5-1-1924

Chronology of the Life of St. Paul

P F. Plunkett
Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir_plunkettp@csl.edu

CHRONOLOGY OF THE LIFE OF ST. PAUL

A Thesis presented to the

Faculty of Concordia Theological Seminary

in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

Bachelor of Divinity

by

P. F. Plunkett

Approved by

W. Arndt

1924

GENERAL SURVEY. -- Introductory.

Though properly an historical rather than a theological problem, the chronology of Paul's life is important in the field of Bible study, and is closely related to several theological questions, including that of the reliability of Scripture and the authenticity of several books accepted by the church as canonical. Its treatment is historical, but much of the freedom for specualtion indulged in by the average student of history is denied the scholar who treats this subject. Anything which cannot be established with reasonable certainty must be left an open question, and the integrity of the Scripture must remain unmolested.

Eliminating from the beginning those portions of Paul's life for which we have no reliable chronological data, we find that our task deals principally with the portion of his life extending from his conversion to a point two years after his arrival in Rome as a prisoner. Concerning this period we have much chronological information. The period from that point forward till his death does not yield such satisfactory results, but must also be considered, while the chronology of his letters forms a separate problem in itself, though it is dependent on the results of the other investigation. Only hypothetical dates for the events in Paul's earlier life are possible, and since no special importance for our purposes attaches to these, they will not be treated here.

SOURCES.

Most of our information on this subject is drawn from one infallible source, God's own Word. The most valuable writing for this study is the Acts of the Apostles, and the information it yields is supplemented by material drawn from the various Pauline Epistles, among whidh Galatians holds first rank for historical notices. The inspired writings enable us without further aid to establish a fairly complete relative chronology for the main part of Paul's life. On no other point do we find such accurate and precise historical and chronological information in the Bible; it is only because actual dates are not supplied by the Scriptures that we are obliged also to use other sources of information.

Fortunately, there are a number of fairly reliable secular writings of that period to which we have access, which enable us to fix the dates of Paul's activities with a remarkable degree of assurance. In these writings we find discrepancies and inconsistencies, which make the task rather difficult for the student, but they are in general reliable sources. There we find records of people and events mentioned in connection with Paul's life and work, together with exact dates. The most valuable of these books are the "Antiquities" and "Jewish War" of Josephus, a late comtemporary of Paul, and the"Annales" of Tacitus,

who was a boy at the time of Paul's death. Almost equal to these in value, and confirming much of what they tell us, are the works of Dion Cassius, a Roman historian of the late second century, who had access to the best of sources and used them well, and whose work covering this period is preserved to us in epitomes prepared by later writers. Valuable chiefly for comparison are the "Lives of the Caesars" written by Suetonius about the time of Hadrian; the "Agricola" of Tacitus; and we might add the works of Seneca and the Plinies, though they have no direct bearing on our subject.

Another class of secondary sources is found in the early Christian writings, though they offer little to supplement the New Testament account. Clement of Rome and the Apologetes give some traditional information on the life of Paul, and there is an important reference in the Muratorian fragment. In the fourth century, Eusebius went over all the reliable sources of information available, passing much of it on to us in his "Ecclesiastical History," a very valuable work, and the earlier "Chronicon," which has not come down tous in the original, and which does not appear to have been quite so trustworthy as the "Ecclesiastical History." We have it in a Latin version by Jerome, an Armenian version, and two fragmentary Syrian copies, but the various versions do not agree among themselves on some of the dates. Orosius, a contemporary of Augustine, gives us one date which we are unable to obtain from other sources, but in general it may be said that our literary sources are exhausted when we have considered Eusebius and his antecedents.

Another important source of knowledge in this sphere in archaeology. A number of inscriptions have been discovered which have a bearing on our subject, though most of these are without independent value, merely confirming what may be otherwise determined. A notable exception is a stone discovered at Delphi in 1908 commonly known as the Gallio Inscription, the text of which is given us by Deissmann, Barton, and others in their writings on this subject.

Numismatics has been called upon to support certain assertions, but the study of coins has given us little new positive evidence of value in settling the questions that arise. A number of arguments have been based on astronomical calculations, but their value is rather doubtful, and calculations which to the exoteric mind seem correct lead to conflicting conclusions, so they are left out of consideration here.

REFERENCE WORKS.

Many writers of modern times have treated this subject, drawing on all available sources, and reaching widely differing results. From Ussher down to the present time, there have always been writers ready to discuss this subject, some in separate works, others is connection with New Testament Exegesis, Isagogics, or History, still others as a portion of the field of Church History. The student of today has the advantage of information

which most of these writers did not possess, and can discard many of the conclusions which have since been decisively disproven. Earlier works still have some value in their thorough discussions of various problems, even when their general results cannot be accepted. Some of the more recent works treating this subject are those of Zahn, Juelicher, Schuerer, Deissmann, Lightfoot, Sanday, Turner, Wieseler, Harnack, and Ramsay. Valuable articles by various writers are to be found in many periodicals and in encyclopedias.

Disagreement among scholars has been due to lack of information, disagreement as to the meaning of certain expressions, and differences of opinion as to the relative credibility of early authorities that disagree. The discovery of the Gallio Inscription is the most important development in modern times, and seems to have supplied sufficient evidence to fix the chronology with a reasonable degree of certainty, but still there is not unanimity of opinion, and probably will not be until further discoveries are made.

In view of the great mass of extant literature on the subject, I have not attempted to give references to all the writers consulted on a question. The references given are almost entirely confined to the Bible and those writings which may be considered as source material, principally Josephus and Tacitus.

Since the Bible is our chief source of information, and the one source that is absolutely infallible, the evidence derived from it stands upon a plane by itself. The natural method of precedure, therefore, is to gather and condense all the chronological data of the New Testament, and then supplement this with evidence from other sources.

RELATIVE CHRONOLOGY.

The Acts of the Apostles with the help of the Epistles enables us to work out a fairly accurate relative chronology, accounting for most of Paul's actions and determining about the length of time between them. After the relative chronology has been established, the actual dates may be supplied by a comparison with other sources.

Paul, a young Jew born in Tarsus, was present at the stoning of Stephen (Acts 7,58) and took an active part in the persecution that followed (Acts 8,3). On On his way to Damascus to persecute the Christians there, he was converted through a divine vision (Acts 9;1-8), and it was revealed to him that he was to become God's chosen instrument for the conversion of many Gentiles (Acts 9,15.16). He began to preach in Damascus, was in Arabia for a time, and then returned to Damascus (Acts 9, 19-22; Gal. 1,17). Three years after his conversion, he was forced to flee from Damascus, escaping the soldiers

of the ethnarch under King Aretas by being let down over the wall, and went to Jerusalem, where he was at first received by the Christians with suspicion (Gal.1,17; Acts 9,23-28; II.Cor. 11,32). Barnabas brought him to Peter and James, the brother of the Lord, who blessed him and sent him away to Tarsus, where he remained for some time preaching the Word in Syria and Cilicia (Acts 9,30; Gal. 1,18-21).

Barnabas, who had been placed in charge of the church at Antioch, brought Paul from Tarsus to aid him in his work, and there they labored together a whole year (Acts 11,25.26). They were sent up to Jerusalem to bring relief to the brethren in Judea, who were suffering from a famine which occurred under Claudius about the time of the death of Hero Agrippa I. (Acts 11,27-30; 12,23). Having fulfilled their ministry in Jerusalem, they returned to Antioch, where they remianed until God made known to them His will that they should bring the gospel to the Gentiles (Acts 12,25; 13,2).

The first missionary journey took them first to the island of Cyprus, where they preached at Salamis, and then passed through the island to Paphos, at which place the proconsul Sergius Paulus was converted. Then they sailed for Perga and proceeded to the interior, where they carried on extensive missionary work in the Roman province of Galatia, first in Pisidian Antioch, then successively in Iconium, Lystra, and Derbe, and the surrounding regions. Everywhere their work was hindered by the Jews, whose enmity they aroused, but they made many converts from among both Jews and Gentiles in every city they visited. Driven from Derbe, they retraced their steps as far as Perga, organizing congregations in each city as they went. Having reached Perga, they preached the gospel there also, and then returned to Syrian Antioch. (Acts 13.14) It is impossible to say just how long this first missionary tour took, but it is generally agreed that a year and a half is a fair estimate.

