

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

## Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

---

Bachelor of Divinity

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

---

5-1-1926

### The Companions of Paul on His Various Journeys and in His Captivities

Arnold F. Meyer

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir\_meyera@csl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv>



Part of the [History of Christianity Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Meyer, Arnold F., "The Companions of Paul on His Various Journeys and in His Captivities" (1926).

*Bachelor of Divinity*. 707.

<https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv/707>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Bachelor of Divinity by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact [seitzw@csl.edu](mailto:seitzw@csl.edu).

**The Companions of Paul on His Various  
Journeys and in His Captivities.**



1

## The Companions of Paul on His Various Journeys and in His Captivities.

For the better understanding of the position in which the companions of Paul stood to the Apostle and the role which they played in the life and journeys of this great missionary it is expedient to say a few words about that great Apostle to the Gentiles. Paul is the axle around which all the companions revolve as the separate parts of a great mechanism. We shall not attempt to give a complete biography of the man; but we shall try to give a brief survey of his life, in order that we may have a clear conception also of the details, with which we are confronted in the remarks concerning some of the companions.

St Paul was converted in the year 32 or 33 A.D. After he had spent some time in Damascus, he went to Arabia and preached (Gal. 1, 8). Just how long he remained there, can not be definitely ascertained. He later returned to Damascus, but was forced to flee. When he had made his escape with the help of his friends, he came to Jerusalem. There Barnabas led him to the disciples. But during his stay at Jerusalem attempts were made to slay him. When the brethren heard of these plans, they sent him to Cilicia. There he preached for some time, making Tarsus his headquarters. It may be here that some of the sufferings took place, which Paul describes 2. Cor. 11, 24-26.

Around the year 44 A.D. he came to Antioch in Syria, where he worked together with Barnabas. In the following year Barnabas and Paul carried a collection to the needy brethren at



Jerusalem in order to alleviate the sufferings, which had come upon the congregation at Jerusalem because of a severe famine. After their return the two men continued their work in the city of Antioch.

The year 48 A.D. marks the beginning of the first missionary journey. Throughout this journey Barnabas was the Apostle's faithful companion. The main stations of their first itinerary were Cyprus, Antioch in Pisidia, Iconium, Lystra and Derbe. Upon their return the two missionaries attended the "Council at Jerusalem". This was around the year ~~49~~ A.D.

In this first <sup>journey</sup> Paul may be said to have been only trying his wings; for although his course was adventurous yet it swept only a limited circle. In his second journey he performed a few more distant and perilous flights. With Silas as his main companion he set out from Antioch and traveled through Cilicia, Lycaonia and Galatia. This probably was in the year 50 A.D. Through the direction of the guiding Spirit they finally came to the city of Troas on the Aegaeon Sea. Due to the "Macedonian Call" they even set sail for Macedonia in Europe. There Paul passed through Philippi, Thessalonica, Berea, Athens and finally arrived at Corinth on the Isthmus. From here he wrote the two letters to the congregation at Thessalonica. Here he was also rejoined by Timothy and Silas, who had remained in Macedonia when Paul had departed to go to Athens. Here he also became acquainted with Aquila and Priscilla, the tent-makers. Paul remained in Corinth for a period of eighteen months (Acts 18, 11). Considering the time which it took to come from Antioch in Syria to Corinth and allowing for visits in various <sup>cities</sup> we may safely say that Paul did not leave Corinth



till the spring of 52 A.D. Thereupon he hurried to arrive at Jerusalem for the feast of Pentecost. Upon his arrival he saluted the brethren and soon passed on to Antioch.

But Paul did not rest very long on his laurels. He again set out to complete the trip which is commonly designated as the third journey. It included a visitation of the churches in Galatia and Phrygia; but a great part of the work centered in the city of Ephesus, where he spent about three years (53-56 A.D.). From there he wrote I Corinthians. After the uproar at Ephesus Paul sailed for Macedonia, from where he wrote II Corinthians.

Much of his time during this journey on the European continent

*taken was to Ken*

<sup>up</sup> with the collection for the needy at Jerusalem. After he had visited Corinth, he prepared for his return trip to Jerusalem in the spring of 58 A.D.. Shortly upon his arrival at Jerusalem he was arrested.

