

*LUKE'S AUTHORITIES IN ACTS I.-XII.*¹

III.

As we saw in the preceding part of this paper, Peter's escape is described to us by Luke in words closely approximating to those in which the fugitive narrated it to the group of the Saints at Mary's door within an hour after it occurred. It would be difficult to find any narrative of an escape from prison better authenticated, or related amid circumstances which exclude more absolutely the supposition either of falsification, or of the growth of legend. The description of the scene at the house must convince the unprejudiced judge, who examines the evidence critically, that Luke had listened to the story as it was related in the presence of several other witnesses of the scene by Rhoda herself, and that he intends to convey to his readers that he had been in the house and heard the story there.

In the story we hear not a word about the conduct of the guards, of whom three sets had to be passed. Were they hypnotized, or drugged, or bribed? Did Peter and the messenger pass among them without being visible? The supposition that they were asleep naturally cannot be entertained where so many were concerned, all bound by their duty to be vigilant and all responsible for their vigilance with their life. Under the head of hypnotism we may sum up any and every kind of supernatural influence which prevented the guards from observing what was going on. The Divine power, if we adopt the theory that the deliverance was accomplished in a supernatural manner, acts through natural means so far as possible; and there must

¹ In the list of recent writers to whom I have been specially indebted in studying the Acts, I omitted accidentally the name of Rev. R. B. Rackham. But, as I said, the present series of articles gives personal impressions, and is not founded on fresh study of modern commentators.

have been some reason evident to an observer why the guards did not take notice of what was going on, not even of the opening of the outer gate, until the morning.

Peter's story explains in part why he observed so little, and why the circumstances are left so obscure. He was wakened out of sleep—evidently a deep sleep—by a blow on the side; but he was still in such a confused, half-awakened state, that he believed all was a dream, until out in the street he found himself alone, after the “messenger of God” had disappeared. Then at last the cold night air and the continuous exercise restored his faculties, and he began to review the situation. He was a practical man, not an observer and student of psychical phenomena. He misses out what would interest the man of scientific temper: “when he was come to himself he said, ‘Now I know of a truth, that the Lord hath sent forth His messenger and delivered me out of the hand of Herod, and from all the expectation of the people of the Jews.’” He pictures to himself the scene on the morrow, the disappointment of the people, and the annoyance of the monarch whose hand and power had proved so feeble. He was conscious of this side of the situation first; and then later came the thought of escape, and of what immediate steps he should take to save himself. The order of his thoughts shows a calm and sane intellect, with a distinct sense of humour. A fussy or timid person would have thought at such a moment only of flight and safety. Peter, as we can gather from this scene, even if we know nothing else about him, was a man far above the common in respect of coolness, courage, and presence of mind. He resolved that the best thing to do was to retire to some obscure spot, after first relieving the anxiety of the brethren about his safety.

We observe that Peter had to think over the situation before he came to the conclusion that his deliverer was a

messenger of the Lord. He had not as yet been conscious of anything apparently supernatural in the circumstances, except that the gate "opened of its own accord."¹ He knew of no agent or instrument pushing it, but saw it open before him. Otherwise the accompaniments were all natural: the light was needed in the dark cell: he fastened his girdle round his tunic, and put on his thick upper garment and his sandals, before going out into the cold night. The chains had indeed dropped off from his hands; but this occurred first of all at the very moment that he was wakened, and he had no knowledge how the fastenings were unloosed. The "messenger" or "angel" appeared to him, therefore, in ordinary human form; and Peter only inferred his superhuman mission from subsequent reflexion about the circumstances. During the escape from the prison Peter was not in a condition to think; he simply obeyed and acted. When, standing alone in the street, he collected his thoughts and reviewed the situation, he concluded that the deliverance was the act of God.

