

DEMETRIUS THE SILVERSMITH.

AN EPHESIAN STUDY.

THE name of Mr. J. T. Wood, whose death was lately announced, will ever be associated with the discovery of the temple of Ephesian Artemis. From her precinct, and from the theatre, he recovered not only important architectural remains, but also a number of inscribed marbles, which are now safely housed in the British Museum. A provisional text of most of these documents formed the most valuable portion of his bulky volume on *Ephesus*, published in 1877.

Students of Roman provincial government perused these documents with great interest, and scholars like Mommsen and Waddington have made them yield important historical results. Not less eagerly did the theologian approach them, hoping to glean new data for the criticism of early Christian history and literature. Thus in the following spring (May, 1878), an article by the late Bishop Lightfoot appeared in the *Contemporary Review*, in which, with his usual clearness, he showed how Mr. Wood's discoveries confirm the narrative of the Acts. The official language of decrees and dedications, the titles of magistrates and priests, the place filled by Artemis in Ephesian thought and life, all these, it is pointed out, verify to the letter the story of St. Paul's Ephesian labours.

It has fallen to my task to re-edit, for the trustees of the Museum, the whole of the marbles brought home by Mr. Wood. Many of these were unpublished; many more came to the Museum in fragments, and have been recom-

bined so far as my patience and skill permitted. The result of my labours will shortly see the light as Part III. of *Greek Inscriptions in the British Museum* (section 2). In the meantime I wish to submit to public judgment one discovery which will, I think, be of interest to students of the New Testament.

I.

One of Wood's marbles¹ exhibits a list of Ephesian citizens, arranged according to their tribes, two from each tribe. It was already known that the body-politic was divided into six tribes; this document acquaints us with their names and their order. Further, each tribe was subdivided into a number of *chiliastyes* or "thousands"; and accordingly, in this catalogue, after each citizen's name and the name of his father, is added the name of his thousand. Only one name is wanting, through a break at the foot of the stèle; it is the name of the twelfth citizen, the second member of the sixth tribe. One thing is clear: we have here an official list of a board of magistrates, representatives of the whole body of citizens. It had been suggested² that the list was a list of the *prytanes*, or presidents of the public assembly; but this conjecture proves to be mistaken. I was so fortunate as to discover, among the many Ephesian fragments brought by Mr. Wood, a small portion of a beautifully sculptured cornice, which clearly had once adorned the upper left-hand corner of an inscribed stèle or pillar; for indeed the commencement of an inscription was legible upon the fragment. This fragment of cornice I placed upon the monument described above, and it was at once evident that the two marbles formed parts of the same original monument, and that by their reunion I had recovered the heading of the inscription. What was

¹ *Inscriptions from the Augusteum*, 1.

² By Menadier, *Qua condicione Ephesii usi sint*, etc., p. 26.

more, though the lines of the heading were incomplete through fracture, yet no reasonable doubt remained but that they read originally as follows: *The senate and people do public honour to those who served as temple-wardens during the prytany of ———, in the year of Demetrius.* Then follows the catalogue of names, as already described, beginning thus :

1. *Of the Ephesine Tribe :*

Demetrius, son of Menophilus, son of Tryphon, of the Thousand Boreis ; Thoas, son of Dracontomenes, of the Thousand Oinopes.

2. *Of the Augustan Tribe :*

(And so on).

Our list then is a list of temple-wardens (*νεοποιοί*),¹ and at the head of the list stands a certain Demetrius. He belongs to that tribe which takes precedence of all the others because it claims the greatest antiquity and the purest Ephesian blood—*φυλή Ἐφεσέων*, the “Ephesine Tribe.” Thus it precedes even the Augustan Tribe (*φυλή Σεβαστή*), which had been added in honour of Augustus, and which accordingly takes precedence of all the tribes save the Ephesine. Moreover, the name of Demetrius stands before that of his colleague Thoas, the other representative of the leading tribe, so that this whole board of temple-wardens is styled “the board of Demetrius’ year.” From the prominence of his twice-repeated name it seems safe to infer that he presided at meetings of the board as *primus inter pares*, either as senior member of the leading tribe, or by vote of his colleagues.

As for the name Demetrius, it is common enough: derived simply from the goddess Demeter, it had no special significance, no local colour, and the career of the “Taker of Cities” had given it world-wide currency. At Ephesus the name was not uncommon; it is found at least thrice

¹ *Νεοποιοί* for *νεοποιοί* or *νεοποῖαι* was an established vulgarism.

as a magistrate's name on Ephesian coins of the first three centuries B.C.¹ It is not of frequent occurrence in Ephesian documents of the imperial time, and it is at least interesting to the student of the Acts to come upon it in so important a connexion in this Ephesian stelè.