Fourteen years after his first visit to Jerusalem, Paul was again present in that city, this time as a delegate to what is known as the Apostolic Council (Gal.2,1-10; Acts 15,1-29). This council was held at the request of the church at Antioch for the purpose of settling disputes that had arisen within the church in connection with the conversion of uncircumcised Gentiles. This was a short visit, and upon his return Paul remained for some time at Antioch (Acts 15,35).

Soon after the Apostolic Council, Paul and Barnabas again set out to work among the Gentiles, but this time not together. Paul's companions on this journey were Silas and later Timothy, for a time Luke, and perhaps others at different times.

On his second journey, Paul revisited the cities of Syria and Cilicia, as well as Lystra, Derbe, and Iconium, then passed through the Phrygian and Galatic region, preaching as he went (Acts 15,41-16,8). Forbidden to preach in the province of Asia, he went on to Mysia, but was again prevented by the Spirit from preaching in Bythinia, so he proceeded to Troas. In a vision Paul was summoned to preach in Macedonia, so he crossed and began his work in Philippi, but following his imprisonment there he went on to Thessalonica and thence to Berea, establishing a Christian congregation in each city in spite of the violent opposition of the Jews (Acts 16,9-17,14). Leaving his companions in Macedonia, Paul went to Athens and sent word for them to join him there. While he awaited their coming, he preached in Athens with indifferent success, then went on to Corinth (Acts 17,14-34). A reasonable estimate of the time thus far spent on the second journey is about a year and a half, rather a little less than more.

Arriving in Corinth, Paul came into contact with Aquila and his wife Priscilla or Prisca, Jewish Christians who had just arrived from Rome, having been driven from that city by a decree of the Emperor Claudius. He made his home with them and preached in the synagogue. He was soon joined by Silas and Timothy, and worked here with great success for a year and a half (Acts 18,1-11).

At the end of this time, while Gallio was proconsul in Achaea, there was a sedition of the Jews, whose attempts to have legal steps taken against the Christians were unsuccessful. Paul remained here for some time after this, and then set sail for Ephesus on his way to Jerusalem to keep a coming feast. Urged by the Ephesians to remain with them, he declined, but promised to return soon if it were God's will. Sailing to Caesarea, he went up and greeted the brethren in Jerusalem, and then returned to Antioch, but set out agin very soon upon a third journey (Acts 18,12-22).

On the third journey he again went over all the country of Galatia and Phrygia in order, strangthening all the disciples. This probably took several months. He continued his journey to Ephesus, and made this city his headquarters for over two years, probably about two years and a half. Having sent his companions before him into Macedonia, he himself followed them after a riot instigated by the silversmith Demetrius. He arrived in Macedonia in the summer, and passed through all those regions, confirming the congregations as he went. This required considerable time, and it was late fall when he reached Corinth. Here he remained three months, and then left for Jerusalem, going by way of Macedonia. He spent the Passover at Philippi, and then proceeded by easy stages to Jerusalem, greeting the brethren from Ephesus and other congregations on the way (Acts 18,23-21,17).

Paul arrived in Jerusalem in time to observe Pentecost there, and was almost immediately seized by the Jews, who intended to do him violence, but he was taken out of their hands by the chiliarch Claudius Lysias. Lysias at first mistook him for a certain seditious Egyptian who a short time previously had led a lawless band out into the wilderness, but when he learned that paul was in reality a Roman citizen he took pains to see that he received a fair trial. The Jews were unable to prove anything against him, so Lysias sent him to Caesarea to the procurator Felix in order to foil a conspiracy against him on the part of certain Jews. The High Priest Ananias brought charges against him before Felix, but judgment was deferred for two years, Paul being kept in prison. At the end of this time, Felix was removed from office and left Paul a prisoner. As soon as his successor, Porcius Festus, arrived, the Jews demanded Paul's immediate trial. Paul refused to go to Jerusalem to be tried, and appealed to the Emperor by virtue of his Roman citizenship. A little later he was summoned to appear before Agrippa II., who visited Festus, and both agreed that Paul was guilty of no crime; but since he had appealed to the Emperor, he was sent to Rome that fall. On the way there, the ship which carried him was wrecked, and the party was obliged to spend the winter on an island. They reached Rome the following spring, and here Paul was held for two years in a mild form of captivity, living in his own rented house and preaching the gospel unhindered (Acts 21,17-28,31).

DISCUSSION OF RELATIVE CHRONOLOGY.

There are several points where individual scholars take exception to the results given above, but the general consensus of opinion and the traditional views are represented above, and the weight of evidence in each case strongly favors the results given. A few points require some comment.

VISITS TO JERUSALEM.

The first problem is to harmonize the two visits of Paul mentioned in the first two chapters of Galatians with those recorded by Luke in Acts. It is generally accepted that the first Jerusalem visit mentioned in Galatians corresponds to the first visit recorded in Acts following Paul's conversion; but the second visit in Galatians gives some difficulty. Most scholars identify it with the third visit of Acts, and they have been followed in this article. This is not because the accounts of the visit agree, though there is no real disagreement, but because the similarity of the two accounts is so great that it is quite evident that the authors could not have been speaking of events that occurred under different circumstances and at different times. It is quite plain that we have two partial accounts of the same visit , written by different men from different points of view and with different purposes.

The very nature of the two accounts makes it quite natural that there would be some difference. Luke's is purely objective, while Paul's is subjective; Luke was not an actor, but used all the sources of information at his command, while Paul was an actor in the events described, and relates his personal experiences; Luke gives an historical record of the Council, while Paul uses the events that occurred there in an argument. It follows that Luke would record that which has to do with the history of the church, while Paul would describe the feature which he wished to use in his argument. The subject matter is the same, -- the council which met to solve the difficulties which arose with the admission into the church of uncircumcised Gentiles.

The same result is reached by a process of elimination. A visit not recorded in Acts is hardly to be considered in view of Luke's detailed account of all of Paul's activities after the first visit, and none of the other three visits will fit the conditions portrayed. Paul's second visit was a relief expedition following a time of trouble and persecution, and though the belief that none of the Apostles were present in Jerusalem at that time is not firmly established, it is highly improbable that the events described by Paul would have taken place at that time; such controversies usually arise under different circumstances. Besides, the Apostolic Council would have been superfluous after that, for the question would have been already settled. Again, Paul's fourth visit, after his second journey, is not to be thought of, because at that time he merely went up and greeted the brethren, and then returned immediately to Antioch, -- a visit apparently so brief and unimportant that it is barely mentioned in Acts, while the visit Paul mentions in Galatians was a very important one. And here, again, we fail to understand how such a dispute could possibly have taken place after the matter had been definitely settled by the Apostolic Council. The fifth visit, at the time when Paul was arrested, is simply out of the question, so there remains only the third visit, at the time of the Council.

The argument that Paul would thus be omitting one of his visits to Jerusalem does not hold, because a careful reading will show that it was not at all his purpose to enumerate his visits to Jerusalem; those who think so are missing the force of the argument. In all of Paul's reasoning he states his points as forcibly and concisely as possible; having proven one point, he advaces immediately to the next. His argument for his apostolic standing in the opening portion of Galatians is a three-fold one: First, his authority was independent of the Twelve; secondly, the Twelve were in sympathy with his work; and thirdly, even Peter recognized him as an equal. He proved his independence from the fact that he did not receive any instructions from the Twelve before he began his work; his equality is shown by the fact that Peter submitted to his rebuke; and the narrative in question shows that the heads of the church in Judea were in full accord with him. His failure to mention his second visit was not unfair, because it could be related to no other point in his argument except the first, and even this point would not be

affected, because he had been preaching for a number of years before this visit was made.

THE FOURTEEN YEARS.

The starting-point for reckoning the fourteen years which preceded the third visit to Jerusalem (Gal.2,1) offers two possibilities. It may mean fourteen years after the conversion, or it may mean fourteen years after the last-named event, which was Paul's first visit to Jerusalem as a Christian, occurring three years after his conversion. The latter assumption is the more probable, and as long as we are able to determine with certainty which way the Apostle was counting, we may accept this view as correct unless good reasons are advanced to the contrary. It should here be added that the fourteen years do not necessarily mean fourteen full years, since Paul uses the common method of counting both terminals, so that anything over thirteen years would be called fourteen years. In this case, as will be seen later, the total amount of time covered by the "three years" and the "fourteen years" combined need not have been even sixteen full years.

THE SECOND VISIT.

