming of Albinus in June, 61. Eusebius makes Florus succeed Albinus in 63, Jerome in 64; the latter date is probably right (the only alternative being January to March, 65). Eusebius and Jerome put the coming of Felix in 51; the true date is 52, but Felix previously had held command in Samaria. Thus Felix had governed Palestine an unusually long time when Paul came before him in 57—"many years," Acts xxiv. 10 (where the word many is understood relatively to the usual duration of procuratorships).

It is established by this concurring series of arguments that Paul came to Jerusalem in May, 57, and sailed for Rome soon after midsummer 59. From this we can calculate backward and forward. He left Ephesus (Acts xx. 1)

<sup>1</sup> Perhaps 20th July to 28th Aug.; but there is much doubt about these winds. Modern scholars are apt to forget that each sea has its own Etesian winds, and the rule for the Ægean does not apply to the voyage across Adria (Acts xxvii. 27, Statius, *Silv.* iii., 2, 87) from Italy to Alexandria. Gentle, light westerly winds blow across Adria all summer. See p. 364.

shortly before Pentecost 56, and spent a year in Macedonia and Corinth (writing 2 Corinthians in summer 56 and Romans early in 57). He had spent in Ephesus two years and three months (called three years by Paul after the usual ancient fashion of counting the fraction of a year at the end as a whole year); and must have arrived there about December, 53. He had gone to Jerusalem for Passover, 22nd March, 53 (Acts xviii. 21 f.), and spent the summer and autumn of 53 in Antioch and in revisiting and establishing all his converts in South Galatia. Before going to Jerusalem, he spent eighteen months in Corinth, August, 51, to February, 53.<sup>1</sup> When Paul first came to Corinth, he found there Aquila recently arrived, after being expelled from Rome by Claudius. Now Orosius puts the edict of expulsion in the ninth year of Claudius, and a comparison of his dates with Tacitus shows that he counted the first year of Claudius to begin from 1st January following his accession,<sup>2</sup> so that his first year was 42, and his ninth 50. If Aquila was expelled late in 50, he would come to Corinth perhaps in the spring or summer of 51, some months before Paul.

Gallio came to Corinth when Paul had been there for a considerable time. He would in ordinary course arrive in the summer; and we must therefore conclude that he came to Achaia in the summer 52. While he was in Achaia he took fever and went a voyage for his health.<sup>3</sup> There is no

<sup>1</sup> The voyage from Corinth to Palestine does not require a long period, as ships ran specially for the sake of Jewish pilgrims to the Passover, making the voyage rapidly; see article "Corinth" in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, i., p. 483, and my *St. Paul the Traveller*, pp. 264, 287.

<sup>2</sup> Compare what is said above about the years of Nero.

<sup>3</sup> Seneca, *Epist. Mor.*, 104, 1. Pliny mentions that after his consulship Gallio went on a voyage (from Italy?) to Egypt on account of phthisis (*Hist. Nat.*, 31, 33). He of course governed Achaia before his consulship.

evidence outside Acts as to the date of his government, but his brother Seneca addressed him by his old name Novatus in the treatise *De Ira*, which was probably composed in 49;<sup>1</sup> and he had taken his adoptive name, Junius Gallio, before he came to Corinth.

It is less easy to reckon farther back, as the lapse of time is not so well marked in that period. But we may fairly place the beginning of Paul's second missionary journey in early summer 50, allot summer and autumn 50 to the work in South Galatia (Acts xvi. 1-6) with the journey north to the Bithynian frontier and west to Troas. The winter and the summer of 51 were spent in Philippi and Thessalonica and Beroea and Athens. Thus we find that the third visit to Jerusalem (Acts xv. 2) had come to an end not later than the beginning of 50. That visit was evidently brief; but the residences in Antioch before and after it are of quite uncertain duration. If events hurried rapidly on in Antioch, Paul may have returned from South Galatia about August, 49, and the first missionary journey with all its wide travels and long periods of preaching may have begun after Passover 47. But it is perhaps more probable that the stay in Antioch should be lengthened (Acts xiv. 28), or that the first journey occupied longer time, or both. We may, however, feel fairly confident that the first journey would begin in spring (doubtless after the Passover), either A.D. 46 or 47, more probably the former. The second visit to Jerusalem may be supposed to have occurred in 45; but the length of the "ministration" there is uncertain.