Thus far we are on solid ground. But the thought inevitably occurred, Has this Demetrius the temple-warden anything to do with the Demetrius of Acts xix. ? He must be indeed a tiro who would allow such a fancy to influence his judgment. A little experience soon convinces us that Greek archæology gives most light just where literature and history are blank. Even where historical record is the fullest and contemporaneous inscriptions most abound, as at Athens, the student is inclined to wonder not how often, but how seldom, the narratives of Thucydides and Xenophon overlap and coincide with the epigraphic records. Archæology more often supplements than confirms history. It either speaks where history is silent, or, if it speaks of the same person or event, it speaks in so different a relation and with so novel a voice, that the historical imagination, tempered by severe criticism, must be called into play before the real connexion and harmony between the written history and the archæological evidence can be apprehended. But when this adjustment has taken place, when the whole of the evidence, monumental and literary, has been focussed (so to speak) upon the event or personage under discussion, the result is a vividness of realization, a certainty of conviction which no other means can attain.

Accordingly, with due scientific caution, I brushed away, as a cobweb of the brain, the idea of connecting the Demetrius of my inscription with his namesake of the Acts, and proceeded to inquire into the date of the monument. That date must be determined by indirect evidence alone. I cannot reproduce here all the reasons which lead me to

¹ Head, *Coinage of Ephesus*.

assign the document to the latter half of the first century A.D. They will appear shortly in my larger work on the Ephesian marbles. Some arguments however, which I have allowed less place in my commentary, I am the more willing to mention here. For example, an inspection of the marble shows that it has been rudely dealt with, and that (it would seem) in ancient times. An inscription of the second century A.D. occupies one of the sides (*B*), the right return of the inscribed front *A*, engraved in letters very different from the list of temple-wardens. So different indeed are they, as to betray a different age and an altered style of art. The plain, square, Roman-like characters of *B* belong to the age of the Antonines, *i.e.* 140-200 A.D., about a century later than what I conceive to be the date of *A*. The subject of *B* is an *ex-voto* to Artemis, of a type very common in the second century: "I give thanks to thee, O Lady Artemis, I, Caius Scaptius Frontinus, a temple-warden and a senator, together with my wife, Herennia Autronia, upon serving as an *essên* with integrity and piety," etc. (Εὐχαριστῶ σοι κυρία Ἄρτεμι, Γ. Σκάπτιος Φροντεύιος, νεοποίος, βουλευτής, σὺν καὶ τῇ γυναικί μου Ἑρηνία Ἀὐτρωνία, ἐσσημεύσας ἀγνῶς καὶ εὐσεβῶς).

The two inscriptions have no connexion with each other; they not only differ in style and date, but also one is a public and the other a private monument. I take it that Scaptius Frontinus simply appropriated to his use a stèle already set up within the sacred precinct. Such appropriation was very common at Ephesus, as the marbles prove, in the second century. The prevailing poverty of Greece was the motive and excuse for it. Thus Dio Chrysostom, in his *Rhodian Oration*, twits the Rhodians upon their new way of paying old debts; they make old honorary statues serve for fresh men, by simply altering the name below. But in truth, to the men of the second century the first century seemed like a distant past: a deluge had swept away the

divine glories of the Julian house, and a new era—more prosaic, but more prosperous—had begun with the *gens Flavia*. To a Tacitus, to a Juvenal, the times of Tiberius or of Nero seemed as the memories of a bad dream. These changed conditions, which are a commonplace of historical writers, find their reflex in the styles of the monuments, in the very shaping of letters. And our monument is no exception. The characters of the Demetrius-list on *A*, though lacking the delicate firmness of earlier days, yet have about them a certain elegance which reminds us at least of the Augustan age; and this impression is confirmed by the rich yet graceful design of the cornice above. But in the centre of the older inscription a hole some two inches deep has been drilled, and in the back of the marble a similar hole appears. A glance serves to show that the stelè was early diverted from its original purpose, and perhaps moved from its original position. It became probably one of a series of marble posts, connected together by bars of iron or bronze, to form a fence or inclosure. The original front thus became a mere subordinate flank, pierced to receive a bar; and what had been a blank side of the stone was now the front, ready to receive the dedicatory inscription of Scaptius Frontinus. The name of the dedicator suggests a further argument for the date alleged for the earlier inscription. In the list of temple-wardens, to each of whose own names the name of the father and often of the grandfather is appended, there occur in all twenty-nine names, and not one is Roman, each is purely Greek. On the contrary, in Ephesian documents of the second and later centuries Roman names become perpetually mixed with Greek, and the citizens of Ephesus, like Scaptius Frontinus, have very commonly Latin names.