Another question pertaining to the relative chronology is whether the death of Herod Agrippa I. occurred before, during, or after Paul's second visit to Jerusalem. In the Acts the account of Herod's death is placed between Paul's coming to Jerusalem and his departure, but this does not infer that this was the chronological oreder of these events. It was impossible for Luke in the first part of his book to offer a strictly chronological presentation, since he was following the fortunes of several individuals and groups at different places at the same time. He does just as any historian must do under the circumstances, -- records the events at one place for a time, then goes to the next group of actors and tells what has been happening to them. Barnabas is followed from the time he departed from Jerusalem to go to Antioch until he returned to Jerusalem with Paul at the time of the famine. Meanwhile, since Barnabas had left Jerusalem, a number of things had taken place: the martyrdom of James the Elder, the imprisonment and escape of Peter, and the death of Herod. Having described these events, Luke continues to tell of the actions of Paul and Barnabas after they brought relief to Judea.

The expression "fulfilled their ministry" indicates that Paul and Barnabas did not simply bring down the food that the Antiochians sent, but that they remained there as long as it lasted, and distributed it to the people. How long this took we are not told. The opinion of Lightfoot that they came to Jerusalem before the famine actually began has nothing to support it except a strict chronological interpretation of the text, which infers that Paul and Barnabas were present in Jerusalem during the events preceding and including the death of Herod. This would be a very unnatural procedure; one would expect them to bring provisions at the time when they were needed. If

they came before the famine had begun, they would probably bring money instead of foodstuffs, and the fulfillment of their ministry would not require any great length of time such as was consumed by the events related by Luke at this point. That the famine had not yet begun at the time of Herod's death is shown by the fact that the people of Tyre and Sidon wished to regain Herod's favor because they obtained their foodstuffs from his land. This point also appears in the consideration of the absolute chronology of this period.

THE FIRST STAY AT CORINTH.

A difference of opinion arises as to the length of Paul's stay in Corinth on his first visit there. A period of a year and six months is mentioned, but the question arises whether this includes his entire stay there, or only the time from the appearance of the vision mentioned until his accusation before Gallio. In a recent article (Neue kirchl. Zeit., Nov., 1923), Dr. Larfeld attempts to prove that the year and six months represents the length of his entire stay there, though Deissmann and others believe otherwise. Larfeld bases his argument on a list of other places where Luke gives the exact period of time included by a certain activity. He has overlooked, it seems, the fact that there is no exact parallel to this case in Acts, the nearest being Paul's stay at Ephesus on his third journey. If we accept Larfeld's principle, then we would have to stay by the same principle in considering his Ephesian activity, which would affect our chronology in several ways. We would have to make the entire stay of Paul at Ephesus two years. The generally accepted interpretation is that Paul was there three months preaching in the synagogue, then he taught in the school of Tyrannus for two years, then he sent his companions before him into Macedonia, intending soon to follow them; there occurred a riot under Demetrius after Paul had remained there for a season, and after this riot Paul left Ephesus. Thus the length of the entire stay there would be three months plus two years plus an indefinite period from the departure of Timothy and Erastus till Paul's own departure. Paul himself later said that he had been with the brethren in Ephesus "three years," and he would not count the time after his departure from Ephesus, since he had not returned there at all at the time he spoke the words. Three years would mean any period over two years according to Pauline use, but it would be more than two years, so the general view seems to be correct. If we count the same way at Corinth, then Paul must have been there until the vision appeared to him, then a year and a half longer until he was accused before Gallio, then an indefinite period afterward, called by Luke " a good while," literally "many days."

Just about how long was Paul's stay there, then? The time previous to the vision must have been brief. A reconstruction of the situation shows him preaching in the synagogue till Silas and Timothy arrived, which must have been soon, for he waited for them in Athens for some time before he came to Corinth. After they came, he was strengthened in

spirit, and preached Christ in the synagogue until he was driven out of it and went to the house of Justus, determined to preach to the Gentiles. It was then that the comforting vision appeared. Judging from his similar experiences at other places, one would hardly be inclined to allow more than a month or so for these events, though they might have taken longer. We notice that in treating the stay at Ephesus Luke especially mentions the period of time in the initial part of Paul's ministry there, three months. On another occasion also, Paul's second visit to Greece, a period of three months is specifically mentioned. From the time of Luke's first personal contact with Paul at Troas, Luke never passes by any considerable length of time spent in one city without telling us how long Paul staid there. Twice he mentions a period of three months, so it seems safe to conclude that wherever he does not mention the length of time spent in a city it must have been less than three months, -- a principle which may overcome the difficulties raised over the meaning of indefinite and relative terms. This principle cannot be applied to periods spent in traveling from one city to another throughout an entire region, nor may we safely apply it to the time before Luke came into personal contact with Paul, since Luke's lack of information there might necessitate an indefinite term.

On this basis we must reject Larfeld's view that the indefinite period designated by Luke as "many days" after the beating of Sosthenes and before Paul's departure from Corinth embraced over a year. A month or two, hardly more than three months, would be the natural assumption; and the stay in Corinth, though more than a year and a half, remains less than two years.

At what time of the year did Paul leave Corinth? The reading which refers to a feast which Paul wished to keep in Jerusalem is doubtful, but even if this is an interpolation it is quite probable that this was his purpose. Unless it were necessary for him to be there on a certain day, he would very probably have staid at least a week or two in Ephesus in compliance with the urgent request of the brethren there. The nature of the vow (the text indicates that it was Paul himself who had the vow) is unknown, but a most natural surmise is that the vow required his presence in Jerusalem at the time of the feast. Paul had been absent from Palestine for about three years, and he would feel the desire of every devout Israelite to celebrate a feast in Jerusalem.

Three feasts may be considered. There was the Passover, Pentecost, and the Feast of Tabernacles. Paul's desire to be there by Pentecost at the end of his third journey has been offered as an argument that this was probably the same feast, and we know that many people came to Jerusalem for this feast from the account of the great Pentecost, when there were men of all nationalities to listen to Peter's sermon. But, on the other hand, Pentecost would not be called simply "the feast," and the pilgrimage at the time of the Passover was much more general than at the Pentecost time; besides, there are other arguments in favor of the

Passover. The Passover was still the great feast of the Jews, the one which every good Israelite would try to spend in Jerusalem if possible. In fact, it seems quite probable that Paul intended to be in Jerusalem for the Passover at the end of the third journey, but was forced to change his plans when the people hindered him from sailing direct from Corinth for Jerusalem. Thus he was forced to make the long route through Macedonia, which made his arrival in Jerusalem for the Passover impossible, so he proceeded in a more leisurely manner, keeping the Passover at Philippi and arriving in Jerusalem in time for Pentecost. At the end of the second journey the mode of travel was more direct; the only placed where he spent any time on the way was at Ephesus, and there he only remained over a sabbath. This would indicate that he sailed on one of the pilgrim ships that sailed each year carrying Jews from Greece and Asia Minor to Jerusalem to keep the Passover there. The Jews would gather in cities like Corinth and Ephesus to wait for these ships, and the voyage would be made as expeditiously as possible. Another point is that Paul began his third missionary journey almost immediately, traveling over the mountainous regions of Asia Minor, a journey that would almost surely be begun in summer. This is the main point against the view that it was the Feast of Tabernacles that he wished to keep in Jerusalem, since that would throw the beginning of the third journey in winter, not a very good time for traveling over mountain passes. Though the Feast of Tabernacles is possible, the Passover seems much more probable.

THIRD JOURNEY.

The above results fit in admirably with the account of the third journey. Spending the Passover at Jerusalem, Paul went down to Antioch, but soon afterward, - the same summer-- he passed through Galatia and Phrygia, strengthening the brethren, and arriving in Ephesus that fall. Three months in the tabernacle and two years in the school of Tyrannus brings us to the end of the third winter, when he sent Timothy and Erastus before him, and he himself remained for a season, probably less than three months, leaving in the late spring for Macedonia. This gave him plenty of time for the "much exhortation" given the churches of Macedonia before he arrived in Corinth about the end of the year, there to spend three months and leave shortly before the Passover. Results are not so satisfactory if we try to place the preceding visit to Jerusalem in the fall.

ABSOLUTE CHRONOLOGY.