The next years (58 A.D.-63 A.D.) were spent in the Caesarean and the first Roman captivity. During the captivity he wrote a number of letters to different congregations. (Note. Absolute certainty in the dates, which we have given in the preceding paragraphs, is not to be had. It is only by connecting those events of secular history which the Book of Acts records, and the dates of which are tolerably well known to ~~us~~ such as the famine under Claudius Caesar (Acts 11, 28), the expulsion of the Jews from Rome by the same emperor (Acts 18, 2) and others with certain intervals that are specified between some happenings in the life of the Apostle (Acts 20, 31; 24, 27; 28, 30; and the first two chapters of Galatians)--that we may establish the chronology of Paul with an approximate certainty. The dates quoted in



the preceding paragraphs have been adapted from "Life and Letters of St Paul" (Conybeare and Howson) and in some instances from the commentary of Jamieson, Fausset and Brown.)

Acts 28,30-31 gives us the following information:"And Paul dwelt two years in his own hired house, and received all that came in unto him, preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching those things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ, with all confidence, no man forbidding him". This is the place where some historians place Paul's condemnation and death. This is possible but not probable. The tags which we find in some of the writings are like cracks and crevices in a great wall, which permit us to get some glimpses of Paul's life after Acts 28,31. Luke tells us no more. We are left to ask whether after two years there was a condemnation or an acquittal. The opinion is quite general, however, that he was acquitted.

We have not a prodigious stock of evidence on the subject, but yet the statements which we have are quite conclusive: (1) Clement, a disciple of Paul (Phil. 4,3), asserts that Paul preached "in the east and in the west" and had gone "to the extremity of the west" hence he had probably fulfilled his original intention to go to Spain (Rom. 15,24-28). (2) In the Canon Muratori we find the following statement:"Luke ----- evidently declares the martyrdom of Peter but omits the journey of Paul from Rome to Spain". Aside from these there are statements of Eusebius, Chrysostom and St Jerome, which treat the westward journey from Rome as an established fact. Besides these statements the question of the genuineness of the Pastoral Letters enters in. In order to do justice to these epistles, we must admit that after his



first Roman imprisonment St Paul traveled at liberty in Ephesus (1 Tim.1,3), in Crete(Tit.1,3), in Macedonia(1Tim.1,3), in Miletus(2 Tim.4,20) and in Nicopolis(Tit.3,12).

How long this freedom lasted, is not known. His martyrdom is said to have occurred in the last year of Nero's reign. That is the year 68 A.D.. This calculation puts five years at our disposal. But what did he do? It is reasonable to suppose that he fulfilled his intention expressed Philemon22 and Phil.2,24, namely, to visit those brethren whom he had not seen personally as yet. After he had visited some of his old friends at Philippi and Ephesus and some of those who were as yet strangers to him personally at Colosse and Laodicea, he probably undertook the long meditated journey to Spain.

Upon his return from Spain around the year 66 A.D. he may have gone to Ephesus and then to Macedonia. Here he probably was detained, but felt that Timotheus needed some documentary assistance. Therefore Paul sent "I. Timothy" to his dear friend at Ephesus. His next trip probably was to Crete. But he did not <sup>have</sup> the time to organize matters there himself, so he left Titus in charge of the churches in Crete and returned to Ephesus. From there he wrote a letter to Titus shortly before his departure for Nicopolis, where he intended to spend the winter (Tit.3,12). It is on this journey from Ephesus to Nicopolis that we may place the event of the sickness of Trophimus, who was forced to stay at Miletus(2Tim.4,20). At Nicopolis we may also place the narratives of the infidelity and the departure of Demas to Thessalonica and the despatching of Crescens on some special mission in Galatia. Titus in all probability also came to Nicopolis upon the summons



of Paul and was sent to Dalmatia. Nicopolis may also be the place where the second imprisonment set in.

The second captivity at Rome evidently was more severe than the first one had been. His friends seem to have been suffered to visit him in his confinement, but no preaching of any kind is mentioned. Concerning his companions during this captivity he wrote to Timothy: "Only Luke is with me". (2 Tim. 4, 11).

