vividness, and it found its fulfilment in the fearful catastrophe which overwhelmed the guilty city, when, on the last night of the siege, which was spent in drunken orgies, a breach was made in the walls by an overflow of the Tigris, and the effeminate king burnt himself alive in his palace. Nineveh disappeared so utterly that the army of Alexander the Great marched over its débris without knowing that a world-empire lay buried beneath his feet. In point of fact the remains of Nineveh first began to be revealed to the world by Layard and Botta after the year 1842.

If the prophecy of Nahum seems to be less directly spiritual than those of such prophets as Hosea, Micah or Habakkuk, we must remember that it forcibly brings before us God's moral government of the world, and the duty of trust in Him as the avenger of wrongdoers, and the sole source of security and peace to those who love Him.

F. W. FARRAR.

THE JEWS IN THE GRAECO-ASIATIC CITIES.

II.

It will help to illustrate the position of the Jews in Tarsus, if we bring together the scanty facts known about the Jews in some other cities of Asia Minor.

V. THE JEWS IN EPHESUS.

Incorrect views on this subject are widely accepted. The Ephesian constitution was settled by the Seleucid Antiochus II., 261-246 B.C.; and this settlement was appealed to by the Ephesian Greeks as authoritative in 15 B.C. There had, therefore, been no serious modification introduced after the time of Antiochus. Now a body of Jews were dwellers in Ephesus in 15 B.C. and the Greeks of...
Ephesus tried to induce Agrippa to expel these from the state on the ground that they refused to participate in the city religion.

On what footing did those Ephesian Jews stand? Some, of course, were merely resident aliens, who had been attracted to the city in comparatively recent times by its great commercial advantages. But were there not some Jewish settlers of a different class with better rights? Ephesian inscriptions throw no light on this: they only prove that there was a Jewish community at Ephesus (see Canon Hicks' *Inscr. of Brit. Museum*, Nos. 676, 677). From Josephus we learn that the Ephesian Jews were granted freedom from military service by Roman officials in repeated acts (evidently because the attempt had been made to force them to service), on the ground that their religion, and especially the requirements of their Sabbath, prevented them.

The most distinct evidence as to the status of the Ephesian Jews lies in the arguments used by the Ephesian Greeks, when they appealed to Agrippa in 15 B.C. 1 They claimed to possess the sole right to the citizenship, which was the gift of Antiochus II. These words are useless and unnecessary, unless there was a body of Jews claiming to be citizens of Ephesus, whom the Greeks desired to eject from the citizenship. They came to Agrippa asking permission not to expel Jewish strangers from the town, but to deprive the Jews of their participation in the State.

This conclusion seems inevitable; and Professor E. Schürer has rightly held it. But even so recent and competent an authority as Professor Wilcken adopts the prevalent view 2 that Antiochus II. merely gave freedom to the Ionian cities, including Ephesus.

Moreover, the next words quoted from the Greeks' argument constitute an even stronger proof: they put the case that the Jews are kinsmen and members of the same race with themselves.

The word "kinsmen" (συγγενεῖς) is conclusive. The Greeks argue, "If the Jews are kinsmen to us, they ought to worship our gods." The only conceivable kinship was that which they acquired through common citizenship. The idea that common citizenship implies and produces kinship is very characteristic of ancient feeling and language. We find it even in St. Paul, Rom. xvi: 7, 11, where the word "kinsmen" will be understood as denoting Tarsian Jews by those who approach the Epistles from the side of ordinary contemporary Greek thought. It can hardly mean Jews simply,¹ for many other persons in the same list are not so called, though they are Jews. Different classes and shades of meaning in the list are indicated by the various terms συνεργοί, συγγενεῖς, συναιχμάλωτοι, etc. Andronicus and a few others are characterized as members of the same city and "Tribe" as Paul.

The Jewish rights, therefore, must have originated from Antiochus II. Now, throughout his reign, that king was struggling with Ptolemy king of Egypt for predominance in the Ionian cities; and the constitution which he introduced in Ephesus must have been intended to attach the city to his side, partly by confirming its rights and freedom, partly by introducing a new body of colonists whose loyalty he could depend upon; and among those colonists were a number of Jews.