Now, since previously the steps of the action had proceeded without his observing anything supernatural in the appearance or conduct of the deliverer, it is not necessary to understand from the conclusion which he stated, that the deliverer was a supernatural being. In the life of such people in modern times as Dr. Barnardo, who from small means have built up vast and beneficial organizations in reliance on the help of God, that help has come always in apparently natural ways. When a stranger in a

¹ This is a very vague thought in the mind of an Oriental, and is perfectly consistent with other explanations besides that of supernatural action. At the same time, I do not doubt that Luke understood it to imply supernatural agency. Luke was influenced insensibly by the western and scientific view, which sharply distinguishes the supernatural from the natural, and he often is placed in a difficulty by the idea of his oriental informants, who tended to identify the natural and the supernatural in a way that he did not fully understand or sympathize with.

hotel in Oxford, noticing Barnardo's name in the visitors' list, told him that he would make the first Village Home for girls, "we need not say that Dr. Barnardo and his friend received this as an answer to prayer, doubting not that the hand of God was in it." Was Peter, or were any of the early Christians at that time, less able or likely to recognize the hand of God in the affairs of the world than Dr. Barnardo and his friend? On the contrary, the Oriental mind is far more prone to see the hand of God in everything that goes on around us than the English mind is. To the Oriental God is always very close. The Oriental thinks and speaks of God far more frequently and familiarly than we do; and yet in his way of introducing the Divine name and supposing the Divine presence and action in the most common affairs of life, there is no irreverence. He does so, because he feels that God is always moving in all that goes on, great and small; that "not a sparrow falls to the ground without Him." We, on the other hand, tend to reserve the action of God for the big things, with the result that the logical mind, which cannot see any reasonable distinction between the small and the big things, fails, and must necessarily fail, to see that hand anywhere. Was not Barnardo more near the truth when he saw the hand of God in the bestowal of a needed subscription, and read in this act the fulfilment of his prayers?

Such is the Oriental view, at any rate; and there cannot be a doubt that, whether or not Peter actually knew his deliverer to be a real human being, he would equally confidently conclude that this was the angel of God. Peter's words should be judged from his own point of view, as they were meant. The Church was in the direst need, when its leader was on the eve of death. The Church engaged in earnest prayers. The prayers were answered. So much is certain; and we may safely assert that, whether the

deliverer was man or a supernatural being, he was equally "the messenger of God," in Oriental phrase.

Further, we may take it as certain that the escape occurred in the darkest part of the night, before the moon rose. The night following the last day of Unleavened Bread was the twenty-second of the moon, which therefore rose very late. The deliverance was doubtless timed, so that Peter should have a long period of darkness to place himself beyond the reach of pursuit. All the more remarkable is it that his escape was not observed until the next morning. The dawning was not very early at that season of the year; and several hours must therefore have elapsed before the guards observed the facts and began to inquire what had become of Peter. It is not stated whether the outer gate closed behind the fugitive, or remained open. Peter observed only what bore on his immediate movements, and evidently never looked behind him, until he collected his thoughts in the street at some distance from the prison. But we cannot suppose it possible that the outer gate of the State prison remained open for hours, especially after the moon had risen, without some one perceiving it and giving the alarm. The gate, therefore, must certainly have been closed by the same agency which, unseen by Peter, had opened it, naturally or supernaturally, to let him go out.

Now there cannot be a doubt that the "messenger" who struck Peter on the side and guided him had human form, and had opened the door of the cell, for Peter, who described the other details so exactly, seems to assume that this door was open, and that only the outer iron gate at the top of the seven steps needed to be opened before them.¹ But, though the "messenger" had the form of a man (like "the messenger" who appeared to Cornelius),² he was

¹ The seven steps are mentioned only in the Western Text.

² Acts x. 30: when Cornelius tells the story he speaks only of "a man in bright apparel"; others speak of a "messenger," or "angel," of God.

to Peter merely an instrument used by the Divine power. God works through natural instruments and agents ; and Peter had none of the desire which we feel to investigate and state precisely the nature of each stage in his escape. The supernatural and the natural were not separated to his mind by any clear dividing line ; the one melted into the other, and he was not interested in placing the line between them.