The Second Epistle to Timothy evidently was written just a comparatively short time before his death. In this letter he begs Timothy to come to Rome and bring Mark along. Whether or not Timothy arrived before the execution of the Apostle, is an interesting question in itself; but a discussion of that question at this place would lead us too far from our main issue. How the execution of Paul took place, is not known. Since he was a Roman citizen, he was probably beheaded. The time of his death is usually given as the late spring of 68 A.D..

That in short is the narrative of the missionary activity of Paul. Into this mission history we shall now try to place the companions of Paul. We propose to treat the companions in the following order: 1 The preachers (Timotheus and Titus) 2 The authors (Luke and John Mark); 3 The main missionary co-workers (Barnabas and Silas); 4 The host of minor characters (including Aristarchus, Demas, etc.); 5 Aquila and Priscilla, the tent-makers; 6 The slave Onesimus.

.....

In the province of Lycaonia there is among the cities which Paul visited the city of Lystra. The first reminiscences which Paul had in connection with this city were far from being



encouraging. Lystra was groping in the darkness and blindness of gross idolatry and heathenism. It was at the gates of this city that the populace made and acted upon the suggestion that Paul and his companion Barnabas were Hermes(Mercury) and Zeus (Jupiter) respectively. This was the result of a miracle, which Paul had performed upon the Lystran, who had been a cripple since his birth. Lystra was also the scene of a violent persecution. Mob violence and Judaistic bias had succeeded in causing a riot because of Paul's teaching. He was stoned and then dragged out of the city by the mob, who supposed that he was a corpse. But God had prevented the mob from doing actual harm. While the disciples were standing around, anxious to revive him, he arose and soon continued his journey.

Thus Lystra had been for Paul a city of persecution; and yet this very place was the home of a man<sup>(c)</sup> who was yet to become one of the most faithful and constant companions of the Apostle in years to come, the zealous follower of his doctrine and the faithful partner of his danger and distress. That man was Timothy.

About two years after the first episode St Paul returned to Lystra and found there a certain christian, "whose name was Timotheus, whose mother was a Jewess while his father was a Greek"(Acts 16,1). The name of the father is not known, but the name of his mother was Eunice and that of his grandmother Lois (2 Tim.1,5). The fact that his mother is mentioned before his father and the description of her in some Mss. as "a widow", may point to the fact that his father was already dead. Just how the mother and grandmother of Timothy came to



live in a town, which had very few Jews and evidently no synagogue, is impossible to explain. They may have been brought there by some accidental circumstance as for instance Lydia, the seller of purple, was brought from Thyatira in Asia Minor to Philippi in Macedonia.

Due to the environments of a city steeped in heathen rites one may suppose that Timothy grew up without much congregational life. On the other hand, however, the information is quite definite that he received a good religious training at home. Paul calls his attention to the fact that Eunice, his mother, and Lois, his grandmother, had dwelt in the "unfeigned faith" and that "as a child" also he had known the holy scriptures. (2 Tim. 1, 5; 3, 15). It must have been a pious Jewish family, which in spite of the Greek influence in the family circle and in spite of the spiritual depravity of the Lystrans could maintain such an ideal of religious home-training.

At the second coming of Paul to Lystra Timothy was already a Christian. According to the account of Luke he was a disciple well known to the Christians in Lystra and Iconium. (Acts 16, 2). This fact together with the expression of Paul 1 Tim. 1, 2 "my own son in the faith", give us good reasons to believe that Timothy had been converted by the Apostle on his first journey. He may have been one of the disciples that stood by when Paul, who had been dragged out of the city as though he was a corpse, miraculously rose up from the ground and continued his journey. It may be that this very spectacle of innocent suffering and undaunted courage, which Timothy had witnessed, had made a deep and lasting impression upon the young man.



When Paul and Silas came to Lystra and Iconium, they heard of the good reports concerning Timothy. Paul was attracted and since he and Silas really needed another man to "minister unto them", as John formerly had done, he decided to take Timothy along. But before they started out with their new companion, Paul circumcised him in order that his companionship might cause no offence since he was a half-Jew by birth. During the first part of the travels Timothy seems to have worked only in the capacity of a personal "minister". In the course of the narrative, however, it is very noticeable how he advanced in rank until we find him as one of the chief preachers especially in connection with the city of Ephesus.