Those resident aliens who had helped in the war against Mithridates had been granted citizenship by the Ephesian State.² But such persons would have to accept enrolment in one of the pagan groups or "Tribes," out of which the

¹ As συγγενεῖς κατὰ σάρκα does in Rom. ix. 3.
² See the inscription Lebas-Waddington 136a, Michel 496, Dittenberger 253.
city was constituted; and this we have seen that Jews could not accept. If there was a body of Jewish citizens in Ephesus (as seems certain), they must have been settled there by some external authority; and, as we have seen, the constitution was permanently settled by Antiochus II.

The accession of colonists required a new Tribe; and to this period we must attribute the institution of a sixth Tribe, which was afterwards renamed Augusta, in honour of the Emperor Augustus. 1 In Ephesus the Tribes were divided into "Thousands." The Jews were evidently formed into a "Thousand" by themselves, just as about 286, when King Lysimachus added a number of colonists from Lebedos to the population of Ephesus, he made a "Thousand" in the Tribe Epheseis for them. 2

VI. THE JEWS OF THE LYCUS VALLEY CITIES.

The Jews in the cities of the Lycus Valley, Laodiceia, Colossae and Hierapolis, form an interesting and important group. That valley was one of the early centres of Christianity; already there were at least three Churches in it, about A.D. 60–61 (Col. iv. 15); and it may be regarded as practically certain that those first Churches originated within the synagogue or the surrounding circle of "the God-fearing." In attempting elsewhere 3 to bring together the evidence about the Jews of those cities, I found very little; but the subject has been greatly advanced by the newly discovered evidence published among the inscriptions of Hierapolis by a German party of exploration. 4

1 Σεβαστή. Similarly at Athens the eleventh and twelfth Tribes, which were created to bear the names of Antigonus and Demetrius, were replaced by the tribes Ptolemais and Attalis.
2 The words used above, p. 24, do not mean that the Hellenic "Tribes" in a city were always older than the city: they were often late institutions, but some such groups existed before the city and constituted the original city.
3 Cities and Bish. of Phrygia, ii. p. 545 f. and ch. xv.
4 Altertümer von Hierapolis, by Humann, Cichorius, Winter and Judeich, 1898, pp. 46, 96 f., 188, 174 f.; the inscriptions are edited by Dr. Judeich; see review in Class. Review, 1900, p. 79.
bearing of the evidence, however, has not been as yet correctly apprehended.

At Hierapolis a settlement of Jews is several times mentioned in the inscriptions. The body of the Jews there was called either "the Settlement (Katoikia) of the Jews who are settled in Hierapolis," or "the Congregation of the Jews." They formed a corporation sufficiently distinct and legalized to have a public office of their own, "the archives of the Jews," in which copies of their own legal documents were deposited. The "Congregation of the Jews" was empowered to prosecute persons who violated the sanctity of a Jewish tomb, and to receive fines from them on conviction.

A most important question is whether those Hierapolitan Jews were citizens or merely resident aliens. This is easily answered. The expression "the Jews who are settled in Hierapolis" might seem indeed to suggest that they were not citizens of the Greek city, but mere residents: the same formula is frequently used of the Romans resident in a Hellenic city. But it must be remembered that the Romans, after the Roman conquest, did not rank among resident aliens in a Hellenic city. They were in their own subject land, and they had definite rights and the position of an aristocratic caste in such cities: they were mentioned along with the body of Hellenic citizens, and frequently even before those citizens, as one of the orders or classes of the population who united in authorizing the acts of the city. The technical term "Settlers" (Katoikoi) therefore points naturally to the rank and legalized position of the Jews in Hierapolis.

Moreover the same term is regularly and technically used to designate the settlers planted in a city of Asia Minor.

1 ἡ κατοικία τῶν ἐν Ἰεραπόλει κατοικοῦντων Ἰουδαίων No. 212, ὡς τῶν Ἰουδαίων No. 69.
by the Seleucid or Pergamenian kings.1 On the whole, analogy strongly and conclusively points to the view that a settlement of Jews had thus been made authoritatively in Hierapolis by one of the kings: the settlers had definite rights and a recognized legal position in the city. Possibly there may have been in the earlier period some difference between them and the citizens proper; but this difference was certain to evaporate as Roman customs gradually destroyed the delicate mechanism of the Greek City-State, and must have entirely disappeared by A.D. 212, when all free Hellenic citizens were made Roman citizens; for this higher status, common to all, overrode the minor status of Greek citizen or settler.