Not to pursue the evidence further, there is nothing in the date of the inscription to discourage the conjecture that Demetrius the temple-warden may have been the Deme-

trius of the Acts who opposed St. Paul in the year 57 A.D. There is nothing indeed specially to confirm the conjecture; it must remain a conjecture to the end. But I shall endeavour now to show that, assuming the identification to be correct, the information afforded by the inscription explains in several important particulars the narrative of the Acts.

II.

The narrative, as it stands, represents the riot as having its origin in the fear of Demetrius for his trade: "Our craft is in danger." He is a silversmith, with many artisans in his employ; these he calls together, and assures them that the success of Paul means an end of their trade, for that his doctrine involved the nullity of graven images. It is true that Demetrius goes on to appeal to another motive of a less personal and selfish kind; he adjures his hearers to rally round the goddess "whom all Asia and the world worshippeth," and whose glory was threatened by the new teaching. But this appeal is represented as only subordinate to the other; the primary motive with him and his craftsmen is fear for a threatened trade. There is nothing unlikely in this. Few things are so sensitive of approaching danger as a vested interest; nothing combines men so promptly and compactly in self-defence. The incident of Ephesus has been repeated many times since then—as at this moment in the organization of the liquor-dealers in opposition to the temperance propaganda. But the action of Demetrius appears in a new and far more significant light, if he really was (as I take him to be) the Demetrius of the inscription, and if the honour therein voted to him and his colleagues by the senate and people of Ephesus was in recognition of the services rendered by him and them on behalf of the national goddess.

We may therefore interpret the movement as really origi-

nating with the temple-priesthood.¹ None would keep a closer watch upon St. Paul than they. None would more jealously note the results and tendencies of his teaching. They had indeed little or no hostility to him as a Jew. Jews in abundance there were at Ephesus, living under special protection of the imperial and the local government.² For many generations the Jews of the Dispersion had learned how to accommodate themselves to the heathen society around. A mutual toleration was quite acknowledged. At Iasos, early in the second century B.C., a Jew (*Νικήτας Ἰάσονος Ἱεροσολυμίτης*—Le Bas, No. 294) is named in a list of subscribers to the repair of the city theatre. Much the same state of things prevailed at Ephesus, as Josephus attests. It is probable that Alexander the Jew, who attempted to address the Ephesian mob, is to be identified with "Alexander the coppersmith," the renegade Christian Jew, who "did much evil" afterwards to St. Paul (1 Tim. i. 20, 2 Tim. iv. 14); he was almost certainly one of the artisans employed in the workshops of Demetrius. What Alexander desired in the theatre was, without doubt, to clear himself and his fellow Jews from any complicity with St. Paul. Alexander and his countrymen at Ephesus were, in fact, playing the same part against St. Paul which the Jews of Smyrna so cruelly enacted against St. Polycarp hardly a century later. It is true that, when the populace saw that Alexander was a Jew, they refused him a hearing. For a Jew, though tolerated by law, and even respected for his wealth and for his strange religious lore, yet was no general favourite; and now that the Ephesian mob was charged with the electricity of

¹ This suggestion is made by Zimmermann, *Ephesus*; but he has no evidence to support the conjecture.

² Mr. Wood did not succeed in discovering the Jewish cemetery at Ephesus (*Ephesus*, p. 125); but he excavated two Jewish tombstones, in one of which Jew is termed ἀρχιεπίτροπος: in both, the Jewish community at Ephesus is made the trustee of the tomb.

patriotic and religious fervour, the sight of a Jew daring to address them in their theatre was just the stimulus to create an explosion. Thus the storm which had threatened St. Paul now burst upon the head of Alexander: "When they knew that he was a Jew, all with one voice for the space of two hours cried out, Great is Diana of the Ephesians." But ordinarily the Jew lived quite peaceably among the Gentiles; and, indeed, to the tolerant polytheist, the reverence of the Jew for his far-off temple, the deputation (*θεωρία*) to Jerusalem for festival and sacrifice, and other rules of Jewish devotion, must have presented analogies to Greek ritual, which made the *concordat* the easier.

