

With regard to the third mark, while it is quite true that 2 Corinthians iii. 1, v. 12, would suit 2 Corinthians x.-xiii. better than 1 Corinthians if there were any other sufficient ground to believe that it ever was part of a distinct epistle, yet in 1 Corinthians ix. we have a passage of considerable length in which St. Paul dwells in detail on the personal sacrifice he had made. And as for Dr. Kennedy's fourth mark, which seems to him the strongest of all, it, as I have shown above, refers to the original design of the apostle, which design he had ceased to entertain before 1 Corinthians was written.

NEWPORT J. D. WHITE.

A CRITICISM OF THE NEW CHRONOLOGY OF PAUL.¹

ONE of the most surprising, and, if established, most important results of the historical criticism of this decade, is the chronology of the life of Paul brought forward in Germany by scholars no less eminent than O. Holtzmann (in his *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, 1895, pp. 125 seq., 248), and F. Blass (*Acta Apost.*, 1895, p. 21 seq.), but now most prominently identified with the great name of Harnack, who defends it on partly independent grounds in his *Chronologie der Altchristlichen Literatur*, pp. 233-243. The slightly variant chronology of Ramsay (*Paul the Traveller*, 1896), more fully developed in the *EXPOSITOR* (Series v. vol. iii. pp. 336, and v. 5. pp. 201 seq.), and the suggestions of McGiffert in *The American Journal of Theology* (I. i. pp.

¹ I desire to express my obligation to Mr. E. W. Lyman, of Yale Divinity School, for his careful and scholarly work in the examination of all the early sources referred to in this discussion and comparison of their data. The chronology to which our enquiry in common has led up was first suggested as a possibility by him.

145 seq.) and in his *History of the Apostolic Church* (pp. 356 seq.) are for the most part a brilliant corroboration on the part of English and American scholarship of the proposed new chronology. This chronology would carry back the whole series of events in the life of Paul from three to six years in time, beyond the dates long regarded as substantially settled. The older view, *per contra*, cannot be said to lack able defence, in view of the argument of Schürer (*Gesch. d. jüd. Volkes*, 2. Aufl. I. pp. 483 seq., Engl. transl. I. ii. pp. 182 seq., n. 38), which does not materially differ from that of Lightfoot (*Biblical Essays*, p. 215 ff.), H. Ewald (*History of Israel*, London, 1885, vol. vii. pp. 37-43), and E. D. Burton (*Records and Letters*, Chicago, 1896, Note I.).

The new chronology is a natural accompaniment of the present marked reaction of criticism toward the tradition of the early Church. Not merely was it becoming increasingly difficult under the older chronology to accept or account for traditions such as that of Peter's activity in Rome, and Paul's in Spain, and for the situations presupposed in the Pastoral Epistles, but the early chronologists themselves (Eusebius, *Chronicon*, ed. of Schoene, including the Armenian and Jerome's version, and the Syriac epitome; also the *Chronicon Paschale*, pseudo-Chrysostom, and Euthalius) are, without exception, in favour of dates which, until very lately, were generally condemned as absurdly early. On the other hand, it is hardly needful to refute the preposterous assertion that the dating of the events of Paul's career, including his conversion, from three to six years earlier than has hitherto been customary will necessitate for the critics an entire new interpretation of New Testament history and literature. The question is, however, of importance fully sufficient to justify a careful and impartial scrutiny of the evidence on both sides; for it possesses not only a high intrinsic interest, but, if a really trustworthy chronology of the life of Paul can be obtained,

both an important element of ancient tradition will be confirmed, and the light thus thrown upon the entire history of the apostolic age will be of incalculable value.

We are fortunately guaranteed in one respect against the disappointing result of being obliged to dismiss the fruits of years of critical investigation as valueless. Supporters of both the older and the new chronology are practically at one in their deductions from the Book of Acts and the Pauline Epistles as to the *relative* chronology of the life of Paul. All are agreed that an interval of some five years separates Paul's arrival in Corinth (Acts xviii. 2) from his arrest in Jerusalem (Acts xxi. 17); an interval of two and a half years more his arrest from his departure for Rome, after Felix had been succeeded by Festus and the latter had heard Paul's defence; and one of two and a half years more his departure for Rome from the date when we lose sight of him in the darkness of tradition. Earlier than this ten-year period there is less exact agreement, although substantial unanimity prevails. Ramsay, whose study of the relative chronology is probably the most accurate, allows five and a half years for the first of the periods above mentioned, and very carefully estimates the time required for the so-called "second missionary journey" from Jerusalem to Corinth at one and a half years more, varying here also not more than a month or two from his predecessors. Twelve years are thus sufficient to cover the best known portion of Paul's career as delineated in Acts xv.-xxviii., from the Apostolic Council to the close of the two years' imprisonment in Rome.