Moreover, Hierapolis seems to have preserved its pre-Greek character as a Lydian (afterwards a Phrygian) city, in which there were no "Tribes," but only the freer grouping by Trade-guilds.2

We must conclude then that the distinction as regards citizenship between the old Lydian population and the Settlers (katoikoi), planted there at some period before Christ, was not a serious one. The two classes constituted in common the population of the city.3

1 M. Radet has discussed clearly and convincingly the connexion of the term katoikia with the colonists planted by the kings in the Graeco-Asiatic cities (De coloniis Maced. p. 17f): the same use is now well known in Ptolemaic Egypt, where the term katoruva lasted through Roman times. But he seems sometimes to narrow the term too much by restricting it to Seleucid military colonists; it was much wider (Cities and Bish. of Phrygia, ii. p. 583). Dr. Buresch would attach even more independence to a Katoikia (see footnote 3 below).

2 This, which is pointed out in Cities and Bish., i. p. 105f., is disputed by Dr. Judeich, Alt. von Hierap. pp. 97, 175; but he has failed to observe that the terms Μονακίς, Μαυλονίδος, Μαμώλιδος, which he regards as denoting Tribes, are really formed from names of villages (κωμαί) into which the wide territory of the city was divided. On the village-constitution of Hierapolis see Anderson in Journal of Hellenic Studies, 1897, p. 411.

3 Dr. Buresch, Aus Lydien, pp. 1-3, would regard a Katoikia as a large and flourishing village (κωμη), not possessing the constitution of a Hellenic City-State. If that were so, then the Katoikia of the Jews at Hierapolis would have to be regarded as even more completely independent and separate from the city. But though Katoikia does occur as apparently equivalent to κωμη, yet
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It was natural that the Jewish settlers, with their commercial aptitude, should form themselves into one or more Trade-guilds, similar to the older Lydian guilds. As has already been pointed out, it was by such unions that ancient religions were usually maintained in foreign lands. If the Jewish settlers were numerous or scattered, they would need more than one synagogue, and more than one union (as, for example, was the case in Rome).

After these preliminary remarks, which seem incontrovertible, we approach a difficult inscription, often published and commented on, which has been a subject of controversy, because the preliminary considerations were not clearly stated and valued by those who have written about it. This document is the epitaph copied more than thirty years ago by Dr. Wagener from a sarcophagus, which seems to have disappeared soon after, as it has never been found by any subsequent explorer. The tomb belonged to P. Aelius Glycon (who numbered among his ancestors a person named Seleucus). By his Will, engraved on his coffin, Glycon provided for a distribution of money to “the most reverend Presidency of the Porphyrobaphoi” ¹ at the Feast of Unleavened Bread; and “to the Synedrion of the Kairodapistai” at the Feast of Pentecost.

That Glycon was a Jew is admitted by all, and seems indisputable. His father or grandfather, Seleucus, must also have been a Jew. That the two Guilds were Jewish is maintained by Dr. Ziebarth, *Griech. Vereinswesen*, p. 129; that they were either Jewish or Christian is urged in *Cities and Bishoprics*, pp. 545, 676. ²

the meaning of “a body of Katoikoi, or colonists,” is far more common and important; and it alone suits the situation in Hierapolis.

¹ τὴν σεμνοτάτην προεδρίαν τῶν Πορφυροβάφων, *Cities and Bish.*, ii. p. 545, No. 411; Jubelich, No. 342.

² In the first place, I inclined to the view that they were Christian; in the second passage, after having observed the difficulty of distinguishing between Christian, Jewish-Christian, and Jewish proper in Phrygia, I tended to regard them as Jewish, and therefore strongholds of Christianity. See further below.
Both views are disputed and denied by Dr. Judeich, *Altert. von Hierap.*, p. 174. But his reasons seem hopelessly inconsistent with Jewish nature and character. He supposes that Glycon wished to secure that his tomb should be always adorned by his business friends on the Jewish festivals. It seems a sufficient answer to this to state what it means. It means that a Jew left endowments to two pagan trade societies in order that those pagans might regularly through all future time practise at his grave certain ceremonies, which were not devoid of a pagan religious character, on the two great Jewish feast days. This seems so unnatural that we can only suppose Dr. Judeich did not really clearly realize all that his words implied. That a Jew should bequeath money to pagan societies, united in the worship of pagan deities; that he should invite pagans in endless succession, through generation after generation, to perform at his grave the ritual which they performed at the graves of their pagan friends; that he should expect and invite those pagans to observe the Jewish feast days for that ritual; all these are equally improbable, almost impossible, ideas.