The case of St. Paul however was widely different. He preached in the lecture-room of Tyrannus, not as a Jew, but as a sophist, a philosopher. It was a time of widespread religious inquiry; and while the blind superstition of the masses and the official rule of the State continued to crowd the courts of the Artemision with worshippers, there were many, especially of the more thoughtful and leisured class, to whom the Artemis-worship seemed but the relic of a dying system, and who were quite ready to listen to this strange new-comer, with his ascetic life, his sublime ethical theory, and his new views of life and death. It is not sufficiently remembered also that every religious system has its sincere and spiritual votaries. Under all forms of worship there remain the unchanging needs and aspirations of man. Among the most earnest worshippers of Artemis were those who would be the first to embrace a more spiritual religion. And at a period when the traditional beliefs were greatly undermined, these earnest and devout spirits were the very life-blood of the old system. From these, apart from the stated festivals and public sacrifices, came the most frequent attendance at the temple, the richest offerings, the costliest dedications. No class of worshipper could paganism less afford to lose; and yet it was precisely these who gradually

would be attracted by the deeper doctrines of the Cross. We can imagine how tenderly and wisely that sympathetic teacher, who became all things to all men, would deal with these earnest inquirers from the very heart of paganism; and how, without one harsh word against Artemis, he would for ever detach them from her worship. The loss of even a few such individuals and families would be keenly felt and resented by the hierarchy of the Artemision.

Another religious influence was also at work, which has only of late been estimated aright as a *præparatio evangelica*. Everywhere through the Græco-Roman world one universal religion, having the advantage of rich endowments and perfect organization, had been steadily propagated by the ruling powers, and was rooted as deeply in the grateful affection as in the fears of the subject masses,—the cultus of the Cæsars. This religion, universal, intelligible, with its splendour of recurrent festivals, with its frequent anniversaries of birthdays and accession days, with its very tangible rewards and no less sensible sanctions of fear, was effectually undermining the old local worships. Already at Ephesus a temple of the Augusti had been reared within the precinct of Artemis herself, and the title which Ephesus had once claimed with such a proud humility, *Νεωκόρος τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος* (“temple-sweeper, or sacristan, of Artemis”), was all but extinct: in official language, on coins and inscriptions, Ephesus is “Sacristan of the Augusti.” At a somewhat later date the worship of the Cæsars, which at present gave a certain negative help to the gospel by sapping the traditional polytheism, became positively hostile to Christianity. It could not brook the refusal of the Christian to pay divine homage to Cæsar; and the Christian who refused, was punished, not as a heretic in religion, but as a traitor to the throne.

I have been frequently asked, as a student of Ephesian antiquities, what I thought of Mr. Long’s *Diana or Christ*.

Opinions may differ as to the merits of that celebrated picture as a work of art; and its archæology is rather difficult to criticise, because I do not know what date the painter had in view. As however the Artemision was burned down by the Goths in the year A.D. 262, we may suppose the picture intended to represent a possible incident of the first two centuries and a half. If so, the situation is untrue to fact. The Roman proconsul is represented as threatening an Ephesian maiden with death for refusing worship to Artemis. I am not aware of any Roman law to compel man or woman to worship Ephesian Artemis. If any Ephesian woman refused to worship the goddess, and the Ephesian authorities had made this (which is absurd) a matter of accusation before the Roman proconsul, he would have driven them from the judgment seat with no less contempt than Gallio showed to the accusers of St. Paul at Corinth. As a matter of fact, the attitude of the Roman governors towards the local cults was much the same as that of the English Government towards the polytheism of India; it was an attitude of politic toleration, of patronage outwardly the more cordial because it concealed a secret contempt. From this point of view it is interesting to learn that the only influential "friends" of St. Paul at Ephesus were "certain of the Asiarchs." Now, while there are some points in the use of this title which are still under discussion, one fact is absolutely certain. "Asiarch" was a title given to those citizens, and those only, who had presided over and contributed largely to the festivals and games held in honour of the Cæsars by the provincial league organized for the Cæsar-worship.¹ In other words, at the moment of extreme crisis, when St. Paul is in danger of being torn in pieces by the devotees of Artemis, pressure is put upon him by certain influential citizens, who were notable supporters

¹ See Bishop Lightfoot on the Asiarchate, in his *Ignatius*, ii. 987 ff.

of the Cæsar-worship, "not to adventure himself into the theatre"; and their friendly intervention saved his life.

So far then every detail falls into its place, and we can perfectly understand the attitude of the temple authorities towards St. Paul. Long before any falling off could be perceived in the demand for images of Artemis, long before the gospel had thinned her crowd of pilgrims, the hierarchy would be sensible of the apostle's influence. Some of their most devout supporters had left them; what was worse, they made no secret of the reason. They were zealous in persuading others to do the same. The lecture-room of St. Paul was crowded daily; philosophic student, oriental mystic, inquisitive Greek, all found the teacher interesting, impressive. To some he was convincing; through him they were admitted into a new world of ideas, became sharers in unutterable hopes. We may suppose that the jealousy of the priests only waited for an opportunity of attacking the apostle. But what could they do? He had infringed no law; he had been guilty of no sacrilege, no impiety; the rigid impartiality of the Roman rule gave them no encouragement. St. Paul had used the liberty allowed to every rhetorician or philosopher, to every charlatan (to an Apollonius of Tyana as well as a Dio Chrysostom) to instruct his scholars by tongue or pen. Legally then St. Paul's position was unassailable, and the temple authorities, if they wished to attack him, must do so indirectly. Our inscription helps us to understand precisely the plan they adopted.