It is to this generally accepted twelve-year period that we must add the chronology furnished by Paul himself in Galatians i. and ii. Unfortunately the ambiguity of Galatians ii. 1 seems absolute. It is impossible to say whether the "fourteen years" must be counted from his conversion, or from his first visit to Jerusalem, three years after his

conversion (Gal. i. 18 = Acts ix. 23-30; cf. 2 Cor. xi. 32, 33). Only two of our authorities have attained to certainty on this question of fourteen or seventeen years between Galatians i. 16 and ii. 1. Ramsay insists on the fourteen years period, because he identifies the visit of Galatians ii. 1 with that mentioned in Acts xi. 30; xii. 25 (relief of the sufferers by famine), instead of that of Acts xv. (settlement of the Judaistic controversy). *Seventeen* years before the known date of the famine (45-47 A.D.) would carry the conversion of Paul back beyond the limits of probability. McGiffert, who agrees with the practically unanimous, and in our view irrefutable, verdict of scholarship against Ramsay (cf. Sanday, *EXPOSITOR*, v. 3 pp. 81 *seq.*, and 253 *seq.*), that Acts xv. 1 *seq.*, and Galatians ii. 1 *seq.* cannot possibly refer to different occasions, but are certainly concerned with the same event, adopts the fourteen-year reckoning, because he identifies the visit of Galatians ii. 1 with *both* visits of Acts; that for famine relief in Acts xi. 30, xii. 25, and that for the settlement of the Judaistic agitation in Acts xv. 1 *seq.* In other words, McGiffert holds that these two accounts are merely variant versions of the same event, which the historian failed to recognise as such, and embodied separately in his narrative. With one bold stroke of the critical knife our brilliant young scholar thus cuts the Gordian knot of the harmonizers, explaining how, according to the emphatic declaration of Paul, the visit provoked by the Judaizers can be the *second*; whereas according to Acts it is undeniably the *third*. The theory is not merely bold and seductive, but supported by evidence which cannot be despised; but as presented by its author it excludes one of the two equally possible interpretations of Galatians ii. 1; and this is a serious objection.

The Apostolic Council, therefore, is by all authorities to be dated twelve years, approximately, before the end of the

imprisonment in Rome, and nine years, approximately, before the recall of Felix (Acts xxiv. 27). McGiffert alone, of our authorities, would insist on the shorter interval (fourteen years) between this and Paul's conversion (Gal. ii. 1), leaving but twenty-six years for his entire career as a Christian; for he rejects the theory of a release and second Roman imprisonment. Ramsay, who holds that the Apostolic Council took place later than the events referred to in Galatians ii., adds a third period of four years (*Paul the Traveller*, p. 68) to cover this interval between the twelve years required by Acts xv.-xxviii. and the fourteen required by Galatians ii. 1, leaving thirty years for the career of Paul to the end of the (first) imprisonment. Our other authorities would add to the twelve-year period of Acts either fourteen or seventeen years for the requirement of Galatians, according as other considerations might dictate. Lightfoot argues indeed in favour of the seventeen-year interpretation, both in his Commentary on Galatians (note on ii. 1) and in his *Biblical Essays* (*l.c.*); with the difference, however, that in the latter (dated 1863) he maintains quite strenuously the necessity for taking *μετὰ τριῶν ἐτῶν* (Gal. i. 18) in the literal sense, whereas in the Commentary (1865) he holds that Paul may well have counted both termini, after the usual fashion of antiquity, and allows but *sixteen* years for the whole period. But Lightfoot himself would hardly claim conclusive force for the arguments he advances in behalf of the interpretation involving the longer reckoning. We may say, therefore, with great probability upon a review of all the evidence, Paul's conversion took place at least twenty-six, and quite possibly twenty-eight or twenty-nine, years before the end of the Roman imprisonment, twenty-three to twenty-six years before the recall of Felix. The reckoning of antiquity (Euthalius, quoting the Chronicle of Euseb.; cf. Harn., *Chron.*, p. 234, n. 2) allowed twenty-five years for this period, but took no note of the half-year required for the voyage

to Rome, and probably underestimated the length of the second missionary journey.¹