Luke also was not interested to divide precisely the region of the natural from that of the supernatural. On the contrary, it would rather seem that he in many cases purposely leaves a debatable ground between the two. Those who, like the present writer, assume as the starting-point of their thought, that the Divine Power does continually exert itself in the affairs of the world, must recognize that at some point the Divine intervention (which is in its origin beyond our ken) becomes knowable to us, i.e., at some point it begins to act through means and in ways that are amenable to the ordinary laws of experience and reason. But where does that point lie ? To answer that question is always difficult. To answer it in the case of Peter's deliverance is impossible, because Luke intentionally or unintentionally—the present writer believes, intentionally—leaves the line of division in obscurity. Does the so-called natural action in this process begin only when Peter stood alone in the street, and was it previously all “supernatural” ? Or did it begin with the agent of the deliverance, in whose heart the thought was born and the means were carefully planned out ? We cannot say with certainty. But we can say with certainty that every one, whether he prefers to make the “supernatural” element larger or smaller, must acknowledge that at some point that element ceases and the ordinary and “natural” begins ; and we can feel great confidence that Luke, who

was generally disposed to enlarge the sphere of the supernatural, purposely leaves the transition obscure.

Now there is no doubt that at the court of the Herods, just as later at the court of many Roman Emperors, the Christians had friends, sympathizers, and even adherents. Slight references occur in the Gospels and the Acts, which may half reveal a considerable background of fact. The wife of Herod's steward was a follower of Jesus. The "foster-brother" of Herod,¹ Menahem, was one of the leading Christians, prophet or teacher, at Antioch. Others have observed and collected these indications; and it is not necessary here to enlarge on them. There is therefore nothing improbable in the supposition that some person influential in the *entourage* of Herod Agrippa I. had skillfully engineered the escape of Peter. The occasion was well chosen, as we have seen, in respect of darkness. Even if Peter had suspected or known who the deliverer was, he would not have mentioned the name at a street door; and he would equally have regarded his helper as "the messenger of God."

This case is typical of what can fairly be expected in the narrative of the New Testament, and of the limitations which must be allowed for. The essential facts and the spiritual truth are placed beyond doubt in this story, for they rest on evidence of the highest kind. But those who are bent on knowing the commonplace facts, those who regard it as the most important part of this historical scene to learn who managed the escape, and how the guards were evaded, will be disappointed: it is utterly impossible from the evidence

¹ I cannot wholly agree with Professor Deissmann's argument in his *Bible Studies*, p. 310 ff., that this term was merely a court title. I think that every one who comes into contact for a time with the life of the Levant lands, and knows how great a part in it is played by foster-mothers and foster-brothers, will be slow to accept some of the sentences in his argument.

to do more than make a vague conjecture, founded on general considerations and not on the special evidence, about these matters. The reason is that such things were indifferent both to Peter and to Luke : they are mere details, which do not in any way affect Peter's conceptions of real and spiritual truth, and the evidence does not even in the remotest way bear on matters of this class. The historian and the sociologist may long to know what was the relation of the royal court to the new Faith : it would be to such scientific inquirers a matter of real value to know whether some person who possessed influence at court managed the escape. Luke, however, did not write for them. Luke wrote for the Christian congregations of the Graeco-Roman world : and he told what was of permanent value for those whom he had in mind as readers. This principle must be applied in general throughout the New Testament narrative.

Turning now to the scene described at the assembly on the first Pentecost (in the second chapter), we observe that the speech of Peter pictures it after a different fashion from the narrative given in the preceding verses and especially in the words attributed to the bystanders. Although Peter at the outset of his speech quotes some of the words uttered by the onlookers, yet he does not mention that those who were now filled with the Spirit were speaking in foreign languages, nor is his tone consistent with the supposition that the use of foreign tongues was a characteristic and important part of the strange scene. He represents the facts which are occurring as a fulfilment of the saying of Joel, that in the last days the whole people, young and old, slave and free, male and female, shall have the gift of prophecy. What Peter heard around him, and mentions as the great feature of the scene, is prophetic utterance, and not the use of strange languages. On the other hand, while the preceding narrative does not exclude prophetic utterance

as part of the scene, it represents the use of foreign languages as being the most striking feature. According to this account, what impressed the onlookers was that strangers from remote lands heard the Christians speaking each in his own language. Those who harmonize everything by methods more or less Procrustean may find these two pictures in perfect agreement; but it seems to us more scientific and far more instructive to admit frankly their differences, and attempt to understand the origin and nature of the divergence between the two pictures.