The topography of Ephesus was peculiar;¹ the famous temple, as we now know, was not within the city walls, but lay about a mile to the N.E. of the town, under a hill-fort now called Aiasluk. From early times, especially under Persian rule, the priesthood of the Artemision had enjoyed an influence which rivalled, and sometimes overshadowed,

¹ See E. Curtius's *Beiträge zur Geschichte und Topographie Kleinasiens*, and Mr. Wood's book and maps.

the civic authorities: in fact, this dual organization is the key to Ephesian history. But no semblance of rivalry between temple and city was possible now: all authority everywhere in the world was controlled, overawed, reduced to a tame and uniform level by the omnipotence of Cæsar. Under the empire the temple became the chief glory of the town, its worship a chief source of profit. All the world flocked to the shrine, and the worship of Ephesian Artemis was carried back by pilgrims to every region round the Mediterranean. And accordingly, as the temple held so large a place in the thoughts of all Ephesus, a board of twelve citizens, annually elected, two from each tribe, acted as *neopoioi*. They were the churchwardens of the temple, they were the lay guardians of the sacred fabric; they had general charge of its treasures and its ornaments. They were the representatives of the whole city in its interest in the Artemision. Chosen as they were from each subdivision of the citizens, they were completely in touch with the whole population, with every part of Ephesian society. The importance of this board we may infer, not only from its frequent mention in Ephesian documents, but also from the important functions discharged by similar boards in neighbouring cities.¹ If any men were qualified to organize an attack upon St. Paul, assuredly it was the board of *neopoioi*, a body at once ecclesiastical and civil, concerned intimately with the temple worship, yet drawn from amid the ranks of the citizens. Of this board Demetrius—as our inscription indicates—is the chairman. He is himself the link between the temple and the municipality. He is a wealthy burgess, the head of a thriving firm; his personal influence is therefore great among the commercial classes of Ephesus. We may safely assume that his colleagues on the board were men of a some-

¹ For the *neopoioi* of Iasos, see *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, viii., 1887, p. 105; for those of Samos, see *Mittheilungen des deutschen archäol. Institutes* ix., 1884, p. 259; and so in many other cities.

what similar stamp. What more easy than for these men to organize a demonstration against the apostle? Legal charge (as the town-clerk afterwards reminded them) they had none to bring. But they had whole masses of the population at their back; they could bring together at will precisely those in whom reverence for Artemis was as much a part of patriotism as of religion. A meeting is convened by Demetrius—a meeting avowedly of his own workpeople, and of those engaged in kindred trades.¹ He appeals first to their trade interests, and soon proceeds to work upon their fanaticism. His line of conduct is precisely what we should expect, if he was throughout the agent of the temple authorities. Moreover the suddenness with which the excitement spread and crowds gathered, until the meeting became a demonstration, and a vast and tumultuous throng rushed and filled the great theatre, all becomes perfectly natural if we suppose Demetrius to have acted in concert with his brother *neopoiot*. Much may be explained by the combustible temper of this half-oriental population; possibly too the riot occurred at festival-time, when the city was full of pilgrims, for the “great Artemisian games” took place in the month Artemision (= March), and the chronology of the Acts suggests the spring of A.D. 57 for this tumult; but we feel, as we read the Acts, that the concourse of rioters can hardly have been as fortuitous as it seemed to the narrator; there must have been some motive force behind. That force we find in the influence of the temple-wardens co-operating with Demetrius, organizing opposition in various quarters, and bringing it to bear at a preconcerted date and place, in one grand demonstration.

¹ Knowing how widely trade-guilds were spread over the Græco-Roman world, and especially in Asia Minor, I have often thought that Demetrius' meeting was a meeting of a trade-guild or guilds. The very word *ἐργασία* (Acts xix. 24, 25) was often used for a “guild.” We find at Ephesus a guild of cloth-workers: *συνεργασία λαναρίων* (Wood, *Appendix*); but I have no evidence of a guild of metal-workers.

III.

Is there anything to confirm this identification of Demetrius? I think the text of the Acts supplies one unexpected piece of evidence, and this in a way which affords a curious glimpse into the literary method of its author.