The Jews had their own associations and guilds; and Glycon went to them to ensure that his grave should be permanently cared for and adorned, just as other Jews trusted the duty of punishing violators to the entire body of Hierapolitan Jews.

The Porphyrabaphoi and the Kairodapistai, therefore, were Trade-guilds of Jews, as Dr. Ziebarth declared. The supposition that they were old pre-Jewish Trade-guilds, in which some Jews had acquired membership, cannot be maintained: the reasoning stated in § III. (*Expositor*, Jan. 1902, p. 23 ff.) is conclusive against it. The older Trade-guilds were united in the worship of pagan deities, and Jews could not be members of them.

But the Jewish Trade-guilds, undoubtedly, go back to the
time when the Jewish colony, the Katoikia, was brought to Hierapolis; and the name Seleucus, which remained in at least one Jewish family, is a sign that the foundation of the Katoikia took place under one of the Seleucid kings, i.e. not later than about 200 B.C., and possibly under the founder of the dynasty, 301–281 B.C. Such Jewish bodies were intended to wear an appearance which agreed perfectly with the surroundings in which they were placed. There was no thought of any esoteric meaning. The Jews adapted themselves to their position as citizens of, or Katoikoi in, a Hellenic city. They formed their Trade-guild of Purple-dippers, which has to be distinguished from the older native pagan Trade-guild of the Dyers (Bapheis). The other Trade-guild, the Kairodapistai, on the same analogy, must be interpreted as bearing a purely trading or manufacturing name.

It forms no argument against the Jewish character of the Trade-guild of the Purple-dippers, that they erected statues or passed decrees in honour of Roman officers. There can be no doubt that Jewish associations habitually did so.

Further, it is probable, and even certain, that the Jewish associations took part in the ceremonial of the Imperial cultus, and that Jews even became high priests in the worship of the Emperors. Of course, they palliated and explained away such acts as being simply expressions of loyalty to the sovereign; and such they really were. The Imperial cultus was an artificial creation, with nothing of the real character of religion about it, which held the whole Empire together in loyal service by the tie of a common ritual and festivals. Hence the same Jews, who would have scorned to merge themselves among the heathen

1 See above, p. 98. 2 See above, Expositor, Jan. 1902, p. 25. 3 Dr. Cichorius, Alt. von Hierap., p. 48 f., suggests kairos yarn, and δαρις carpet, probably rightly. 4 Judeich, Alt. von Hierap., Nos. 41, 42. 5 Church in the Roman Empire, p. 190 ff.
by participating in the religious ceremonies of a pagan "Tribe," were ready to show their loyalty to the sovereigns whose cause they always supported.

The Jews had begun at an early time to fall into this course even in Palestine. When in the opening of First and of Second Maccabees we read that altars of Zeus Olympios were set up in Jerusalem, and that some of the Jews offered sacrifice on altars of idols, there can be little doubt that, primarily, the altars were erected to the deified king, who was identified with Zeus; ¹ and that the sacrifice was exacted as a proof of loyalty, and not from any desire to interfere with the Jewish religion (which the kings protected and favoured). Of course, as bitterer feelings were excited by revolt, the kings began to proscribe and insult the Jewish religion for its own sake, as the cause of revolt; but, originally, what they desired was merely to secure proof of loyalty and to spread Hellenic civilization.

On the same principle, many of the Jews in the Graeco-Asiatic cities, doubtless, complied with the requirements of loyalty under the Seleucid kings, and still more under the Roman Empire. Doubtless the Pharisees from whom Paul was descended had always refused to conform to that requirement of the Imperial cultus; and, as we know, the organization of that cultus was not nearly so complete and thorough at that early period as it soon afterwards became.