We start from the belief that the speech of Peter is accurately and adequately reported. We have before us a *précis* of the actual words made by some of the audience (or by Peter himself), who possessed in a high degree the power of seizing and presenting in brief the essential topics of the discourse. There is nothing in the first half of Acts which more strongly impresses us with the historicity and early character of the record than the speeches in the Acts ii.-x.: these are original documents, in the truest sense, giving us faithfully the thought of that period, unaffected by later ideas.

We must, therefore, take Peter's speech in the second chapter as a thoroughly trustworthy account of the scene at Pentecost, so far as it goes. It was addressed at the moment to the spectators, and therein lie both the guarantee for its absolute trustworthiness and the cause of its deficiency. The speaker could not possibly address to such an audience a speech that was evidently out of keeping with the patent facts of the scene. But, on the other hand, he naturally and necessarily assumed as evident to the spectators, and therefore omitted from his speech, much that we should like to know. But, so far as it goes, and especially so far as it was intended by the speaker to go, it is perfect and conclusive evidence. Nothing that is directly contrary to it can be

accepted ; but much that is complementary to it may be correct, though not mentioned by Peter.

We have already stated the opinion that the report of Peter's speeches and of the scenes in which he appears ii.-x. comes, not from himself, but from Philip. Now, is it probable, or possible, that Philip, in addition to reporting exactly the gist of what Peter said, should also report to Luke his own impression of what he saw ? That such a theory is possible no one can hesitate to admit. That it would account for the divergence of the two accounts may also be at once admitted. The description given at the very moment by two spectators of such a scene, so strange and so confused, would certainly differ greatly. Peter, speaking to the crowd, and Philip, relating at a later time his own impressions, might very naturally and probably lay stress on different features ; and the two accounts are not fundamentally inconsistent with one another. The present writer feels no doubt that they both come from good authorities. Yet we must hesitate to attribute the narrative, verses 1-13, to Philip. It has not the character or spirit of those narratives that are most probably or certainly his, such as the scenes in Samaria and Caesarea. It is quite unlike the vivid and natural account of the healing of the lame man. It bears on its face the impression of being a later narrative, which attempts to describe to others by metaphors and elaborate similes a scene which they had not beheld, and to explain in this way not only the visual features of the scene but also the mental effects on those who were present. In verse 3 the remarkable words, " there were apparent to them as it were tongues of fire dividing themselves, and it sat upon each of them," present a vague and confused account and not the vivid picture of a spectator telling exactly what he sees. What sat upon each of them ? was it the fire as a whole, or a single tongue upon

each? Neither answer is satisfactory, either grammatically or rationally ; and yet there is no other possible. The truth is that the authority on whom Luke relies, though in himself good, was not clear on the point in his own mind, because he is mixing up two purposes, a description of what was seen and an account of the mental and spiritual process (which he is trying to make plain by aid of a comparison drawn from the language of the senses). The Divine influence occupied the mind of each individual ; and the manner in which it seized on each and divided itself so as to occupy the mind of each, is compared to the numerous jets of flame springing forth separately from a great fire : each jet divides itself from the mass of flame, and yet each is simply a part of the flame. The simile or allegory was, in a way, vivid and instructive to the simple minds of the ordinary Christians in Jerusalem, to whom the story was told frequently in the following years : but to the educated and scientific mind of modern students it is only confusing. It conceals the truth, instead of revealing it. But Luke was writing for the ordinary congregations, which contained "not many that had a philosophic and scientific education or administrative and official experience,"¹ and the comparison or simile was very suitable for his purpose and his audience. He had to convey a vague rough idea to minds which had