The remaining portion of our task, as far as the main part of Paul's life is concerned, is to fix our dates. The relative chronology is so definite that one or two dates will determine the entire period, since we can count backward and forward from one to the other. But here we must leave our favorite source of knowledge, the Bible, and seek a point of contact with secular history. The Biblical account offers the following prospects:

a) The escape from Damascus under Aretas; Acts 9, 23 ff.
II.Cor.11,32.
b) The death of Herod Agrippa I. Acts 12,23.
c) The great famine in Judea under Claudius.Acts 11,28.
d) Sergius Paulus proconsul of Cyprus. Acts 13,7.
e) The decree of Claudius banishing Jews from Rome. Acts 18,2.
f) Gallio proconsul in Achaea, Acts 18,12.
g) The sedition of the Egyptian, Acts 21,38.
h) Ananias the High Priest. Acts 23,2; 24,1.
i) Festus succeeds Felix as procurator in Judea. Acts 24,27.
j) Agrippa and Berenice visit Festus, Acts 26,13.

On a number of these points we have definite information, on others it is fairly definite, while several of them the information is only such as in a general way confirms the story. It shall be the purpose of this article to fix one date definitely from two independent sources, and then figure forward and backward according to the relative chronology. The results will then be tabulated in a chronological chart and discussed briefly point by point.

PAUL IN CORINTH.

For many years most authors have used the arrival of Festus as the starting-point in their calculations. Various results have been arrived at, not through lack of material, but on account of the nature of the material. A number of them have arrived at what recent developments would indicate to be about the correct dates by this means, but most of them have given dates one, two, or even three years too late or too early. The discovery of the Gallio Inscription at Delphi in 1908 offers us a more promising point of departure. The text of this inscription is given us by Deissman, Barton, and others. It bears a date which is almost certainly in the first half of the year 52, and refers to Gallio as proconsul in Achaea at that time. It had been previously known that Achaea was a senatorial province since 44 (Dion Cassius 60,24), and as such was governed by a proconsul. Gallio was known to us as a brother of the philosopher Seneca; his real name was Annaeus Novatus, but he assumed the name Gallio after he was adopted by the orator Junius Gallio. Sometime after 49 he was proconsul in Achaea, and afterward consul (Tac. Ann. 15,73; Dion Cass. 60,35; Pliny, Nat. Hist. 31,33; Seneca, Epist. 104). His death occurred in the year 65(Tac. Ann. 15,73; Dion Cass. 62,25). This inscription alone gives the exact date of his proconsulate. Since a Roman proconsul must be present in his province not later than July 1, and Gallio was proconsul during the first half of 52, his term of office was from about May or June, 51, to the same time in 52. Since the accusation of Paul before him took place a short time before the latter departed to spend the Passover in Jerusalem, it must have been early in 52, and Paul's arrival is to be dated a little more than a year and a half earlier, probably the late summer of 50.

This date is further established from a different source. The decree of Claudius banishing Jews from Rome is referred to by a number of authors, but the only early writer who gives a date for it is Orosius, a contemporary of Augustine (Suet. Claudius 25; Dion Cass. 60,6; Orosius, Hist. 7,6). He has been

commonly quoted as giving the date 49, but it seems that he uses a different system of dating than was commonly used, and a comparison throughout with Tacitus and Suetonius indicates that the year really should be 50, according to Ramsay and others. Many scholars gave no credence to this reference, since it purports to rest upon the authority of Josephus, whereas the writings of Josephus as they have come down to us to not mention this decree. However, this allows a number of explanations, and Orosius, who seems to be pretty reliable, must have had some authority for his statement, while there is no evidence against this date. It seems improbable that such an edict should be issued while Agrippa II., who was a good friend of Claudius (Jos. Ant. 20,1.2), was in Rome; but Agrippa was given a province not later than 50 (Jos. Ant. 20,5,2; 20,7.1; Jos. War 2,12.1; 2,14.4), and so was absent from Rome in the early summer of 50; he was again present in Rome in the year 52 (Jos. Ant. 20,6.3). Aquila and Priscilla had just arrived from Rome at the time Paul made their acquaintance when he reached Corinth in the late summer of 50. There is no authority whatever for a later date for this edict, except the necessity that many scholars have forced upon themselves by the dates which they accept for other events. If the year 50 is accepted as the date of the edict, then it hardly seems permissible from this fact to place the arrival of Paul in Corinth as late as the fall of 51, as some do. A reconstruction of the situation shows a disturbance among the Jews at Rome arising from the introduction of Christianity. This seems to be the true sense of the "Chresto impulsore," since the form "Chrestus" was often used instead of "Christus," and it is implied either that Chrestus would be known to the reader or that the author himself knew little of the cause of the disturbance. Paul's reception in Rome nine years later is no argument against this; and it seems probable that the first entrance of Christianity into Rome would be accompanied by disturbances similar to those in other cities, the Christians being attacked by the Jews. The Romans made no distinction, regarding the Christians as a Jewish sect, and for them the simplest way to quell the disturbance was by a general edict banishing all Jews from Rome. Without a doubt the strict enforcement of this edict was never intended, for there were too many Jews in Rome, and the city could hardly get along without them; but the edict would offer valid grounds for the prosecution of such leaders as would be arrested if the rioting continued. Aquila, who was later such an able assistant to Paul, was undoubtedly a leader among the Christians, and one against whom the zeal of the hostile Jews was especially directed. The edict would endanger his liberty, so the tent-maker would find it prudent to leave the city as soon as the edict was published. It appears that the edict was very soon modified so as to merely forbid gatherings of the Jews, and after the rioting had ceased it was forgotten for the time being. One finds it difficult to imagine Aquila leaving the city on account of the edict a year after it was issued, and after it had been practically repealed. Nor can we allow that he was present in Corinth any considerable length of time before Paul arrived there, for the phraeology of the biblical account excludes that.

LATER CHRONOLOGY.

We have, then, two independent authorities, based on independent evidence relating to two different historical events, both of which lead to the same conclusion: that Paul arrived in Corinth in the late summer of 50, and departed shortly before the Passover of 52. Arrving at Jerusalem at the Passover season in 52, he left as soon as the feast was over for Antioch, but his stay there was of short duration. He spent the summer of 52 revisiting the congregations which he had previously founded in Asia Minor, arriving at Ephesus on the fall. This was his headquarters until about Pentecost, 55, when he passed over into Macedonia and remained there until the late fall, visiting and admonishing the congregations there.

Proceeding to Corinth, Paul remained there three months, and then set out for Jerusalem, spending the Passover at Philippi. Traveling by easy stages, he arrived in Jerusalem at Pentecost, 56, and was there arrested and held till the fall of 58 at Caesarea. He spent the following winter on the way to Rome, arriving there in the early spring of 59. The two years spent in Rome in mild captivity bring us down to the year 61, where the biblical account of Paul's activities ends, though the Bible gives us aid in studying the problem of his later life.

EARLIER CHRONOLOGY.

Counting backward from the first visit to Corinth in the same way, we get most of the necessary dates. Having arrived in Corinth in the late summer of 50, he must have left Antioch on his second missionary journey in the spring or early summer of 49, according to the estimate that the earlier part of this tour consumed between a year and a year and a half. Since the sceond journey was begun a short time after the Apostolic Council, this event must have taken place early in 49. Paul must then have made his first visit to Jerusalem after his conversion fourteen years earlier. It is to be noted that this number of years is given by Paul, not Luke. Luke's statements of time are exact, -- "two whole years," "a year and six months," --while Paul counts both terminals after the custom of the ordinary people of that time. Counting back fourteen full years, we would arrive at the year 35 as the date of the first visit, but if we count both terminals we get 36, which is probably correct, the fourteen years being part of 36, part of 49, and the twelve intervening years. In the same way, counting back three years from 36 we arrive at the date 34 for the conversion, the three years being part of 34, the year 35, and part of 36.

We have not yet accounted for any dates between the first visit to Jerusalem in 36 and the third in 49. These dates must be independently obtained, and rest upon the date of the great famine, which is closely connected with the date of Herod's death. Herod died in the fall of 44 [illegible]. According to Josephus, the famine

according to Josephus (Ant. 18,8.2; 19,9.2). The famine took place under his successors, Cuspius Fadus and Tiberius Alexander (Ant. 20,2;6; 20,5.2). There really was famine over the whole world under Claudius, but not at the same time in all countries (cf. Suetonius, Claudius 18). The famine may have continued for several years, but the most probable theory is that it began with a crop failure in the spring of 45 and continued until another crop was harvested. It follows as a matter of course that Paul and Barnabas went up to bring help from the brethren in Antioch when the people of Judea began to suffer severely from the famine, their own supplies having become exhausted. This would be toward the end of 45, and they probably remained for some time returning in the spring of 46. They appear to have given all their time to the distribution of provisions on this visit.