That authorship indeed has been vigorously disputed. Criticism however, it is now generally agreed, has brought the issue within very narrow limits. All allow that the author of the third gospel was the author of Acts also. Nor will any one deny that the germ of the Acts is to be sought in what are called the "We-sections." These are without question the memoranda of a companion of St. Paul: whatever materials besides, written or traditional, may have been employed by the author of the Acts, and whatever value we may assign to them, the "We-sections" at all events bear the stamp of immediate and authentic testimony. It is also now agreed that the "We-sections," though easily disengaged from the connecting narrative, yet reveal no difference of style or diction. The impression is forced upon us, the oftener we read the book, that the whole of it, including the "We-sections," is the work of a single hand and mind. In explanation of these phenomena only two alternatives are possible:

1. The traditional view, which I decidedly share, that the "We-sections" are from the diary of St. Luke, who works them into the narrative he is composing. This is an obvious explanation of the general uniformity of style, and it perfectly accounts for the use of the first person in the "We-sections."

2. The alternative view, which is forced upon those who wish to lower the data of the composition, is, that the author of Acts is not the original author of the "We-sections." These sections (which are derived from the pen

of Titus or some other friend of St. Paul) are merely some among many literary materials employed by the compiler. The compiler however was a writer of great skill, who allowed himself much freedom in handling his materials; so much so, that whatever unevenness or contrasts existed in the style of his original *Quellen*, they all received in his hands a new literary form and were stamped with his uniform style. Ingenious and suggestive as is this hypothesis, it labours under one obvious difficulty. If the author claimed so free a hand in recasting his materials, if he was so accomplished a literary artist, how is it that, whereas he took pains to rewrite the "We-sections" so completely as to obliterate every original characteristic of style, he yet was so clumsy as to let the first person remain in awkward contrast to the rest of the narrative?

Let me then assume that the author was St. Luke, and that in the "We-sections" he is merely working into his narrative, unaltered, passages from his own missionary diary.

Now the narrative of Acts xix. is not one of the "We-sections." St. Luke was not at Ephesus with St. Paul. That is to say, St. Luke is here basing his narrative upon the statements and records of other men. But so vivid is the narrative at this point, so strong the stamp of authentic detail, that we need not doubt that St. Luke had before him the writing of an eyewitness who was at Ephesus at that time. Is it possible at all to recover this original document, and to see how the historian used it, what license he allowed himself in the expanding, altering, and working up of his material?

I think our Ephesian inscription affords an indication of his method. The example indeed is a slight one, but it is significant, and (unless I am mistaken) it will clear up a difficulty in the narrative which has never been met.

The narrative, as it stands, describes Demetrius as a "silversmith, who made silver shrines for Diana." It is

stated, or at least implied, that these shrines were in large demand, and formed the staple of his trade. What were these shrines? St. Chrysostom's comment on the text is, *καὶ πῶς ἐνὶ ναοὺς ἀργυροῦς γενέσθαι; ἴσως ὡς κιβώρια μικρά*: "and how is it possible for shrines (temples) to be made of silver? Perhaps they were really small shelves, or caskets." The fact is, that St. Chrysostom's question has never been answered, and his own interpretation, though plausible, is yet without a basis of fact. If these silver shrines were, as the commentators all assure us, common articles of merchandise, such as pilgrims to the famous temple purchased to take back to their homes, then we might fairly expect to find some specimens still extant among the treasures of our museums. But, on the contrary, nothing of the kind is known. The commentators on Acts xix. have accumulated a number of references, which upon examination render very little help. Some of the passages cited refer to the canopies or shrines which protected temple statues;¹ others describe smaller movable shrines or *ædiculæ*, containing a divine image,² others speak of niches or shelves upon the wall of a house;³ the rest merely tell us what we knew before, that *statuettes* of the Ephesian Diana were to be found everywhere in the Græco-Roman world. In fact, these *statuettes* of the goddess, reproducing all her hideous oriental features, may be found in bronze, in silver, or in

¹ Diodorus Sic. i. 15 (of the legendary building of Thebes by Osiris): the temple of Zeus contains *ναοὺς χρυσοῦς* of the other gods. Pliny, *N. H.* xxxvi. 5 (of the Cnidian Venus): *ædicula ejus tota aperitur ut conspici possit undique effigies dea foyente ipsa, ut creditur, facta.*

² Herod. ii. 63: *τὸ δὲ ἀγάλμα, ἐὼν ἐν νηφ̄ μικρῷ ξυλίῳ κατακεχρωσµένῳ, προεκκοιμίζουσι, κ.τ.λ.*