It is, of course, not to be thought that this was the sole point in which the Pharisees of Asia Minor differed from the less strict Jews around them. It was only a peculiarly striking and obvious mark which differentiated the class, though along with it went many other points of difference from the common Jews. But the important thing to observe is that the Pharisee of a Jewish colony in a Graeco-

¹ Such identification of the reigning Seleucid monarch is a well known fact from at least the time of Antiochus Soter (281-261) onwards. The worship of the founder, Seleucus Nikator, persisted long after his death.
Asiatic city is not to be taken as thinking exactly the same with a Pharisee of Jerusalem. The views of the former were inevitably far wider, he was far more open to education, far less hostile to foreign rulers and government, than the latter.

Various examples—mostly of a probable but still only hypothetical nature—have been given elsewhere of the Jewish habit of conforming to Roman loyal customs. A Jewish citizen in a city of the Empire could enter on a public career only by thus conforming, and it might be taken as certain, even without any exact evidence, that many Jews engaged in the career of office either in their own city or in the Imperial service. In addition to the examples elsewhere quoted, a newly discovered proof may here be stated. It belongs to Sala, a city which lay only a little way north of the Lycus valley on the borders of Lydia and Phrygia. Two magistrates are mentioned on the coins of Sala bearing the names of Meliton (under Trajan, A.D. 98-117), and Andronicus (under Antoninus Pius, A.D. 138-161). Nothing could be less Jewish than these names. Andronicus and Meliton were evidently ordinary magistrates of the city, striking coins with pagan religious types, and taking part in the ordinary State ceremonial, which necessarily and un­avoidably included performance of the ordinary loyal sacrifices and offerings to the Imperial divinities, the reigning Emperor and his deified ancestors. But in the proof sheets of Mr. B. V. Head’s forthcoming work on the coinage of Lydia, I observe that his more correct reading of certain coins shows that both Andronicus and Meliton were sons of Salamon, which puts their Jewish birth beyond question.

1 Cities and Bish., ii. pp. 640, 648 ff., 672 ff. One of these has recently been much strengthened by a fuller copy of the inscription on a stone formerly hidden in great part. Its Jewish character is now practically certain: see my paper in Revue des Etudes Anciennes, 1901, p. 272.

2 In the case of Andronicus the father’s name is contracted Sala(mon).
The great difficulty in tracing the Jews of Asia Minor lies in the fact that they so completely Hellenized or Romanized themselves. If we had only the names, who would recognize that Paulus and Silvanus and Andronicus were Jews? Very rarely does such an evident name as Salamon occur in inscriptions. In one Hierapolitan epitaph a Jew named M. Aurelius Alexander Theophilus with the added name Asaph occurs. The purely Jewish name Asaph is introduced with the formula ἐπικλησιν, which we have noted as common in Jewish and Christian names, and rare in names of ordinary Greeks and Romans.

Names of the kings or Roman officers who had shown favour to the Jews were often used by them, especially Alexander: Seleucus has been quoted above. Names containing the element “God” (Θεός) were also much used by them, as Theophilus just quoted (Eldad, Jedidiah), Theodorus (Matitya), Theodotus or Dorotheos (Netanya, Nathanael), etc. Where several names of this class are found in one Phrygian inscription, there is a presumption that it may be Jewish. Several other names, which are obviously translations of Hebrew names, were also favoured by the Jews, as Eirene (Salome), Justus (Zadok), Boethos (Oser, Ezra), etc. All these classes passed into Christian usage also.

Dr. Cichorius has remarked on the frequency of the names Glycon, Glyconianus, Glyconis, among the Jews of Hierapolis; and he adds that some other inscriptions, in

1 See Cities and Bish., ii. pp. 522, 539, 547 note; Expositor, 1888, viii. p. 416ff.
2 On Jewish names as represented or translated in Greek, see Zunz, Namen der Juden, 1837; Herzog, in Philologus, lvi. p. 50 ff.; Th. Reinach, Revue des Et. Juives, 1893, p. 126 ff.
3 They occur also in Christian or Jewish-Christian inscriptions of neighbouring districts: Cities and Bish., Nos. 356, 360, 368.
which those names occur, may perhaps be Jewish. In all probability the names are renderings of the Hebrew Naam, Naaman, Naomi, Naamah.