Paul had come down to Antioch with Barnabas a year previous to the expedition, according to the apparent sense of the author. There is slight reason to question the author's meaning, especially since no other dates are affected by this one. Paul came to Antioch, then, in 44, the intervening years from 36 to 44 having been spent in presching the gospel at Tarsus and in the surrounding regions of Syria and Cilicia.

Between Paul's return to Antioch early in 46 and the Apostolic Council early in 49 occurred the first missionary tour. It was preceded and followed by periods of activity in Antioch, and lasted from a year to a year and a half. With this much information, we cannot go far wrong in either direction in setting its dates. The spring of the year would be the most favorable time for beginning a journey, offering great advantages to the traveler both by land and by sea. According to our chronology each of the other journeys was begun in the spring, and that would be the natural time to set out on such a journey. It seems more than probable, then, that the first tour was begun in the spring of 47 and ended in the fall of 48.

Having completed our reckoning, we may now tabulate the results and see how they agree with what is known concerning other points of contact between biblical and secular history. Reckoning from Gallio's proconsulate, the edict of Claudius, the death of Herod, and the great famine in Judea, the following chronological chart may be presented for criticism:

CHRONOLOGICAL CHART.

Conversion of Paul	34.	
First visit to Jerusalem	36.	
Began work in Antioch	44.	
Second visit to Jerusalem	45-6	(fall till spring).
First missionary tour	47-8	(spring till fall).
Apostolic Council	49	(early spring).
Second Journey begun	49	(spring).
Arrived in Corinth	50	(late summer).
Fourth visit to Jerusalem	52	(Passover).
Third journey begun	52	(late spring).
Arrival in Ephesus	52	(fall).
Departure from Ephesus	55	(Pentecost).

Arrival in Corinth	55 (end of the year).
Arrest in Jerusalem	56 (Pentecost).
Departure for Rome	58 (autumn).
Arrival in Rome	59 (spring).
End of Acts	61.

DISCUSSION OF CHART. - Aretas.

There are six points of contact between Pauline chronology and secular history that have not been considered. The first is the escape of Paul from Damascus while that city was under the rule of King Aretas of Arabia (II.Cor. 11,32). King Aretas was Haretat IV., king of the Nabathaean Arabs, who reigned from 9 B.C. till 40 A.D. (cf. Barton's "Archeology and the Bible," Cobern, "The New Archeological Discoveries," etc.) We have very many inscriptions bearing his name. But Damascus was a Roman city belonging to the province of Syria, therefore not a part of the Kingdom of Aretas at this period, as far as history tells us. This seeming difficulty does not speak against the historical accuracy of the Bible, but is rather an argument for it; however, it has caused much discussion among those who have attempted from it to determine the year of Paul's conversion. It has been believed by some that the city was under the rule of Aretas all along, but coins up to the year 34 show that it was a Roman city. The theory that Aretas held it as a vassal of Rome after the Romans took it from him has not been substantiated. If this were so, then any year up to 40 would be possible; but this seems like a short cut out of a difficulty, and is a very improbable solution. It is significant that we have no Roman coins from Damascus between the year 34 and the regin of Nero. There is coin bearing the name of Aretas which might date from the year 37-8, depending on the starting-point from which it is reckoned. The absence of Roman coins during the reigns of Caligula and Claudius might point to a different ownership from that of Rome during that time, and this may have begun a few years before Caligula became Emperor in 37. We know that while Caligula was friendly to Aretas, his predecessor , Tiberius, favored Herod Antipas, the rival and foe of the Arabian monarch. With these known facts, we may investigate the theories advanced as to when Aretas was in possession of Damascus.

Aretas went to war with Herod Antipas over a boundary dispute, an element in the hostilities being the fact that Antipas had divorced the duaghter of Aretas to marry his brother's former wife. In this war Antipas was defeated, and Tiberias came to the aid of his friend by instructing Vitellius, who was at that time governor of Syria, to proceed against Aretas with an army. Vitellius hated Antipas and was friandly to Aretas, so he delayed action. At a feast in Jerusalem he received news of the death of Tiberius and succession of Caligula, so he dismissed hi army without carrying out his project of advancing against Petraea, the capital of Aretas (Ant. 18,5.1-3). This was early in the year 37. It is conceded probable that during this period of hostility between Rome and Aretas, the latter may have seized

Damascus, which had formerly belonged to his kingdom. It is true, Josephus does not mention this seizure, but neither doe he mention the passing of Damascus into the possession of Aretas in any other way.

Another theory is that Caligula presented Damascus to Aretas, but there are no more records to substantiate this theory than there are for the other, nor are there any records of its subsequent return to the Roman crown, nor any records showing that it was independent of Rome for any considerable length of time. Caligula made several gifts to his friends, similar in nature to what this gift would have been, but the earliest one recorded is in 39. The reign of Aretas appears to have ended in the year 40, and it is questionable whether he ever received such a favor from Caligula, though the possibility always remains. The first theory seems more probable on the face of it, and fits in best with the rest of the chronology. However, if future developments should show that this took place later, between 37 and 40, the dates from the Apostolic Council on would not be affected, since there remains the possibility that the fourteen years before the Apostolic Council were reckoned from the conversion instead of from the first Jerusalem visit.

SERGIUS PAULUS.

The next point is the time when Sergius Paulus was proconsul on Cyprus. Here we find nothing that would either detract from or confirm our previous results. All we know is that Cyprus was a senatorial province, and as such governed by a proconsul (Dion Cass. 54,4), and there are archeological records of a proconsul named Paulus sometime before 53, who was undoubtedly the Sergius Paulus converted by Paul.

THE EGYPTIAN.

The next point deals with the Egyptian for whom the chiliarch Lysias mistook Paul at the time of his arrest in Jerusalem. Josephus tell us about this Egyptian (Ant. 20,8. 1-6; War 2,13.1-5). At the time of Nero, there were a number of robber bands harrassing Palestine. Felix broke up one band, and there arose another worse band known as sicarii, and afterward a number of demagogs who claimed to be inspired. Chief among these was the Egyptian referred to , who gathered together a band of thirty tousand people consisting mostly of sicarii and idle vagabonds in the wilderness, and led them to the Mount of Olives, claiming that the walls of Jerusalem would fall before him as the walls of Jericho had fallen before Joshua. But Felix sent an armed band against them, and a number of them were slain or captured, while the remainder, including the Egyptian himself, escaped. This event undoubtedly occurred at the Passover time, though the year is not stated. Considering that Nero became Emperor in 54, and taking into account the events that occurred under Nero before this, a reasonable date would be about Passover of the year 56. Wieseler thinks another year necessary, but it should be remembered that in those times it would not take long to assemble

a rabble of vagabonds such as the Egyptian led, and also that such a multitude could not have lived together long in the wilderness, both on account of lack of provisions, and because inaction would soon dissolve such a band, which was of such a nature that it could be held together only by a fanatic enthusiasm which would demand rapid action. Nor is it thinkable that Felix would long allow such a menace to the Roman power to remain unmolested. Furthermore, Wieseler is wrong in assuming an interval of over a year between the dispersion of this band and the arrest of Paul. Paul's arrest must have come at the Pentecost following the Passover which marked the encounter with the Egyptian, while the incident was still fresh in the mind of the chiliarch. A year later the latter would not have hastily jumped to the conclusion that it was that troublesome Egyptian again; we must remember that these were restless days, one conspiracy following upon the heels of the other. This is clear when we observe how much of this nature Josephus records in the two years during which Felix remained in Judea after Paul's arrest (Ant. 20,8.7-8; War 2,13.6ff.). This point fits in quite well with the results we have already obtained from other sources.

ANANIAS THE HIGH PRIEST.

The mention of Ananias as High Priest at the trial of Paul offered a crux for a time, but only on account of a misunderstanding. Ananias was summoned to Rome in 52 to answer certain charges, but he was not, as has been supposed, at that time deprived of his office (Ant. 20,6.2f.). It was only natural that he should keep his office until his trial, and in the trial he was cleared of the charges against him, so he returned to Jerusalem and continued to hold office (Ant. 20,9.2). His successor was appointed just before the departure of Felix (Ant. 20,8.8). Ananias retained the title, but not the office, until his death (Ant. 20,9.2). It is apparent that he still held the office at the time of Paul's trial; Josephus invariably mentions the appointment of a new High Priest, and none was appointed at the time when Ananias was summoned to Rome, so this point is quite in accordance with history. Of course, this is no help to us in fixing the date.