¹ It is strange that this phrase of St. Paul's is so often interpreted as if "not many" meant "none." Even Professor Deissmann adopts this misleading interpretation, *EXPOSITOR*, March, 1909, p. 221. His paper suffers from a fault which is probably due to the translator. It seems to move in a range of thought which assumes that there were in the Græco-Roman society only the aristocracy and "the lower classes," and it tries to demonstrate that Christianity was of the lower classes—an old idea. I have always maintained that, while early Christianity touched both the governing class and still more the lowest classes, its main power lay in its hold on the middle class. Professor Deissmann does not even mention or think of this aspect of the case. It is rather a characteristic of foreign theologians to ignore this class of the population, which, however, is the most thoughtful, the most energetic, and in the long run the strongest part of a nation.

not been trained to demand or to appreciate clear and definite ideas.

It must, as I think, be inferred that the account in verses 2-4 is that which formed itself in the earliest congregation at Jerusalem in the years following immediately after the event, and which was heard by Luke there in A.D. 57. Such allegory or simile is the beginning of legend: but in this case we find the process in such an early stage that its character and origin are clear. Had the process gone on for forty years longer, through a new generation, we should probably have had a legend in the fullest sense. As matters stand, we have the story still controlled by eye-witnesses, because it was repeated to Luke before the generation which beheld the scene had died out.

So far, the narrative seems to be only a naïve emblematic way of expressing the same fact that Peter describes in his speech, viz., the imparting of inspiration and power of prophecy to a number of persons. The following verses 5-11, however, are different in character, and undeniably describe a scene in which the inspired Christians are supposed to be speaking in various foreign languages. This is not necessarily inconsistent with the preceding and the following verses; but it certainly adds a new feature. The kind of prophetic utterance called "speaking with tongues" is never described elsewhere after that fashion; but it was certainly a feature of "speaking with tongues" that the expression was broken, hardly articulate, and not intelligible without an interpreter. It was the result of an ecstatic condition of the individual, and did not benefit others. Hence Paul regarded it with less respect, and classed it lower, than any other form of spiritual influence. Our view is that ii. 5-11 give a popular description of the first occasion on which this influence was manifested in the Church. That the description is not to be taken as literally correct, but

as the current descriptive tradition in the congregation at Jerusalem, follows from the following considerations.

In the first place, there is contained in it a speech which obviously was never actually made. The impression produced on the minds of the spectators is expressed emblematically in the form of a speech; but none of the spectators literally said those words. This is the way in which the popular mind afterwards expressed and described the thoughts of the crowd, when the story was told and retold in the Church.

Secondly, the enumeration of peoples (really of languages) is evidently a rough enumeration such as occurs to one who was present, and who afterwards told the story, adding at the end two nations which he had omitted and which recurred too late to his memory. The understanding of this list has been obscured to the commentators because they take it as a list of countries where the Jews had settled; it is a rough list of the languages spoken by or known to the Jews of the Diaspora (corresponding, of course, in some degree to the countries where they lived); and several are called by popular terms which cannot be specified with any certainty, Persian, Median, Chaldæan or Elamite, and North Aramaic¹ (Mesopotamia), Hebrew or South Aramaic, and Cappadocian, and some Pontic tongue² and Greek (Asia), Phrygian and the barbarous half-Greek of Pamphylia,³ two north-African languages, and Latin (spoken by both Jews and Roman proselytes), finally as an afterthought Cretan (a dialect of Greek so different from the Koine, as to seem a distinct language to the Jews) and Arabic. There is here no classification, but a popular statement, as the

¹ I use these terms in a rough unscientific fashion.

² We have no information as to the language in any of the various districts called Pontus.