With the last-named date we have reached the common starting point of nearly all modern chronologies, which attempt to connect the relative chronology of Paul's life with the general chronology of secular history by means of the synchronisms of the Acts, the Epistles, Josephus, Tacitus and other historians, and thus to make it absolute. In the present paper we shall confine ourselves to this principal synchronism of the recall of Felix, reserving for another occasion our discussion of other proposed points of connection with secular history, and our summing up of the evidence.

Harnack very naturally begins the argument for his *Chronology of Paul* by a quotation from Schürer's masterly review of the evidence in favour of the long accepted date. Says Harnack (*l.c.*): "Everything here [in the fixing of the absolute chronology] depends on the determination of the year in which the procurator Felix was recalled and superseded by Festus. Schürer remarks [*l.c.*]: 'An exact and certain determination of the year in which Felix was recalled is clearly impossible. Most of the recent investigators assume A.D. 60 as the most probable date. Some go a year or two farther back. Only Kellner and v. Weber [references in Schürer, *l.c.*], after the example of some earlier scholars (Bengel, Süsskind, Rettig, on whom see Wieseler *Chronologie des apost. Zeitalters*, p. 72) place the recall of Felix in the very

¹ Ramsay, in his article entitled "A Fixed Date," etc. (*Expositor*, v. 3, p. 342) refers to an oration on Peter and Paul ascribed to Chrysostom (spurious according to Montfaucon, vol. viii., p. 621), wherein it is stated in an incidental way that Paul suffered martyrdom in the sixty-eighth year of his age and the thirty-fifth of his Christian career. This tradition may serve as a confirmation of the testimony of Euthalius, for both doubtless rest upon the chronology of Eusebius, according to which a third period of ten years is added to cover the time from Paul's release until his martyrdom in Rome in the sixty-eighth year of our era, after a second Roman imprisonment (cf. Harnack, *l.c.*, p. 241).

beginning of Nero's reign, Kellner: Nov. 54, Weber: summer 55.' "

It seems to be O. Holtzmann to whom we owe the earliest denial of Schürer's dictum and attempt to demonstrate that "an exact and certain determination of the year in which Felix was recalled is *not* impossible. Holtzmann rests exclusively upon the authority of Tacitus (*Annal.*, xiii. 14) in combination with Josephus (*Ant.*, xx. 8, 9). His argument is as follows (*l.c.*, p. 128): "Festus' predecessor, Felix, escaped the accusations brought against him by shielding himself behind his brother Pallas, whom Nero was then holding in especial honour (*μάλιστα δὴ τότε διὰ τιμῆς ἄγων ἐκείνου*). Now Tacitus says expressly that in the year 55 Nero removed Pallas from the conduct of affairs, for he had been made chancellor by Claudius. That this man should subsequently have been restored by Nero to especial favour, is not made probable by appeal to the favourable outcome of a suit brought against him in this same year 55 (*Tac., Ann.*, xiii. 23). Tacitus himself in xiii. 14 sets forth that Pallas, even before his deposition, had made provision against the possibility of condemnation. Either Josephus is in error, or Festus went to Palestine in 55." On the latter of these two alternatives Holtzmann has based his admirably condensed and lucid argument. Our own investigations will show, however, that it is the former which must be adopted, and that with the error, or better, the unwarranted inference, of Josephus falls practically the whole of the structure so carefully reared, with all the superstructure erected by later hands.