Dio Cass. xxxix. 20: *τεράτων τέ τινων ἐν τούτῳ γενομένων, ἔν τε γὰρ τῷ Ἄλβανῳ νεῶς Ἡρας βραχὺς ἐπὶ τραπέζας τινὸς πρὸς ἀνατολῶν ἰδρυμένος πρὸς τὴν ἄρκτον μεταστράφη.*

Heysch. *s.v.*: *καδίσκοι σιπῶναι, εἰς ἃ τὰ ἱερὰ ἐτίθεσαν.*

³ Petronius 29: *Præterea grande armarium in angulo vidi, in ejus ædicula erant lares argentei positi.*

Theophrastus, *Char.* 16: the *δεισιδαίμων* is always putting up niches and *statuettes* in his house (but *ναίς* is not used).

terra-cotta, in every European museum. The type was exceedingly common, and witnessed to the wide extent of the worship. If the writer of the Acts had spoken of Demetrius as driving a brisk trade in these metal statuettes, the narrative would have corresponded to the facts. As it is, the statement that Demetrius was the maker of "silver shrines," is either to be set down as a loose mode of expression, or else it awaits explanation.

It appears to me that our inscription suggests a much simpler solution of the difficulty. I believe that St. Luke merely misapprehended the document which lay before him, and, in paraphrasing, gave a new turn to its meaning. That document was part of the diary of an eye-witness, whose jottings were doubtless as brief as they were precise. He had recorded how Δημήτριός τις ὀνόματι, ἀργυροκόπος ὄν καὶ νεοποιὸς τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος, "One Demetrius by name, a silversmith and a *neopoios* (shrine-maker) of Artemis," had raised a riot by assembling his workpeople, and so on. He had described Demetrius first by his trade—ἀργυροκόπος, "silversmith,"¹ and then by his office—νεοποιός or νεοποιὸς τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος, for such the inscription shows him to have been. St. Luke, when he comes to work this statement into his narrative, fails to see that νεοποιός is a title of office, and (misled by its juxtaposition with ἀργυροκόπος) takes it to be a further specification of his trade; his paraphrase there-

¹ In Blumner's *Technologie und Terminologie der Gewerbe und Künste*, iv., pp. 304, 305, there are some interesting remarks on the terms χρυσοχόος and ἀργυροκόπος. He points out that the art of the goldsmith lay almost entirely in the beating out of gold, gold being used in works of art, chiefly in leaf or in *repoussé* work. Yet the goldsmith was termed χρυσοχόος, because in early days he did not procure or sell the metal with which he worked; it was then very rare, and was brought him by princely patrons, often in the shape of more ancient ornaments. His first work was therefore to melt down his material, and the name χρυσοχόος being thus applied to his craft, still clung to it when its appropriateness had ceased. Ἀργυροκόπος, on the other hand, was the designation of the silversmith, because silver was from the first a more common metal, and the artist had it by him in the rough; his art also was chiefly directed to the making of cups and similar articles in *repoussé* work.

fore is Δημήτριος γὰρ τις ὀνόματι, ἀργυροκόπος, ποιῶν ναοὺς ἀργυροῦς Ἀρτέμιδος, κ.τ.λ.

IV.

This paper would hardly be complete without some mention of two other documents brought by Mr. Wood from Ephesus, which seem to me to throw indirect light on the progress of Ephesian Christianity. One of these is a long inscription which covered a whole wall of the theatre : it is dated by naming the consuls of A.D. 104. It belongs therefore to the seventh year of the reign of Trajan. It deals with a bequest made by a certain C. Vibius Salutaris to the Ephesian city of an endowment in money, and also of a number of silver statuettes of deities, and particularly of Artemis herself. Elaborate directions are given for the investment of the money, and the annual distribution of the interest in doles. No less detailed are the directions about the statuettes ; they are to be carried in procession from the temple to the theatre at all public assemblies and dramatic celebrations, and thence conducted in procession through the city as far as the Coressian gate. This bequest is a striking illustration of the way in which the metal-work of Ephesus was encouraged by the popular religion.¹ The processions also with the images have been brought by Bishop Lightfoot into striking relation to a passage of St. Ignatius in his *Epistle to the Ephesians*.² But I cannot help regarding the bequest of Salutaris as having yet another bearing. The elaborate enactments connected with the gift, the pains taken to multiply processions and advance the honour of the goddess, appear to be intended as a sort of manifesto : although Christianity is not named or alluded to, yet the entire proceedings seem to have a polemical aim.

¹ On the metal-workers of Ephesus see some remarks of Dr. Waldstein, *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, iii., 1882, pp. 103, 104.

² Lightfoot's *Ignatius*, ii., p. 17.