The name Maria occurs often in the Lycus valley and neighbouring towns.¹ In some cases it may be the feminine of the Latin Marius, but generally it must be taken as Jewish or Christian, or Jewish-Christian.

The whole subject of Jewish-Greek names needs a thorough study: the beginning would be to collect in one list the names which are certainly Jewish, and in another list those which are indubitably Christian.² These two classes are closely related to one another, which is in perfect accordance with the historical fact that the early Christian congregations originated in the synagogues and the circle of “God-fearing” proselytes around them.

One other inscription of Hierapolis deserves and demands mention. M. Aurelius Diodorus Koreskos, with the added name Asbolos, leaves a bequest for an unexplained purpose³—the burning of Papoi—to the Board of the Presidency of the Purple-dippers. In the Expositor, 1888, viii. p. 416, this inscription was published and recognized as Christian.⁴ I still think that its Christian character must be accepted; but the explanation there given of the name Porphyrabaphoi as adopted by a Christian congregation for concealment must be abandoned, as has been stated above. The name originated long before Christ among the Jews.

Diodorus Koreskos, surnamed Asbolos, was a Jew, but

¹ Judeich, Nos. 80 and 225; Cities and Bish., Nos. 365, 418, 439, 440.
² Contributions to these lists will be found in the notes to the Christian inscriptions of Central and Southern Phrygia (Cities and Bish., ch. xii., xvii.); but till the inscriptions are completely published, the lists cannot be made.
³ (ε)ἰς ἀποκαταστάσεις τῶν ΠΑΙΠΩΝ.
⁴ The corrected text given there is confirmed by the copy of Judeich, except that he reads with Waddington Κορήκου for my Κοράκου. The strange reading, ΠΑΙΠΩΝ, scouted as an obviously false reading by M. Th. Reinach, Revue des Etudes Grecques, 1895, p. 461, is confirmed by Dr. Cichorius.
a Christian Jew; and it still seems probable that the burn­ing of Papoi on the wonted day, and the bequest in the second instance to the ἔργασία θρεμματική, must be under­stood with reference to this fact, the latter being an institution for bringing up foundlings (θρέμματα).

VII. POSITION OF JEWS AND CHRISTIANS IN THE CITIES.

Only by carefully observing the scanty details that have survived regarding the Jews of Asia Minor can we appre­ciate the position of St. Paul in his childhood. Among those Jews we see that the narrow Palestinian Pharisaic views, which some scholars attribute to Paul, could not originate or exist. He himself knew well that the sur­roundings amid which he was born and brought up had made him the one suitable man to carry the Gospel to the Roman world, or, in other words (as he says to the Galatians), that God had set him apart from his mother's womb to preach Him among the Gentiles. He was the man to carry the Jewish faith to the Graeco-Roman world, because he knew both and understood both, because he saw from the beginning that the fulness of time was come, i.e. that not merely was the Roman world ripe for and in need of the Jewish faith, but also the Jewish faith was ripe for and in need of the wider sphere of the Roman world. As has been stated in previous paragraphs, it had come to this, that either Judaism must lose its hold on its own people amid the enervating and seductive atmos­phere of the brilliant Roman world, or it must take that world into itself and ennable it in the true faith.

In the course of his career Paul learned that Judaism must modify and perfect itself before it could take into itself the Roman world, and, finally, in a sudden flash of inspiration, it was made manifest to him that the Messiah had come, and that Christianity was the new and perfect form of the Hebrew religion.
It is necessary to repeat and to insist from many points of view on this truth, that Paul's education was the growth of centuries of Jewish experience in the Gentile world, that his mind was the fine product and mixture of all that was best in Greek learning and in Jewish religious thought, that he was the widest as well as the clearest and subtlest thinker of his time. In short, there was only one land where St. Paul could have been produced, viz., the Seleucid regions of Asia Minor, and in that land only one city could bring him forth, viz., Tarsus.

As we have seen, it would be a mistake to think, even as regards those Jews who yielded most to the temptations which their brilliant prospects of wealth and influence in that pagan world held out to them, that they sank to the level of the common pagans around them. Morally they stood on a higher platform, and intellectually they were fully on an equality with their Greek rivals. It is quite evident that pride of race was strong among them all. The Asian and Phrygian Jews were an aristocracy of mind even more than an aristocracy of wealth; and they could not, except in rare cases, let themselves fall to the pagan level.