³ It is known from inscriptions.

memory moves from east to west, with a supplement of two omitted languages. This is not Lukan; it is what Luke was told, and it comes from the memory of some one who was present. But why is a list of languages given, when we may feel certain that almost all of those Jews knew Greek and that many also knew either Hebrew or South-Aramaic or both? The whole passage merely emphasizes in popular fashion the strangeness of the phenomenon: the tongues were as intelligible in Persian as in Arabic: you needed only an interpreter in every case. The striving after emphasis, which is characteristic of the popular Oriental mind, is here carried to an extreme, and brings the narrative to the verge of legend: yet it is not legend, but an attempt to make uneducated people appreciate vividly a strange phenomenon.

In the third place the comparison of Divine inspiration to fire, which occurs in verses 2-4, was developed in verses 5-11 according to a popular Jewish superstition. That comparison is natural to the human mind, and was peculiarly characteristic of Hebrew thought and expression. Metaphors in which high mental excitation or spiritual enthusiasm is described by such terms as "burning," "flaming," "kindle," etc., are found in every language. But here the elaborate simile of verses 2-4 recalled to the popular Jewish mind the thought of a variety of languages, because a belief had grown up that on Mount Sinai the fire in which God spoke became a multitude of voices. Mr. Vernon Bartlet in his *Acts*, p. 384, rightly says that the analogy is sufficient "almost to prove the influence of this Jewish belief upon the present narrative." Such a development seems inconsistent with anything except a narrative current among the people and taking its colour and tone from their ideas.

Verses 12-13 describe other sides of the onlookers'

thoughts in briefer fashion, but quite in the same general style.

We have in this whole passage the popular account of the scene, as it was current in the Church at Jerusalem. We have not the description which Philip would give, if we judge him by the standard of those parts of the following chapters, where his hand is most apparent. But the picture is in its way a very striking one, and seemed to Luke worthy of preservation, in order to give full emphasis to the first episode in the growth of the new Church. He was certainly quite conscious that the incident contrasted strongly with the more orderly conduct that reigned in the Philippian Church, with its official bishops and deacons. He regarded the scene as an example of the Jewish and Eastern spirit, which even in the Church could not altogether disappear. His historical purpose was to describe the development of the Church; and he knew that Pauline views as to spiritual life were different from and higher than this. But that early scene also was the effect of the Divine Spirit, seizing on the young congregation for the first time and almost intoxicating them with its fervid enthusiasm. The Acts as a whole sets before us the picture of a Church growing, and not of a Church stationary.

We do not maintain that every part of these chapters can be assigned to some definite authority. Allowance must be made for the formative and guiding genius of Luke, and for his habit of using details taken from one authority to enrich and enliven a narrative taken from some other. But it seems in the highest degree probable that we can safely trace the varying origin of different parts of chapters i.-xii. Philip and his daughters, Rhoda and other persons in the household of Mary, may be confidently believed to have contributed by their personal narrative and trustworthiness to give greater individuality and vividness to

the account which was heard by Luke as current in the Palestinian Church about 57 A.D. Mere popular narrative tends to become vague, to lose grip of exact details, and finally to degenerate into legend. In the chapters we must acknowledge that some parts are more thoroughly historical and trustworthy than others; and we see the reason in the varied authorities on whom Luke depended.

The popular tradition was far more liable than single educated authorities like Philip to let its account be coloured by subsequent events; and it is therefore of the utmost importance that we have the tradition at such an early date. The arguments that Luke's history was composed and published about A.D. 60 or 70 rest on facts which really only imply that he had caught the tradition at that stage and reported it faithfully. In some cases it is of real value to have in the Acts a certain reference to subsequent history, because the history to which it refers is so early. The tradition even at its worst gives us the views entertained at an extremely early period. Perhaps the most important of those views is the conception of Church government which underlies the Acts. The administrative work of the Twelve, in which they subsequently needed the supplementary aid of the Seven, is repeatedly termed *diakonia*, and once *episkope*. It is logically necessary to infer that Luke, who was evidently keenly interested in the practical side of the history of the Church as an administrative institution, regarded the diaconate and the episcopate as both developing out of the apostolate in its capacity of a governing body. So long as there were any of the Twelve Apostles left, the government remained with them. But in their absence and after their death, other devices had to be introduced. In Syrian Antioch Barnabas and other "prophets and teachers" formed a governing body, not essentially dissimilar in character to the Twelve; Barnabas