For the moment was one fraught with grave issues for the Church. The aged St. John had lately been removed by death, and the supernatural glories of the apostolic age seemed now to come to an end,

“And fade into the light of common day.”

The letter of Pliny to Trajan, just eight years after this (A.D. 112), not only shows how remarkably the faith had hitherto advanced, and how seriously it had threatened the local worships, but it reveals also that the very success of Christianity had provoked a reaction, and the aid of the law was being called in to persecute the faith.¹ In other words, the earlier years of Trajan were a time of pagan revival; the Church seemed for the moment to be losing ground, and heathenism to be gaining upon her. In this view the gift of *Salutaris* was timed at a significant hour. It was an effort of reviving idolatry, the manifesto of a reactionary movement, of pagan propaganda.

The last monument I wish to mention, also brought to England by Mr. Wood, has been often published, but in a mutilated form. It is the famous decree about the Ephesian month *Artemision*, which is declared to be henceforth entirely sacred to the goddess; all the days of the month are to be holy-days, and no law business may be done in them.² The inscription, as hitherto published, has no heading or date. Another marble however, presented by Mr. Hyde Clarke to the University of Oxford, proves to be the missing portion of the monument, and I had the satisfaction of first combining their readings.³ The date of the document now appears to be A.D. 160, in the proconsulship of *Popillius Carus Pedo*,⁴ the last year of the reign of

¹ Lightfoot, *Ignatius*, i., p. 449.

² *C. I. G.*, 2954.

³ The whole document will appear shortly as No. 482 in the forthcoming volume of *Ephesian inscriptions*.

⁴ Waddington, *Fastes*, p. 224.

Antoninus Pius. It seems that the proconsul had given offence by transacting public business at Ephesus (perhaps by holding his *conventus*) on some of the holy-days of the month of Artemision (= March). Against this the Ephesian senate had protested, as being an insult to the goddess and contrary to the usage and ordinance of previous proconsuls. To this remonstrance Pedo makes a courteous reply, owning his mistake and reaffirming the ordinance. Hereupon the senate and people of Ephesus issue an elaborate decree, upon the motion of Laberius Amoenus, the town-clerk (*γραμματεὺς*), consecrating the entire month to Artemis. But it is to the preamble of this decree, which has never yet been printed, that I desire to draw attention. It runs thus: "Whereas Artemis, the goddess who presides over this our city, is being set at naught (*ἀτιμᾶται*), not only in her own native town, which she has made more glorious than all other cities by means of her own divinity, but also among both Greeks and barbarians, so that in many places her sacrifices and honours have been neglected (*ἀνεῖσθαι*): and yet she is worthy herself to be set up and to have altars reared to her, by reason of the evident manifestations (*ἐπιφανείας*) she makes of her presence," etc. If my restoration of this preamble be at all correct (and I think it will bear close scrutiny), it is certainly remarkable. It testifies that, towards the end of the second century the Artemis worship was declining. We need not wonder at this. Many influences were at work to undermine it. Under Antoninus Pius the worship of the Cæsars went forward with gigantic strides, and left little room for local cults. Purely oriental worships, of Mithras especially, and of Isis, Osiris, and the Egyptian gods, engrossed the devouter pagan minds. But, above all, Christianity, in spite of the frowns of the emperor and the clamour of the mob, made converts daily; and martyrdoms like that of Polycarp in Smyrna close by, which took place only four or five years before

this decree, did but add lustre to the faith and bring new converts to the Church. The preamble of the decree seems but to echo the language of Demetrius a century before; what he feared has actually come to pass. Artemis is being dethroned by the preaching of the Cross.

But her final fall was delayed yet a century longer; in A.D. 262 her temple fell a prey to the Goths, and her worship ceased.

E. L. HICKS.

RECOLLECTIONS OF DR. DÖLLINGER.

III. ENGLISH TOPICS.

NOT many foreigners outside the circle of professional diplomatists have habitually preserved such a keen and well-informed interest in England as Dr. Döllinger. The many Englishmen who just once in their lives have visited Munich, and obtained half an hour's conversation with its great theologian, must often have been surprised at the amount which he knew about their own country, and the readiness with which he comprehended anything which they had to tell him respecting the questions which were occupying English thought at the time. He was a German of Germans; but after Germany England had the next place in his affection and admiration. Not a few of his most intimate and best loved friends and pupils were Englishmen. He visited England more than once, and cherished a lively and happy recollection of what he had seen there. He habitually read English newspapers and periodicals, and liked to converse in English. Whatever drew Germans and Englishmen together was a delight to him; and it was the settled conviction of his life, a conviction which during his later years became an enthusiasm,