But first we must trace the influence of this argument of Holtzmann upon the present supporters of the so-called "new" chronology, which is really the only chronology of Paul's life known to antiquity. For two of the ablest of these, Harnack and McGiffert, independently of one another, have built upon it, the inevitable coincidence of

their results being even appealed to as additional evidence for their accuracy (McGiffert, *Ap. Age*, p. viii.). Harnack admittedly rests at least one-half of the weight of his case upon Holtzmann's argument, declaring that "the best proof" for the trustworthiness of the Eusebian dating "is the fact that O. Holtzmann has reckoned out this very same chronology, without even taking into consideration the data of Eusebius."¹

After the example of Holtzmann, Harnack further dismisses all other attempted synchronisms as valueless (*l.c.*, p. 236), and herein coincides again with his brilliant pupil in New York. McGiffert, however, goes much further than Harnack in his dependence on Holtzmann, since he not only makes no attempt to criticise his (incorrect) statements in regard to Tacitus, but rests the *entire* weight of the chronology he adopts upon Holtzmann's data alone, making no use, as Harnack has done, of the scholarly and able argument of Blass (*l.c.*) for the trustworthiness of the Eusebian data.

It is not strange that McGiffert, in adopting the results of Holtzmann, should have fallen into the same error as his authority in dating the recall of Felix and accession of Festus in 55 A.D., the year of the overthrow of Pallas.² For Harnack's important supplement to Holtzmann's extract from Tacitus, viz.: that the fall of Pallas was some days

¹ "Der beste Beweis für die Haltbarkeit der Aufstellung liegt aber darin dass O. Holtzmann eben diese Chronologie ausgerechnet hat, ohne von der Angabe des Eusebius auch nur Notiz zu nehmen" (*l.c.*, p. 237. Italics the author's).

² Holtzmann (*l.c.*, p. 129): "Entweder irrt Josephus, oder Festus ist schon 55 nach Palästina gekommen . . . Sonach scheint der Anfang der Verwaltung des Festus nicht später als 55, der Ausgang derselben nicht früher als 58 angesetzt werden zu dürfen." And again (p. 130): "Felix konnte, wenn er Sommer 55 Palästina verliess, doch noch frühzeitig genug in Rom sein um durch seinen freilich nur noch kurze Zeit mächtigen Bruder Pallas geschützt zu werden." McGiffert has twice (*Journ. Am. Th.*, I. 1, p. 147; *Ap. Age*, p. 357) the statement that "Pallas fell into disfavour with Nero and was relieved of his offices before the end of the year 55," and twice: "It seems therefore that the latter [Festus] must have become procurator in 55; for before the end of that year Pallas was in disgrace." (Italics mine.)

earlier than the birthday of Britannicus, which occurred on February 12, had not then been made. Had McGiffert considered the effect of this closer determination of the date, he must have seen that Holtzmann's year 55 was out of the question; for McGiffert himself calls our attention to the fact that according to Josephus (*Ant.*, xx. 8, 9): "The accusation from which Felix was relieved by the good offices of his brother was made after his departure from Palestine and after the accession of his successor Festus."¹ Now as it is clear from Acts xxiv. 27; xxv. 1, 6; xxvii. 1-9, that Festus did not arrive before midsummer, and the fall of Pallas was in January or early in February, the supposed intervention of Pallas must have been in the previous year, *i.e.* 54 A.D. and not 55.

It is not strange that McGiffert should have failed to make this correction of Holtzmann based upon the date of the birthday of Britannicus, for only a close comparison of Tacitus, such as Harnack has given, would have revealed the discrepancy. But how can we account for Harnack's own failure to correct, since the error lies patent upon the very surface of his work? "Pallas fell into disfavour, according to Tacitus (*Annal.*, xiii. 14, 15), no later than February in the year 55; hence the recall of Felix cannot have been later than 55-6."² This is a pure blunder. Every

¹ The statement of *Ant.* xx. 8, 9 is inconsistent with that of *Bell.* ii. 13, 7 (*v. Schürer, l.c.*, p. 185). According to the latter passage Felix himself sent the ambassadors of both parties to the Cæsarean dispute "to Nero"; and this Schürer regards as the more probable. By supposing that the deputations were really sent to Claudius, but *arrived* under Nero, it might be possible to rescue the statement of *Ant.* xx. 8, 9, that Pallas' intervention on his brother's behalf was "while he was in the height of favour with Nero." Unfortunately for those who might wish to resort to this supposition in support of Holtzmann's synchronism, the intervention of Pallas would then have nothing whatever to do with the date of Felix's recall or the accession of Festus. It would merely tell us the date of an effort which *failed* to secure the recall of Felix.

