

PAULINE CHRONOLOGY.

ON first reading Dr. Harnack's *Chronologie d. altchr. Litt.*, I. pp. 235 ff., I began for the moment to entertain a strong hope that the chronology of St. Paul's life is at last settled, that discussion and dispute must now come to an end, and that we may congratulate ourselves, not merely that they have ended, but also that the issue is to justify the chronology of Eusebius, so often disputed and despised, and to show that the fundamental authorities on whom our knowledge of early Christian history so largely rests have been in the right. Disputation and doubt and minute criticism would prove to have been most serviceable, if the issue is so satisfactory and so triumphant.<sup>1</sup>

I may be allowed to speak so confidently, because his date is not the one which I have advocated, and therefore no one can say that I am a prejudiced witness. But the Eusebian date satisfies one test, which I regarded as fundamental, as well as the year which I selected; it makes one coincidence with Roman history more complete; and it is the recorded dating which embodied the results of the careful investigation of Julius Africanus, who had access to far better evidence than we possess (living at the beginning of the third century), and who was followed by Eusebius.

I learn from Mr. Vernon Bartlet that Prof. McGiffert of New York has advocated the same opinion; but at present I have not access to his paper. If it prove that he uses any of the arguments by which I shall attempt to test Prof. Harnack's position, the coincidence between us, being reached independently, will probably be taken by the readers as proving the truth of the arguments; and if he uses different reasons, this paper will supplement his.

<sup>1</sup> The first three paragraphs, written prematurely in support of Harnack, are left to show that I am not hostile to his view. As on careful consideration formerly, so now, I find the Eusebian dating inadmissible.

Eusebius dates the coming of Festus to govern Judæa in A.D. 56,<sup>1</sup> which implies that the last journey of Paul (in company with the delegates and offerings of the Churches of the Four Provinces, Acts xx., xxi.) was made in the days between Passover and Pentecost, A.D. 54, and that the voyage to Rome began in the autumn of 56. Hitherto A.D. 58 and 60 were the dates most favoured; while in my *St. Paul the Traveller* I advocated the dates 57 and 59. Let us now accept the earlier dates, and apply some tests which Prof. Harnack has not taken notice of.

In the EXPOSITOR, May, 1896, p. 338, I published a paper on the Pauline Chronology, in which it was proved (as I think conclusively) that of the years 56 to 59 A.D., none except 57 would suit the details mentioned in Acts xx. vv. 5-12. Briefly, the argument is this. Luke, in accordance with the general custom of the ancients, and especially of the Romans,<sup>2</sup> reckons always the first and the last items as units, even although they may not be complete. Now Paul's company started from Philippi for Troas as soon as the Days of Unleavened Bread were ended, and their journey to Troas lasted into the fifth day, and they stayed seven days in Troas. Further, either the last or the second last of the seven days in Troas was a Sunday, therefore we can reckon back and say with certainty that the eight days of the Jewish solemnity either lasted from a Wednesday to a Wednesday, or from a Thursday to a Thursday. But as, in years 56-59, the Passover never fell on a Wednesday, and only once (viz. 57) on a Thursday, it seemed to me to follow that the journey was made in 57, and on this I founded my whole chronology in my work on *St. Paul the Traveller*.

Now we know that the voyage from Troas onward began

<sup>1</sup> I do not take notice of minor differences, variations of MSS., etc. Every student knows how frequently errors of a year are made in such cases.

<sup>2</sup> An instructive example in Cicero *ad Att.* IX., 1, 1.

very early on Monday morning, obviously before sunrise. The one point of uncertainty in the argument is whether Monday was counted as one of the seven days. In other words, did Luke on the one hand reckon according to either the Roman Civil Day of twenty-four hours from midnight to midnight, or the Greek and Hebrew Sacred Day of twenty-four hours, from sunset to sunset,<sup>1</sup> or, on the other hand, did he count according to the common popular reckoning, which made the day begin from sunrise? This question could not be confidently answered, and both possibilities were open; but it did not vitally affect the subject, for apparently the only possibility left open for the years 56-59, was that Luke followed one or other of the first two methods. Accordingly I reckoned the part of Monday as the last of the seven days.