in fact carried with him the prestige of commission from the Twelve, and of a rank close to theirs. We have still a semi-Oriental kind of governing authority, not unlike the colleges of priests at the great Asiatic and Anatolian hiera. But, when we come to the Hellenic cities of South Galatia, we find that Paul introduced the Greek system of popular election to Church office, Acts xiv. 23. This method suited the democratic spirit of Hellenic towns, and was wholly alien to Oriental ways. It was perpetuated, for in the *Didache* the rule occurs "elect for yourselves bishops and deacons": and it led to evils, as already is evident in Paul's letters, where allusions are made to the rivalry among the members of a congregation for distinction and office. Such rivalry, and the faults to which it is prone, was hardly avoidable in the Greek and Roman world. In the introduction of this method we recognize the Greek side of the mind and training of Paul. The pure Jew would never have instituted such a system of government.

In Galatia it was presbyters that were appointed. In Jerusalem the presbyters were merely "the elder brethren" (Acts xv. 23), viz., those members of the congregation whose experience and age fitted them for deliberation, while the younger members acted where vigour and physical work were needed (v. 6, 10): the distinction is a natural one, which comes about automatically. But in the Hellenic cities of South Galatia,¹ the presbyters were elected officials. The difference is profound. The one institution has no bearing on or inner connexion with the other. Very soon the "presbyters" were differentiated into "bishops" and "deacons," as we see at Philippi and in the *Didache*; and the two classes came to be regarded as respectively superior and preparatory. This development and systematization must have interested Luke keenly; and the fact that no

¹ Doubtless also in the Pauline Church at Ephesus,

word bearing on its initial stages is found in his history is one of the many reasons which convince me that his work was never completed, that a third book was in his mind, and that even the second book, the Acts, never received its finishing touches. In the year 57, when we leave Asia, there are only Presbyters. In the year 61 there are at Philippi bishops and deacons, as we see in the slight glimpse which Paul's letter to the Philippians permits. The development began in that interval, during which the Acts does not touch Asia or Galatia. A study of the Pastoral Epistles may throw some light on the subject.

W. M. RAMSAY.

LEXICAL NOTES FROM THE PAPYRI.¹

XIV.

ἐξηλώω.—Dr. Stanton (*The Gospels as Historical Documents*, p. 100) remarks on Justin's use of "the curious word ἀφηλωθείς" to denote that Christ was "unnailed" from the Cross (*Dial.* 108). The passage is noted by Sophocles (*Lexicon s.v.*), who also gives references for the corresponding verb ἐξηλώω. To these last may be added TbP 332^{14f.} (A.D. 176) where complaint is made of robbers who τὰς θύρας ἐξηλώσαντες ἐβάσταξαν, "extracting the nails from the doors carried off" what was within, and PFi 69^{21, 24} (iii/A.D.) ἐξηλοῦσι σανίδες (accus.).

ἐξομολογέω.—For the ordinary Bibl. meaning of "admit," "acknowledge" cf. HbP 30¹⁸ (iii/B.C.), οὔτε τῶι πράκτορι ἡβούλου ἐξομολογήσασθαι, "nor were willing to acknowledge the debt to the collector" (G. and H.). The derived sense of "agree," as in Luke xxii. 6, comes out in TbP 183 (ii/B.C.), τοῦ κω[μάρχ]ου ἐξωμολογησαμένου ἕκαστα: cf. PFi 86¹¹ (i/A.D.) ἐξομολογουμένην τὴν πίστιν.

¹ For abbreviations see the February and March (1908) *EXPOSITIO*, pp. 170, 262.