As to the conversion, the evidence of a fourth- or fifth-century homily, wrongly ascribed to Chrysostom, is important and probably embodies an early tradition. It states

<sup>1</sup> Lehmann, *Claudius und seine Zeit.*, p. 315 ff.

that St. Paul served God thirty-five years, and died at the age of sixty-eight. Eusebius places his death in 67, Jerome in 68; but they lump together the whole Neronian persecution, from 64 on, in a single entry, not implying that it lasted only one year. In the great political crisis of 68, trials of Christians must have ceased; and the death of Paul must be placed in 65 or 66 or 67. But it seems clear that Paul entered public life after the crucifixion; and if he did so (as was not rare) in his thirtieth year,<sup>1</sup> he must have been under thirty at that event, A.D. 29. This seems to oblige us to place his birth in B.C. 1, his conversion in 32 on 19th January (the traditional day may be certainly accepted), and his death in 67.

When this chronology was first proposed, it was founded solely on the authority of Acts, especially xx. 5 ff.; and it is employed in *St. Paul the Traveller* and later works by the present writer. For years he thought that the Eusebian chronology was opposed to it, and sorrowfully rejected Eusebius. Now, after the acute suggestion of Dr. Erbes, it has been shown that this system is the Eusebian and the traditional chronology. We closely follow Eusebius (or in one case his first-century authority) everywhere; and we see that ancient traditions, rejected by every other chronologist simply because they did not suit his system, fit into it exactly, and confirm its correctness. We have found several of our dates in ancient authorities, and any one proves the others. Not a single positive statement in any ancient author supports the commonly accepted chronology, which is given by its earlier supporters professedly as a makeshift

<sup>1</sup> The Greek word *νεός*, a young man, was commonly used of a person from twenty-two to forty years of age; so also *νεαρίαις*. Hence no stress can be laid on the description of Paul as "a young man".

in the dearth of positive evidence, and is scouted by many excellent scholars. Yet it is the accepted system of the school and college handbooks; and our system is for the present regarded as an attempt to overturn settled chronology, whereas it is really the old tradition resting on positive ancient testimony of the highest character.

There is urgent need for a book on Eusebius and the early Christian chronology, showing his essential accuracy, and tracing the cause of his occasional mistakes (which are due to defective method). Here we cannot take up space in answering some of the objections that are sure to be brought forward to our system (as, *e.g.*, it has been contended by many that Aretas could not have been in possession of Damascus [2 Cor. xi. 32] before A.D. 37, an objection which is answered beforehand by Marquardt, *Römische Staat-salterth*, i., p. 404 f.). We can simply rest on the fact that ours is the ancient and authoritative chronology.

As to the season of open sea (p. 359 f.), the period is stated as 27th May to 15th September. These dates are stated absolutely; but it cannot be supposed that sailors were absolutely governed by them, regardless of weather in each year. We may feel quite confident that, if steady settled weather and an early season occurred in any year, sailors would take the opportunity and begin to sail earlier than 27th May.

TABLE OF PAULINE DATES

Birth of St. Paul . . . . .	after Passover, B.C. 1
Entrance on public life in his thirtieth year . . . . .	after Passover, A.D. 29
Conversion . . . . .	January 25, 32
First visit to Jerusalem (in the third year, Gal. i. 18) . . . . .	34
Second visit to Jerusalem (in the fourteenth year, Gal. ii. 1) . . . . .	45
First missionary journey . . . . . (perhaps March, 47; probably) March,	46
Return to Antioch . . . . . (perhaps August, 49; probably) about August,	48
Third visit to Jerusalem; the Apostolic Council . . . . .	early 50
Second missionary journey . . . . .	begins after Passover, 50
In Corinth (Epistles to Thessalonians) . . . . .	September, 51, to February, 53
Fourth visit to Jerusalem at the Passover . . . . .	March 22 to 29, 53
Return to Antioch (Epistle to Galatians) . . . . .	April, 53
Third missionary journey . . . . .	begins early summer, 53
In Ephesus (First Epistle to Corinthians) . . . . .	December, 53, to March, 56
In Macedonia (Second Epistle to Corinthians) . . . . .	summer and autumn, 56
In Corinth (Epistle to Romans) . . . . .	winter, 56, to 57
At Jerusalem at Pentecost . . . . .	57
Imprisonment in Cæsarea . . . . .	June, 57, to June, 59
Voyage to Rome . . . . .	August, 59, to February, 60
Imprisonment in Rome . . . . .	February, 60, to (at latest) February, 62
Later journeys . . . . .	62 to 66
Taken prisoner at Nicopolis . . . . .	winter of 66 to 67
Execution at Rome . . . . .	67