But I had the uneasy feeling that perhaps the language of Luke implied that he counted the Sunday as the last day spent in Troas, for the Sunday services with the incident rising out of them lasted till the sailing of the ship. Moreover, we know that on the Macedonian system even the Civil Day was reckoned from sunrise to sunrise,<sup>2</sup> and it is certain that this system prevailed widely on the Ægean coasts, and in such cities as Pergamos and Philippi. If that were the case, then Paul spent at Philippi the days Wednesday to Wednesday (14-21 Nisan), started on Thursday, and spent seven days, Monday to Sunday, in Troas. Now in A.D. 54 the Passover fell on Wednesday, April 10; so that, on this view, 54 is the only year which suits.

On the Eusebian chronology, then, we find ourselves

<sup>1</sup> On either of these methods of reckoning there would have elapsed a certain number of hours of the day following the Sunday, before the ship sailed.

<sup>2</sup> See my paper in *EXPOSITOR*, June, 1896, p. 457, on *The Sixth Hour*. On this system of reckoning, the day which followed Sunday would not begin until sunrise on Monday morning, and it is probable that the ship had already sailed before sunrise (*St. Paul*, pp. 290, 293).

compelled to hold that Luke reckoned his days (*i.e.* spaces of twenty-four hours), according to the Macedonian style,<sup>1</sup> from sunrise to sunrise, and that the seven days' stay at Troas began on Monday, and ended as the early north wind was beginning to blow on the next Monday morning (*St. Paul*, p. 293). But careful reading of Acts xx. always brings me ultimately to the view that, as the ship sailed on the day after Sunday, *v.* 7, the day of sailing was reckoned as one of the seven (on Luke's usual principle). Midnight is mentioned in *v.* 7 as if it closed the day. Let us, however, allow that both dates, 54 and 57, give permissible interpretations of Luke's words.

In estimating the bearing of these fixed dates on the earlier events of Paul's life, we may conveniently consider these events in two periods: (1) from the Apostolic Council onwards; (2) before the Apostolic Council. In the later period the dates given in my *St. Paul* must be set uniformly back three years; the Council is to be placed in the early spring of 47. As has been pointed out elsewhere, in a great number of cases we can be sure at what season of the year events occurred, and sometimes can date them even to a month or a day; but the years have hitherto always been uncertain. From the Council onwards, the sequence and intervals of the narrative are fairly certain; I can see no possibility of making any change in the relative chronology of the whole series of events from the Council onwards; and Harnack's reckoning of the lapse of time agrees exactly with mine (p. 237).

The dating advocated by Prof. Harnack (which I shall call the Eusebian dating, in order to be less personal) would entail no change of any consequence in the views advocated in my *St. Paul* even in the earlier period, and would support the view that the acquittal of Paul on the first trial

<sup>1</sup> This bears on the question of Luke's origin (see *St. Paul the Traveller* pp. 203, 206, etc.).

at the end of his two years' detention in Rome was due to the wider policy which Seneca's influence impressed on the Roman administration:<sup>1</sup> the reasons lie both in the facts of the period and in the tradition (in its details incorrect, but implying some historical germ of truth as its origin) as to the relation between the statesman and the missionary. The earlier date is even more favourable to this view than the later. Seneca's fall was not finally consummated till 62 (some months after Paul's acquittal, according to my former dating); but his ignoble conduct in 59 in condoning and justifying the murder of Nero's mother, Agrippina, and other crimes of the emperor, had possibly weakened his influence as much as they must have sapped his own self-reliance and moral power.