² "Pallas fiel nach Tacitus (*Annal.*, xiii. 14, 15) bereits im Jahr 55 im Febr. in Ungnade; also kann Felix nicht später als 55-6 abberufen worden sein" (*l.c.*, p. 235). We omit the reference in the note to the question whether Tacitus may not have meant the year 56. For the discussion of this unguarded proposal of Harnack see our criticism further on.

careful reader must see that Harnack should have written 54-55, yet he not only fails to see the bearing of his own more accurate determination of the date, but proceeds to build upon Holtzmann's date of 55, as if that were substantiated, and the only question remaining, the question whether Tacitus might not be brought into correspondence with the Eusebian date of 56 by certain more or less improbable suppositions.

We owe to the keenness of Ramsay, in his review of Harnack, entitled "Pauline Chronology" (EXPOSITOR, v. 5, p. 209), the demonstration that the recall could not "be sent out by Nero after he entered on power October 13, A.D. 54, in time for Felix to reach Rome before February, 55," since "such a journey could not be accomplished in the winter season within the space allowed." It is Ramsay, again, who shows that Harnack's proposal to correct the statement of Tacitus that the birthday of Britannicus in question was his fourteenth, "*quartum* decimum aetatis annum explebat," by substituting *quintum*, "fifteenth," is absolutely negated by the dating (*Annal.*, xiii. 11) under Claudius Nero, and L. Antistius (= A.D. 55), as well as by the whole arrangement of the narrative. Thus whatever the possible value of Holtzmann's synchronism, he is forced in any event to carry back the recall of Felix to the year 54, and to struggle as best he can with the difficulty of the winter journey.

Harnack has two possibilities in reserve, if the emendation of Tacitus be inadmissible, by which Holtzmann's chronology may become, if not identical with, yet approximately near the Eusebian. (1) Festus may not have followed immediately on the heels of his predecessor in office. (2) Pallas may not *at once* have lost *all* influence.¹ We will discuss these in order.

¹ "Will man das (the possible error of Tacitus) nicht zugestehen . . . so fragt es sich noch immer ob Festus ihm (Felix) auf dem Fusse gefolgt ist, fragt

(1) The most favourable possible supposition for Holtzmann, and of course for Harnack as well, involves two assumptions: (a) That the "recall" of Felix coincides with the accession of Nero, October 13, A.D. 54; in other words, that Felix did not wait to be formally relieved of office, but started for Rome as soon as the news of Claudius' death reached him, let us say with Kellner, November, 54. No intrinsic impossibility is involved in this supposition (*v. Schürer, l.c., p. 183*). (b) That the appointment of Felix's successor was unusually delayed, so that Festus did not arrive until some nine months after Felix's "recall," *i.e.* July 13, 55 A.D. There would then be left a discrepancy of only *one* year between Holtzmann's chronology and the Eusebian.

But it is no other than Josephus himself, on whose accuracy here Holtzmann is absolutely dependent, who makes both of these assumptions absolutely impracticable. (a) He makes the recall of Felix not coincident with the accession of Nero, but at an interval thereafter, which Holtzmann himself estimates at "some months," Schürer at "several years," Lightfoot (*l.c.*) at "five or six years." (b) He states expressly (*Ant., xx. 8, 9*) that Felix did not leave Palestine until after the accession of his successor Festus. Neither one of the proposed assumptions (*a* and *b*) is admissible, and *both* are essential to the theory; for it is only on the supposition that Festus' accession was delayed until the following summer that it becomes supposable that Felix might have been recalled between October 13, 54, and the fall of Pallas, January-February 12, 55. Otherwise we shall have to hold, with the untrustworthy Armenian version, that Felix was recalled by Claudius (!) in order to bring Festus' accession within the season of year required by Acts.

(2) But may not the influence of Pallas have endured for some time after his fall, so that his intervention could shield his brother? To this we have no objection to offer. Indeed we think it very probable that Felix was thus shielded, for Pallas lived on till 62 A.D., the richest man in Rome; and, as Ramsay truly says: "A millionaire is a great power even in the best state of society." *But if the intervention of Pallas was subsequent to his fall, what becomes of the precious synchronism?* Absolutely no chronological inference can be drawn from it. Harnack's harmony will be effected at the cost of the very datum for the sake of which it was made, and on which the entire structure of Holtzmann and his followers has been erected!