FELIX AND FESTUS.

A point that will require considerable attention is the date of the arrival of Festus to succeed Felix as procurator in Judea. This has been the battle-ground of critics for years; dates have been given varying from 55 to 61, and the whole mass of evidence is confusing. Recently the year 60 was generally accepted, originally as an approximate date; but soon the need for an absolute date became evident, and heaven and earth were moved for evidence to fix this date with certainty, some holding fast to the date 60, others moving it forward or backward. Since all dates were computed from this one, the effect was to throw the entire problem of the chronology of Paul's career into a state of chaos.

The only early writing which assigns a definite date to this event in the "Chronicon" of Eusebius, and we do not even know what date he assigned to it (cf. the translations in Harnack's "Chronologie der altchristlichen Literatur"). The Armenian version gives 54, an obviously impossible date, while the Latin version of Jerome and the Syrian fragments give 56, a date which Harnack champions, but which seems to be excluded by the evidence in the case, as we shall see later. Dr. Erbes, Ramsay, and others advance the theory that Eusebius really wrote 54, but meant 59, the mistake of five years being due to the incorporation in his work of a document which used a system of dating differing from his own. The 56 is then regarded as a correction made later by scholars who saw that the 54 was wrong, but failed to realize how it got there and what the date really should have been. Others think that he really wrote 56, but was mistaken by a year or two. Still others simply disregard the date of Eusebius as being wrong in either case, and accept the date that their systems call for, seeking confirmatory evidence elsewhere. This mode of procedure is defended on the grounds that Eusebius does not repeat the date in his later "Ecclesiastical History," a proof that he did not consider it well authenticated, and by the further fact that other dates given in the "Chronicon" have been shown to be unreliable, even in cases where all the versions extant agree. We should feel bound to attach some weight, at least, to this evidence, if we knew what date Eusebius really gave, but under the circumstances its value is doubtful unless substantiated by other evidence. The Erbes-Ramsay theory is the only one that seems to attach any value to this citation, since it alone allows a date that does not conflict with other good evidence.

Felix was appointed procurator in Judea in 51, 52, or 53 (Ant. 20,7.1; War 2,12.8; Annal. 12,54; Euseb. Chron.). The evidence favors 52, but the statement that he had previously ruled over Samaria two years contemporaneously with his successor Cumanus is open to serious doubt. Paul at the time of his arrest told Felix that he had ruled over "this land" for "many years." If Felix previously ruled over Samaria for two years, these two years might and might not be included by Paul, so the date from which we may reasonably count the "many years" is 52; for certainly Cumanus, and not Felix, was ruling over "this land," Judea, up till that time. But the old questio arises, how many is "many"? The term of a procurator in Judea was as a rule pretty short in those days, but even so, we should think that about four or five years would be required to justify the term, even when used as a compliment, as it was here. It seems, then, that the term would apply in 56 or later, but hardly earlier; 56 would allow four full years. Since Felix was removed two years later, we can say that his removal might have taken place as early as 58, but hardly earlier.

The argument from the Egyptian is conclusive against any earlier date, since a considerable series of events, more than one would reasonably concede to be possible in six months, had occurred between the accession of Nero in the fall of 54 and the disturbance created by the Egyptian, so this event, two years before the arrival of Festus, must have been not

earlier than the Passover of 56. (cf. above: THE EGYPTIAN)

Pallas has given the scholars some trouble, though needlessly. Pallas was the brother of Felix, and a favorite of Nero, who saved the life of Felix when accusations were brought against him by the Jews at the time of his recall. (Ant. 20,8.9; Annal. 13,2; 13,14). But Pallas was removed from his high office by Nero early in the year 55, the latter having become offended by the pride and arrogance shown by Pallas (Annal. 13, 14; 13,15; cf. Sueton. Claud.27; Nero 33; Dion Cass. 61,7). Now it has been argued that the recall of Felix must have taken place before Pallas fell from grace with the Emperor; but Felix was removed in the summer, and Pallas lost his office early in the spring of 55, so that under these cirsumstances Felix could not have held office a single day under Nero, who did not become Emperor until the fall of 54. The opinion which Harnack has inefectually advanced, that Tacitus made a mistake and meant 56 instead of 55, is unsupported, and even that would not help, for the date is still too early to agree with the other evidence. Furthermore, the time preceding his removal from office would not be a favorable time for Pallas to save his brother's life. Nero became offended at the arrogance of Pallas as soon as he became Emperor, and the time when the latter had great influence with him must have been later, after he had regained the favor of the fickle Emperor, who would then be eager to make up for his ingratitude in removing from office the man to whom above all he owed his adoption by Claudius and his ultimate possession of the Imperial power(Annal. 12,25; 13,2). Instances are not rare where a man was recalled to favor even after being exiled, as we know from the history of Seneca and others, and Pallas was not exiled, but merely removed from office. That same fall, Pallas and his friend Burrhus were both accused of treason, and both acquitted, their accusers being punished with death (Annal. 13,23). This fact msut have raised them in the estimation of Nero. Burrhus enjoyed great power after the trial, and held a high office up to the very time of his death (Annal. 14,7; Dion Cass. 61,20; 62,13; Sueton. Nero 35; cf. Ant. 20,8.9; War 2,13.7). It is but natural to suppose that Pallas also would regain the favor of such a weak and fickle ruler as was Nero, and in fact there can be no doubt of it, since Felix could not have arrived in Rome early enough to be saved from death by Pallas prior to the latter's removal from office.

How long did Porcius Festus remain in office? The question cannot be definitely answered, though we know that he died in office in the fall of the year, and Albinus was appointed to succeed him. The appointment of Albinus took place in the winter, and he arrived in his province after Easter (Eus. Eccl. Hist. 2,23; cf. Ant. 20,9.1). The science of numismatics tells us that a new era in the reign of Agrippa II. began with the renaming of the city Neronias (Ant. 20,9.4), which seems to have occurred, from the coins, in the year 60-61. Albinus was present at the festival when this occurred, which would indicate that he arrived not later than the early summer of 60. Then Festus must have died in the fall of 59, and since his activities cannot be com-

pressed into the short space of only a few months, the latest date for his arrival is the summer of 58, which we have already shown to be the earliest possible date. However, if Ramsay is right about the method of counting from the festival, a date a year later is permissible, though of course not necessary. The year 1 of the new era that began with the renaming of the city Neronias is the year 61-62 of our era. Ramsay holds that the renaming of the city must have occurred during this year, the current year then becoming year 1 of the new era. If this was the case, then we know that Albinus was present not later than the summer of 61, though he may have been there over a year before the gestival in question; and Festus, having died not later than 60, must have arrived not later than 59, though his activities may have extended over more than two years, which would necessitate his earlier arrival..The date reached by reckoning from Paul's stay in Corinth is 58, and since the independent evidence favors this date, leaving only the year 59 as a possible alternate, with a remote further possibility of 60, the date of the table seems sufficiently well established.

AGRIPPA AND BERENICE.

The visit of Agrippa and Berenice to Caesarea to call on Festus gives us nothing definite. Berenice, the sister of Agrippa, lived with him from about the time of the death of Claudius on, and might have visited Caesarea with him in any of the years under consideration.

TERMINAL DATES.

There remain only two points upon which our chronological chart might be assailed, - the beginning and the end. That is to say, does it allow plenty of time for previous events and for later events to occurr in their proper time? Wieseler thinks the date for Paul's conversion is much too early; but if we accept the date 29 or 30 for the crucifixion of Christ, and all scholars now agree that one of these dates is the correct one, there seems no valid reason why the conversion of Paul could not have taken place four or five years later. The argument is brought that the stoning of Stephen could have taken place only immediately after the removal of Pilate, before his successor was appointed, since the Jews were not allowed to put a man to death; this would place the event about the year 36, and necessitate the alternate reckoning of the "fourteen years" in Galatians, were it not for the fact that the entire procedure leading up to Stephen's martyrdom appears as the work of a lawless mob, and such mob violence was common and might have taken place at any time. Paul barely escaped the same fate at the hands of a similar mob when he was arrested in Jerusalem by the chiliarch. The date of the table allows plenty of time for the rapid growth of the church, so there is no valid objection here. The same holds true of the closing date, as the following consideration shows.