The proconsulship of Gallio causes some difficulty. According to the Eusebian dating, Paul was in Corinth from September, 48, to March, 50. Gallio arrived after Paul had been some time in Corinth; and, as his official residence would begin in summer, he must have come to the city about May or June A.D. 49. Now it is assumed in my *St. Paul* (and by many previous writers) that Gallio's career was entirely stopped during the exile of his younger brother Seneca. In that case, as Seneca was recalled only in 49, Gallio's proconsulship could not begin earlier than A.D. 50 (probably in May), which is too late. But it is not absolutely impossible that Gallio's career continued in spite of the misfortunes of his brother, and that he enjoyed office even during the period of Seneca's exile.<sup>2</sup> The Eusebian dating is therefore not barred absolutely by this consideration.

<sup>1</sup> The generous freedom with which all religious questions seem to have been treated in the earlier years of Nero's reign was probably due to Seneca's influence: *St. Paul*, p. 355.

<sup>2</sup> He was in Rome when Seneca wrote from exile consoling his mother Helvia (xviii. 1), and did not lose his rank; but he was certainly not a *grata persona* at court, and his career would be at least more difficult.

But a more serious difficulty remains. Gallio had been adopted, and changed his name before he went to Achaia. Now Seneca addressed the treatise *On Anger* to his brother under his original name Novatus; so that when that treatise was written, the adoption had not taken place. But Lehmann<sup>1</sup> has given strong reasons for the view that that treatise was written after Seneca returned to Rome in A.D. 49; and his view is endorsed by one of the highest authorities on the subject, the fifth edition of Teuffel's *History of Roman Literature*, edited by Dr. Schwabe.<sup>2</sup> If the date of the treatise were certain, this argument would be conclusive against the Eusebian dating.

Further, as must be acknowledged, there is a certain improbability that Novatus should have been adopted while Seneca was in disgrace and the family under a cloud. The adoption was a mere form by which Novatus might succeed to the wealth of the elder Gallio; and every one who thinks of the state of Roman society, and the extraordinary prevalence of *hereditæ*, and the way in which even the highest sought after the succession to the property of rich *orbi* and *orbæ*, must feel how improbable it is that under the corrupt and greedy Messalina any one would be bold enough to adopt the brother of the man whom she hated. It is therefore probable that the adoption would not take place earlier than A.D. 49, too late for the newly adopted son to go as governor to Achaia in that year.

Some mistakes commonly made about Gallio, even in good authorities, may be noted here, as they are apt to

<sup>1</sup> *Claudius und seine Zeit*, pp. 315 ff. I have deliberated carefully over the arguments there advanced, at first with a prejudice against them (for sometimes Lehmann, perhaps, lays too much stress on a merely general statement made by Seneca in an indefinite way *exempli gratia*); but, as a whole, their force is sufficient to make a very strong case (though not absolutely conclusive), for Lehmann's dating. Diepenbrock, *Seneca*, is not convinced by Lehmann: he leaves the date open.

<sup>2</sup> I have only the English translation, not the German text; but the translation is acknowledged to be good and thoroughly representative.

distort the force of the arguments: (1) It is an error to suppose that he must have been consul before his proconsulship of Achaia, for the latter office would naturally follow after his prætorship; (2) it is incorrect to place Seneca's prætorship in 49, for he was only recalled from exile in that year, and was rewarded with the prætorship, *i.e.* nomination for the following year 50.

The facts with regard to Gallio, though not favourable to the Eusebian dating, are capable of being explained away. But the following argument seems conclusive.