We have seen that a harmony of the Eusebian chronology with that of Holtzmann such as that on which Harnack has attempted to rear the superstructure of the new chronology is impracticable. We need take but few words to point out how entirely fallacious is the whole reckoning of Holtzmann and his followers, whether in agreement with the Eusebian or not.

It is certainly most singular that Ramsay, whose ears were impervious to two seductive strains of the harmonizer, should have yielded to the third, and admitted that there might be force in the suggestion that Pallas could not at once have lost all influence in Rome. "Josephus' words," he admits (EXPOSITOR, v. 5, p. 210), "are a little too emphatically expressed, but the fact they contain is true; Pallas's power shielded Pallas's brother from his just punishment." Is not Ramsay here, in the very act of exposing the violence of Harnack to Tacitus, exposing himself to the charge of violence to Josephus? Is it "true" to say that "Pallas was then in the height of favour with Nero," *μάλιστα δὴ τότε διὰ τιμῆς ἄγων ἐκείνον*, if in reality Pallas had fallen from favour at least a year before? Be it remembered that there is not only no ground (Holtzmann,

as quoted above, p. 128) for assuming a restoration of Pallas to favour, but even, as McGiffert points out (*l.c.* p. 357), Tacitus expressly remarks in regard to the judicial white-washing Pallas had procured for himself later in the year 55, that "his acquittal was not so gratifying [to the emperor] as his arrogance was offensive."¹ On the contrary, there is no concession whatever to be made to Holtzmann. To his peremptory dilemma, "Either Josephus is in error, or Festus went to Palestine in 55 [read 54]," there is but one possible and necessary answer: Josephus is certainly in error. We have seen that Josephus' own statements as to the indictment of Felix would require us either to place the recall early in 54, *i.e.* under Claudius (!), or else to acknowledge that the incident of the intervention of Pallas has no bearing on the date of Felix's recall. We have seen that Josephus' own statements, again, are explicit as to the continued activity of Felix under Nero. And we have seen that Tacitus' testimony to the final expulsion of Pallas from court favour, as having occurred some days before February 12, A.D. 55, is invincible. These statements, taken together, make the recall of Felix before the overthrow of Pallas absolutely impossible. Against them we have nothing but the casual, unsupported remark of Josephus—contrary to his own representations elsewhere—that if it had not been for his brother's influence at court, *then at its height*, Felix would have met his just deserts. Plainly in the attempt to explain the escape of so great a rascal from Roman justice Josephus, in the words italicised, for the moment forgets his dates. The foundation on which Holtzmann and McGiffert have rested the entire weight of their chronologies, and Harnack fully half the weight of his, is a pure anachronism, absolutely without value for the purpose, save by the inference which might be drawn from the probable limits of error beyond which

¹ *Annal.*, xv. 23.

Josephus cannot well have strayed. But the consideration of this inference belongs to the constructive side of our enquiry, and this we reserve for a later occasion.

BENJ. W. BACON.

DIFFICULT PASSAGES IN ROMANS.

II. ST PAUL'S THEORY OF ETHICS.

AFTER a distinctively Christian greeting in Romans i. 1-7, St. Paul goes on in verses 8-15 to express his deep interest in his readers. He never ceases to give thanks to God for them, and prays that a way may be opened for him to visit them, hoping thus to benefit both them and himself, and eager to pay a debt which he owes to all men of whatever nationality and degree of culture. The debt he wishes to pay is to preach the Gospel.

Then follows a description of the Gospel. It is a power of God for salvation, for every one who believes, for Jew first, and for Greek. For in it a righteousness of God is revealed, from faith, for faith. And this is in harmony with an announcement by an ancient prophet, that "the righteous man by faith will live."

At this point, in verse 18, a sudden change comes over the scene. Righteousness and faith vanish from view; and unrighteousness and anger take their place. The hinge on which the discourse turns is the word *revealed*. Righteousness of God revealed in the Gospel is now confronted by *anger of God revealed from heaven against all unrighteousness*. The specific reason of this anger is stated, viz. that *men hold back the truth in unrighteousness*. And this St. Paul explains by saying that in the material universe *God has manifested to men His power*, and that which distinguishes God from man, *i.e.* His *Godhead*. But men turned from the Creator and worshipped the creature, even