PAUL'S LIBERATION AND LATER HISTORY.

The concluding words of Acts tell us that after Paul's arrival in Rome A.D. 59, he lived for two whole years in his own rented house, enjoying great freedom, and preaching the gospel unhindered. In the year 61 there must have been some change in his condition, else why the mention of the two years? There are two possibilities: either he was liberated at that time, or he was subjected to a more severe form of captivity. In the first place, the Pastoral Letters, which fit into no other period of Paul's life, show unmistakable traces of Pauline origin, and only one of them was written from prison, so Paul must have been at liberty at some later period. The Captivity Letters also show a confident assurance of his coming liberation. In the second place, there is a well established tradition dating from the earliest times, which says that Paul was liberated, and revisited all the congregations he had previously established, that he visited Spain, and that he was again arrested and suffered martyrdom at Rome after a short imprisonment during the persection instituted by Nero following the burning of Rome. This is confirmed by a passage in the Muratorian Fragment, and is reported by Clement of Rome and other early Church Fathers. Eusebius records it as generally accepted (Eccl. Hist. II.,22.25; III.,1). and it is only recently that it has been questioned seriously. The first attacks upon it seem to have been made in an attempt to deny the authenticity of the Pastoral Letters, and the question subsequently became an idependent one. There is no evidence of value to support the theory that Paul's death followed the first Roman imprisonment without an intervening period of freedom..

No complete account of Paul's activities after his liberation can be given. Tradition and the evidence of the epistles show that he revisited the congregations in Asia Minor, Macedonia, Greece, Illyricum, Cyprus, etc., and that he visited Spain, Crete, and other regions previously untouched by him during his labors, that he was again arrested and taken to Rome, where he was held for a time and then beheaded. The different versions of the "Chronicon" of Eusebius vary between the dates of 67 and 68 for his death; it took place during the reign of Nero, and Nero died in 68. There is a group of scholars who believe that Paul's martyrdom occurred in the year 64; their reason is that according to Tacitus (Annal. 15,44) the persecution began immediately after the burning of Rome, in the year 64, though its duration is not known. Suetonius does not connect the persecution with the burnimg of Rome (Nero 16). Eusebius says that Paul and Peter were both martyred during the first persecution under Nero. As far as is known, there was only one persecution under Nero, and it is generally belived that the sense of the words is "at the beginning of the persecution under Nero," though it might almost as well be translated "the persecution under Nero, which was the first." The evidence of Eusebius is the best that we have, and between the two dates, 67 seems the best authenticated.

CHRONOLOGY OF THE EPISTLES.

CHRONOLOGY OF THE EPISTLES.

Both as to the time of their writing and their contents, Paul's letters may be divided into three groups: the Earlier Letters, the Captivity Letters, and the Pastoral Letters. Though written while Paul was a prisoner, II. Timothy is not classed with the Captivity Letters, but with the Pastoral Letters. Hebrews does not belong to any of these three groups, but must be considered separately.

THE EARLIER LETTERS.

The Earlier letters are the two to the Thessalonians, Galatians, two to the Corinthians, and Romans. The time of their writing must be obtained from internal evidence, since Acts does not mention the writing of the letters. The question whether Paul wrote other letters than the ones included in our canon cannot be determined with certainty, and has no bearing on our task, which is to determine the dates of those epistles which have come down to us.

Paul wrote his first letter to the Thessalonians during his second missionary tour, shortly after his arrival in Corinth. Timothy had come from Macedonia and joined Paul, who had been prevented from revisiting Thessalonica before leaving Macedonia, and for this reason had found it necessary to write the letter. After he had received an answer to this letter, the second epistle was written. It is probable that both of them are to be dated in the latter half of the year 50, though the second one may not have been written until early in the year 51.

The first letter to the Corinthians was written from Ephesus toward the end of Paul's stay there during the third journey. He had already sent Timothy and Erastus before him into Macedonia, while he himself wished to remain in Ephesus until Pentecost. The date of this letter is the spring of 55. The second letter to this congregation was written that same fall from some point in Macedonia. Paul had not yet visited Corinth on this journey, but he had received from Titus further word of the conditions there, and had received an answer to his first letter. A short intermediate visit to Corinth between the first and the second epistles hardly seems consistent with the mass of evidence, but many scholars insist upon it on account of the first few verses of chap. 13. This would have taken place between Pentecost of 55 and the writing of the second epistle that same fall; but the matter is rather obscure and may be differently interpreted; it seems probable that Lightfoot and others have a misconception of Paul's meaning, and Paul had only visited Corinth once when the letter was written.

The letter to the Romans appears to have been written from Corinth during Paul's second stay there, early in the year 56, though it may have been written already from Ephesus about the same time as I. Corinthians. It is closely related in form, content, and style with the letters to the Corinthians and Galatians, and also those to the Thessalonians. Its composition in Corinth at this time is indicated by several features, among them the presence of Priscilla and Aquila in Rome and Paul's approaching departure to take to Jerusalem the contribution of the churches in Macedonia and Achaea. There are a number of other points, but these two seem conclusive.

THE GALATIAN QUESTION.

The epistle to the Galatians offers the greatest problem of all Paul's letters. A number of early Christian writers have placed it as the first of all the Pauline letters, while others would have it to be the very last. The proper position is doubtless after the two letters to the Thessalonians, and before the other three letters of this group. Just where it fits in is a matter of dispute, and it will be well to summarize briefly the chief arguments on both sides of a controversy that has of late arisen and has a bearing on this question.

The question in point is, to whom was this epistle addressed? Galatia was the name of a region in the heart of Asia Minor, the chief city of which was Ancyra. But at the time when Paul wrote, the name had been extended, and the Roman province of Galatia had been formed, extending northward almost to the Euxine Sea and southward to the Tarsus Mountains, thus including the regions to the south embraced by Lycaonia and portions of Phrygia and Cappadocia. The cities of Derbe, Lystra, Iconium, and Pisidian Antioch were in the Roman province of Galatia in Paul's time, but not in the ancient territory of Galatia Proper. When Galatia is referred to in I.Peter, it appears that the Roman province is meant, and many believe with Ramsay that Paul uses the name the same way, the letter being addressed to the congregations is Derbe, Lystra, Iconium, Pisidian Antioch, and the neighboring regions. This is called the South Galatic theory.

The majority of scholars seem to cling to the older North Galatic theory, according to which the term Galatia referred only to the northern part of the province, the ancient region of Galatia. After many years of travel in these regions and thorough study of the life of Paul, Ramsay declares the North Galatic theory untenable. The bearing of the question on the chronology of the epistle lies in the fact that when the letter was written Paul had twice visited the churches addressed, and he visited the churches of the South Galatic region, but not those of the North Galatic region, during his first journey.

The points advanced by the protagonists of the North Galatic theory seem less weighty than those of their opponents. In the first place, they say that Luke expressly calls

Lystra and Derbe "cities of Lycaonia," and never refers to the cities of the South Galatic region as cities of Galatia. However, if this is always the case, it only established Lukan usage, and it would still remain probable that Paul differed from Luke in this. In fact, Paul never uses any but the Roman provincial names. He never speaks of Hellas, for instance, but with him Greece is always Achaea. Luke is not so consistent in this respect, but it is not unreasonable to believe that the term refers to the province, specifically to the southern portion of it, each of the two times it is used in Acts. During the second journey, we are told that after visiting Derbe and Lystra he passed through "the Phrygian region and Galatia", but this is a mistranslation; literally it would be "the Phrygian region and the Galatic," or "the Phrygian and Galatic region," i.e., that portion of the Phrygian region which lay in the province of Galatia and embraced Pisidian Antioch (which was not in Pisidia). On the third journey Paul passed through the Galatic region and the Phrygian (note the order); Lystra and Derbe are not here mentioned, and a reconstruction of the voyage indicates a tour through the province of Galatia and then the ~~province~~ region of Phrygia on the way to Ephesus. The conclusion follows that Luke used the name Galatia to indicate the province, but that on the first journey he did not use this term, but mentioned the more local regional names in order to give the location of the cities in question in a more detailed fashion.

A map study of the two journeys under consideration shows that the course of Paul's travels seems a much more natural one according to the South Galatic theory than according to the North Galatic.