But in the religious point of view, to the eye of the prophet and the thinker, the people was in a dangerous condition. It was not merely that they were necessarily less scrupulous about the minutiae of the Law than the Palestinian Pharisees; that was inevitable in their position among the Gentiles, and was really a higher, not a lower, stage of thought. But the religious feelings of the people were being sapped and enervated by prosperity. They had ceased to develop in morality and religion; and a people that has ceased to develop must decay.

In every stage of their history, the Jewish people, as they began to lose hold of the divine idea, found a prophet
to keep before their eyes the truth of God, to enforce and reiterate that truth, to denounce the backsliding which necessarily resulted from the relaxing of their eager aspirations. So, in this case, at the due moment the prophet Saul appeared.

We must compare and contrast the position of the earliest Christian congregations with that of the Jews in the cities of Asia Minor. Both were exposed to the same dangers and the same temptations; but the Christians were far more completely exposed than the Jews. If the influence of pagan surroundings was strong among the Jews, fenced off as they were from them by their own Law and by their political privileges, how much more difficult must it have been for the pagan converts to disengage themselves from the environment in which they had been born and bred, and amid which their life must necessarily be spent to some extent even after they became Christians.

Well might the Corinthians write to Paul that, if they interpreted literally his orders to keep no company with idolaters and so on, they must needs go out of the world amid which their lot was cast. It was, in fact, impossible to obey him literally; and he wrote to explain that he had not contemplated this too literal interpretation of his words (1 Cor. v. 9-11).

But, further, the Christians newly converted from paganism commonly were in the position which (as we have shown) would have been impossible for a Jew, and was never occupied by Jews. They were citizens enrolled in Tribes or Trade-guilds among pagans; they were members of religious associations and benefit societies of pagans; they were bound by their position to take part in meetings and ceremonies of purely pagan character, encompassed all day long from birth to death with a constant succession of pagan

---

1 See Expositor, Jan. 1902, p. 23 f.
observances, from which the Jews of the same cities, citizens and residents alike, were entirely free.

It was hard to save the Christianized pagans from sinking back to their former level. The whole of First Corinthians is an illustration of the difficulty. Only one thing could permanently save them, and that was the persecution of centuries. That persecution was inevitable, after Paul, Peter, and John had agreed in forbidding them to remain as members of pagan societies. Their withdrawal from the social life of the city was more conspicuous, and provoked more hatred than was the case with Jews, because the latter had always had their own societies and guilds and political classification, while the new Christians (if they were not of Jewish birth) had been hitherto mixed up with the pagans in all things. The hatred of the mob was always a force pushing on Roman governors and officers, even against their will, to put the law in force.

Moreover, many and probably the majority of the Jews outside Palestine were willing to accept the tests of loyalty proposed by the Imperial religion, while the Christians were absolutely forbidden to do so; and this provoked and challenged the Roman Government, which proscribed necessarily those who placed themselves outside the pale of loyalty.

Thus persecution was inevitable; and persecution alone could have kept Christianity in life and vigour.

In conclusion, it is necessary to reiterate what we have elsewhere emphasized, viz., the essential identity of view on this point between the Epistles of Paul and the Revelation of John. It is true that Paul was still hopeful of toleration in the Empire and of a peaceful conquest, while John had learned that toleration was impossible, and that the Empire

1 Expositor, Dec. 1900, Feb. 1901.
would be conquered only by the blood of the Church. But Paul had taken the steps which made persecution inevitable: on no vital point of teaching could he differ from John: their reply to every serious question regarding the relation of the Christians to the pagan world, its customs, and its rulers, was identical. When one sees this, it is disappointing to read in an article in this magazine 1: "Had Paul the Aged survived to read the Apocalypse, it would have broken his heart. He was spared that piercing thrust, that 'wounding in the house of his friends' (Zech. xiii. 6)."

Such an exaggerated and ungoverned statement is a typical example of the way in which preoccupation with one single thought (even one true in itself and fruitful, as in this instance) and neglect of all other considerations may lead into the extreme of errors—an error that in this case ought to be vehemently combated as distorting the view of early Christian history.

W. M. RAMSAY.