When Paul was arrested, the Sicarii were familiar to every one, and the insurrection of "that Egyptian" was passed (*Acts* xxi. 38). The "Egyptian" had disappeared, but his reappearance was looked for by the people, and was regarded as possible, or even probable, by the Romans. Now the Sicarii did not arise till the reign of Nero, and Nero began to reign on the 13th October, A.D. 54.<sup>1</sup> The feasts, when Jerusalem was crowded with visitors, were the occasions of their exploits; and their first act was the murder of the ex-high-priest Jonathan. The earliest possible date for this event, therefore, was the Passover of 55. After the murder, evidently at some one of the later feasts, the "Egyptian" appeared. Yet, on the Eusebian dating, Paul was arrested at Pentecost A.D. 54, under the reign of Claudius.<sup>2</sup> It seems strange that Prof. Harnack has not observed this difficulty.<sup>3</sup> I should be glad to learn how he would dispose of it. At present it seems to me that we must choose between Eusebius and Josephus; and I am confident that every one who is used to historical criticism

<sup>1</sup> Josephus, *Bell. Jud.*, ii. 13, says that they arose after the brigands were put down by Felix; and he places the destruction of the brigands under Nero. See also *Jud. Antiq.*, xx. 8.

<sup>2</sup> Lewin discusses the date very completely, and brings down the rising of the "Egyptian" as late as 58: I should prefer 56 or 57.

<sup>3</sup> It is all the more strange, as he expressly says, that all these events happened under Nero, p. 236, lines 1-3. Jerome puts them under Claudius.

must feel that Josephus is a much higher authority. The method of arranging events in a brief chronological table presented peculiar difficulties in ancient times, owing not only to the immense variety of eras, of ways of expressing dates by annual magistrates' names, by years of kings and emperors, *etc.*, but also to the variation in the beginning of years (sometimes during the spring, sometimes at the autumn equinox, sometimes the first of January, *etc.*). Every historical student knows by experience how difficult it is even now to reduce a date by some ancient era to the proper year of our chronology: volumes by the score have been spent on this task, and many controversies, which are still raging, turn on this difficulty. Every student knows also how many mistakes of this kind exist in Jerome's Latin version of Eusebius's Chronicle (and the additions), as well as in the Armenian version. Moreover, MSS. of such a chronicle are peculiarly liable to errors of misplacement. If we have to choose between Josephus and Eusebius, we must follow Josephus; but I shall be very glad to learn any way of reconciling them.

An example may be added from Orosius, whose account of the reign of Claudius is very good, of the tendency to error in chronological statements. He dates the accession of Claudius in A.U.C. 795 (A.D. 42) instead of A.U.C. 794, and this error makes him date the famine at Rome (which really occurred A.D. 51)<sup>1</sup> in the tenth year of Claudius (whereas it was in the eleventh), the riot at the Passover under Cumanus (probably A.D. 48)<sup>2</sup> in the seventh year of Claudius (whereas it was in the eighth), the famine at Jerusalem (A.D. 45)<sup>3</sup> in the fourth year of Claudius (whereas it was in the fifth).

<sup>1</sup> Tacitus, *Annals*, xii. 43; *St. Paul the Trav.*, p. 68.

<sup>2</sup> Schürer, *Gesch. des Jud. Volkes*, i. p. 475, and Lewin, *Fasti Sacri*, p. 290, date Cumanus's arrival at Jerusalem in 48, which would imply that the riot occurred in 49.

<sup>3</sup> *St. Paul the Trav.*, pp. 51 ff.



Accordingly we must interpret on the same analogy his statement about the edict of Claudius expelling the Jews from Rome. He places it in the ninth year of Claudius; but we must follow his reckoning, and understand A.D. 50. But, according to the Eusebian dating, Paul came to Corinth A.D. 48 and found there the fugitives expelled from Rome by that edict; hence Orosius is, on any interpretation, as hostile to the Eusebian dating as Josephus seems to be,<sup>1</sup> but his authority is, of course, far from so great as that of the Jewish historian.

Finally, I may claim the pleasure of finding myself in agreement with Dr. Schürer, who has discussed the Eusebian dating in his *Geschichte des Jüd. Volkes*, I. pp. 483 ff., and rejected it, briefly but emphatically, as irreconcilable with Pauline chronology. He does not give much argument, evidently considering the case too plain. Prof. Harnack has apparently made the mistake of assuming that, because Schürer had mentioned no other reasons, there were no others to give; otherwise it is difficult to see how he could have passed over the serious difficulty connected with the Sicarii, who belong to the period of the final struggle against Rome.