On the North Galatic hypothesis, the congregations founded by Paul on the first journey drop from sight entirely after the second journey, which is contrary to tradition; furthermore, it would be strange that such an important part should be played by the isolated North Galatic region, in view of the fact that we cannot name a single city of that region in which there is known to have been a Christian congregation at that time.

It has been said that the sickness which Paul mentions does not fit into the first tour; but this argument is very weak, because Luke is not giving the personal memoirs of Paul, but a history of his accomplishments, and nowhere mentions the sickness to which Paul frequently refers in his letters. It is quite reasonable to suppose that Paul was seized by an attack of his disease while he was among the Christians of this region, just as we know from Paul's epistle, but not from the account of Acts, that when Paul came to Corinth the first time he "was with them in weakness, and in fear, and in much trembling" (I.Cor. 2,3).

The last argument against the South Galatic view is that Paul would not have called the people of this region Galatians (Gal.3,1). But why not? Would not the people of the province of Galatia be Galatians just as those of the province of Macedonia were Macedonians? What other term could he have used? If there was a certain opprobrium connected with the name, referring to the lack of culture of the true Galatians, who were descendants of the Gallic tribes that had settled there a long time before, would the term be out of place in the reproach that paul addresses to them as "foolish Galatians?"

An argument in favor of the South Galatic theory is the frequent mention of Barnabas, as one known to the Galatians, whereas Barnabas was present with Paul only on his first journey; but on the other hand, Timothy, whose home was in that region, is not mentioned, and Barnabas is also mentioned once in I. Corinthians, though he had not been present in Corinth.

The matter rests very largely upon the geographical situation; other arguments are nearly equal, but the maps seem to settle the question.

It must be admitted that dating of the letter is more difficult according to the South Galatic view than it would be upon the other theory, which would place its date some time during Paul's stay at Ephesus on the third journey. But the weight of the evidence shows that this was after Paul's third visit to the people addressed, while the letter was written following his second visit to them. Thus it must have been between the summer of 49 and the spring of 52, before the beginning of the third journey. After the second visit there had come false teachers leading many away from the pure doctrine as he had preadhed it among them. Word of this reached Paul, and he immediately wrote the letter. Just at what time this occurred is a disputed point. It could not have happened before his arrival in Corinth, for in his travels the news could not have reached him so quickly evan if the defection had occurred only a few months after he left them. Ramsay's theory is this: While Paul was on his way to Rome at the end of the second journey, Timothy left him at Ephesus to visit his home. Timothy rejoined Paul a little later at Antioch, bringing the news of the defection of the Galatians, whereupon Paul hastily wrote the letter, and followed soon afterward in person. But Paul makes no mention of an intended visit, and this could hardly be due to haste, since his intention to come to them would be the first thing he would mention it that were his purpose. It is possible that he wrote in haste, and as soon as the letter was gone decided to visit them in person, fearing that a letter would be inadequate. But this is a mere conjecture, and we do not even know that Timothy went from Ephesus to visit his home.

It seems just as probable that during the last part of his stay at Corinth, or at Ephesus on his way to Jerusalem, he received authentic word of conditions in these congregations and hastily despatched the letter, and then took the first opportunity to reinforce its effect with a personal visit to the congregations addressed. In either case, we may place the date in the early part of 52. This was over two years after his second visit to them, but it is stretching the meaning of a relative term to insist that under the circumstances a space of two and a half years is excluded by the expression "so soon," which is an idefinite and relative term.

The one seeming difficulty is the long separation from the letter to the Romans and those to the Corinthians, with which it is closely related in language, structure, content, and style. However, there is also a close relation to the letters to the Thessalonians, and a separation of a few years in time would not make a great difference in a man's style, as long as the letters were written during the same period of his life, under similar conditions, and for similar reasons, while the content is determined by the particular needs of each individual case.

THE CAPTIVITY LETTERS.

The Captivity Letters are Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, and Philemon, written while Paul was a prisoner. There is a close connection between all the letters of this group in style, form, contents, language,and structure, and above all in the greetings. They were all written about the same time, Philippians perhaps a little later than the others. Rome is the place of writing, and the apostle seems assured that he will soon be liberated and visit the congregations addressed. This points to the end of the first Roman captivity, probably the year 61.

THE PASTORAL LETTERS.

The Pastoral Letters, I. Timothy, II. Timothy, and Titus, are proven by their internal evidence to have been written after Paul's release from captivity in Rome, so they belong to the period following the year 61. They do not appear to be separated by any great length of time; Titus was apparently written first, then the letters to Timothy, the second of which was written while Paul was again a prisoner awaiting death. This indicates the year 67 for II.Timothy, and about the year 66 for the other two.

HEBREWS.

Hebrews was considered as a Pauline letter by a number of the Church Fathers, but most of them denied that Paul wrote it, ascribing it to one of the workers associated with

Paul or with the Twelve; thus it was considered as canonical even by those who denied its Pauline authorship. It has retained the same standing till the present time. Opinion is fairly unified today that Hebrews had its origin in Pauline circles, and this is borne out by the content and to a certain extent by the structure and phraseology, though the language and style indicate a different author. It approaches much nearer to the classical Greek than does any of the admittedly Pauline letters, and while inferior to them in vigor and forcefulness, it excels in rhetorical excellence and beauty of style. The place of composition is Rome, but there is no reference to either the captivity or freedom of Paul. It was probably written by a pupil of Paul, and it is unlikely that Paul was present with the author at the time. I am inclined to believe that this letter is among the latest of the canonical writings, written after Paul's death. The probable dates of the Pauline letters follows, as nearly they can be determined.

CHRONOLOGICAL CHART OF PAUL'S LETTERS.

I. Thessalonians	50 (fall).
II. Thessalonians	50 (winter).
Galatians	52 (spring).
I. Corinthians	55 (spring).
II. Corinthians	55 (fall).
Romans	56 (spring).
Philemon	61.
Ephesians	61.
Colossians	61.
Philippians	61.
Titus	66.
I. Timothy	66.
II. Timothy	67.

In conclusion it must be said that a full treatment of all the questions involved in Pauline chronology has been impossible within the limited scope of this paper. The disclosure of further evidence may necessitate a change in some of the dates, especially regarding the first part of the chrology and the letters, and possible also the date of Paul's death. So much has been established, that the events recorded in the Bible are historically accurate, and that is the chief end of this study for the theologian. Whatever of historical knowledge aids in establishing the historical reliability of the Bible, and whatever, by helping us to a better understanding of the times and conditions, is useful in studying his doctrine and its effect upon his own life and that of the people to whom he went, so much is useful; all the rest is merely secondary, interesting though it may be.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

In addition to the source material mentioned in the introduction to this article, the following books are especially valuable in the study of this subject:

O. Holtzmann: Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte.
Bartlett : Apostolic Age.
Wieseler: Chronologie des apostolischen Zeitalters.
Neteler: Untersuchung der neutestamentlichen Zeitverhaeltnisse.
Harnack: Chronologie des Paulus.
" : Chronologie der altchristlichen Lit. bis Eusebius I.
Zahn: Intoduction to the New Testament.
Ramsay: Paul the Traveler and the Roman Citizen.
" : Pauline and Other Studies.
" : Was Christ Born in Bethlehem?
Lightfoot: Biblical Essays.
Renan: St. Paul.
Clemen: Paulus.
Coneybeare and Howson: Life and Epistles of St. Paul.
Farrar: Life of Paul.
McGiffert: Apostolic Age.
Hoennicke: Chronologie des Paulus.
Deissmann: Paulus.
" : Licht vom Osten.
Weiss: Introducrion to the New Testament.
Juelicher: Einleitung in das Neue Testament.
Moffatt: Introduction to the Lit. of the New Testament.
Erbes: Todestage Pauli u. Petri.
Schuerer: History of the Jewish People.
Barton: Archeology and the Bible.
Cobern: The New Archeological Discoveries.
Hogarth: Devia Cypria.
Marquardt: Roemische Staatsalterthuemer.
Steinmann: Abfassungszeit des Galaterbriefs.
Introductory articles to the various epistles and to the Acts and the life of Paul in all good commentaries on the New Test.
Various articles in in the better Bible Dictionaries and Encyclopedias, especially:
Encyclopedia Brittanica.
Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible (Various editions).
International Standard Bible Encyclopædia.
McClintock and Strong, Encyclopedia of Religious -- Literature.
Schaff-Herzog, Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge.
Winer, Biblisches Realwoerterbuch.