A counter-argument in favour of the Eusebian dating must be considered. Josephus says that Felix, when he returned to Rome, was saved from serious punishment by the influence of his brother Pallas. Now Pallas was disgraced in the beginning of the year 55<sup>2</sup>; and hence a desire is felt to set back the return of Felix to Rome earlier than that event. Holtzmann places the recall of Felix in 55, in order to make him arrive in Rome before the fall of Pallas

<sup>1</sup> Harnack quotes Orosius as agreeing with his reckoning; but seemingly he has made a mistake in counting. He sees that Paul must have arrived at Corinth in A.D. 48, and yet he reckons Orosius' date (which, even uncorrected, implies that Aquila was in Rome in 49) to be a proof that Aquila had come to Corinth before autumn 48.

<sup>2</sup> Some time before the birthday of Britannicus on February 12.

from power; but how could the recall be sent out by Nero after he entered on power October 13th, A.D. 54, in time for Felix to reach Rome before February, 55? Such a journey could not be accomplished in the winter season within the space allowed. It is therefore impossible that Felix could have arrived before Pallas fell; and the argument derived from Josephus's emphatic words about Pallas's influence shielding his brother ceases to have any force. Dr. Harnack suggests that Tacitus made an error in regard to the birthday of Britannicus, which fell on 12th February, later than Pallas's disgrace; and suggests that we should understand the 15th, not the 14th birthday, bringing down the disgrace of Pallas to A.D. 56. But he forgets that this would not be a sufficient correction of Tacitus, for the event is also dated by the consuls of the year and by the whole arrangement of the narrative. Dr. Harnack's suggestion is one which he can only have made in haste, and which he himself is not likely seriously to entertain after a little reflection: certainly no one who approaches these questions from the side of Roman history will entertain it for a moment.

But Pallas lived many years after his fall from power, and was the richest man in Rome. A millionaire is a great power even in the best state of society that has ever been attained: how much more so in the corrupt, legacy-hunting age of Nero! Josephus's words are a little too emphatically expressed, but the fact they contain is true; Pallas's power shielded Pallas's brother from his just punishment. As soon as it became patent to the world that Pallas was to be permitted to retain his life and his wealth, his influence would return in some measure. His fall would for the moment destroy his power and frighten every one from his side; but the period of his greatest weakness would last only during the first months after his disgrace.

Finally, it rouses astonishment that Dr. Harnack, defending Eusebius's date in a matter like a change of procurators, rejects it for the martyrdom of Paul, an event which Eusebius would regard as of infinitely greater importance. Harnack treats it as one of the few certainties in early Christian chronology that Paul was executed in 64, but if the day, 29th June, is rightly given by tradition, no years are open under Nero except 65-67.<sup>1</sup>

W. M. RAMSAY.

## CHRISTIAN PERFECTION.

### III.

#### THE TEACHING OF WESLEY.

IN former papers we have seen that, according to the teaching of various New Testament writers, Christ claims from all who put faith in Him unreserved devotion to His service, a devotion involving victory over all sin; that all this is wrought in them by the Holy Spirit, through faith, and in proportion to their faith; and that this faith is a confident expectation, based on the promise of God, that from this moment He will work in us whatever He requires from us. We also saw that this whole-hearted devotion is practically identical with the maturity or perfection which Christ and His Apostles set before those to whom they spoke and wrote.

A doctrine called by him *Christian Perfection* or *Entire Sanctification* was a conspicuous element of the teaching of Wesley. The effect of that teaching is seen in the great impulse given by the Methodist revival to the spiritual life

<sup>1</sup> The fire was 19-24 July; the persecution of Christians began later. Paul's trial lasted several months, see *St. Paul*, p. 361; he was probably arrested abroad in the second stage of Nero's action (*Church in R.E.*, p. 241); his previous acquittal barred arrest (*St. Paul*, p. 308), until that stage.