A number of years elapsed, however, between Timothy's first drafting into service and his final position at Ephesus. From Lystra he went with Silas and Paul on their journey to Troas. As a result of the vision, which beckoned them to go into Macedonia, they soon left for the European continent. Timothy is not mentioned in the story of the Philippian prison. By some chance he may have escaped this torture. As the men traveled on, the new companion gradually gained prominence. From the salutation of the first letter to the Thessalonians we may draw the inference that Timothy not only ministered to his superiors but also did some preaching. When Paul was obliged to leave Berea, Timothy and Silas stayed there. It was from there that Timothy was dispatched to Thessalonica with the important mission of strengthening the Thessalonians, who were suffering persecution. (1Thess. 3, 2) Thereupon Silas and Timothy left Macedonia in order to join Paul at Athens. But Paul had already departed for Corinth, to where they followed him. There Timothy assisted Paul in preaching (2Cor. 1, 19).



During the stay Paul wrote two letters to the congregation at Thessalonica. In both of them Timothy and Silas are mentioned as being with Paul. Timothy evidently was in close contact with the church at Thessalonica. He had strengthened them in a period of persecution and now was together with Paul, who expressed also his feelings and sentiments in the two letters written to that congregation from Corinth.

The question now arises concerning the whereabouts of Timothy during the history of the next section of Acts. When we read the accounts in Acts, we notice that his name is not mentioned *between* Acts 18,5 and 19,22. According to analogous cases of Luke's style we may infer that he was attached to Paul's service during the period which intervened, ready for any mission, as the one mentioned Acts 19,22. During the journey to Jerusalem and Ephesus not a single reference is made to Timothy. But he very likely accompanied Paul and acted in the capacity of a personal minister.

Among the other missions of minor importance, which he may have accomplished during the period which intervened, we are told especially of one, which struck the historian Luke to be of more than usual significance. While Paul was prolonging his stay in Ephesus to about three years, he sent Timothy together with Erastus into Macedonia. At almost the same time Paul wrote to the Corinthian congregation that Timothy was coming, "who shall put you in remembrance of my way, which be in Christ" (1Cor.4,17). According to this information it may be quite firmly established Timothy had been instructed to proceed from Macedonia down on the European side to Corinth.



Some critics may try to find a discrepancy between the statements of Paul and Luke. It is a fact that Luke gives us the information that Timothy and Erastus were sent to Macedonia; but Paul states that Timothy had been instructed to go to Corinth. This, however, is no discrepancy but only another example of the manner in which the different books of the bible verify and complete one another. The solution is the very simple one, which has been offered above, namely, that Timothy was to go to Corinth via the cities of Macedonia.

The question, whether he was able to carry out the instructions of the Apostle, naturally suggests itself. Did Timothy go to Corinth as Paul had announced to the Corinthians in the first letter? It has been suggested that he did not come to the city of Corinth because of the large amount of work in connection with the collection for the needy at Jerusalem, which was in progress in the cities of Macedonia at the time. There is, however, another suggestion, which is based on 2 Cor.7,12. It has been thought that Timothy had come to Corinth and had been the one "that suffered wrong"(2 Cor.7,12). Since he was of a rather timid nature, Hastings suggests that he returned to Macedonia and reported to Paul, who then sent Titus to Corinth. Either one of these suggestions brings Timothy and Paul together in Macedonia, from where Paul wrote the second letter to the Corinthians while Timothy is with him.(2 Cor.1,1).

He was one of the companions, who was with Paul on the journey from Europe to Jerusalem when the large company was taking the liberal donations of the Macedonian and Corinthian christians to the needy brethren at Jerusalem.



The arrival at Jerusalem marks the beginning of Paul's Caesarean captivity. From this time the name of Timothy disappears from the Book of Acts. He is not mentioned during the entire Caesarean captivity nor as a companion on the long and tedious journey to Rome. If we consider that he is one of the most important companions of Paul and yet we look in vain for his name among the fellow travelers to Rome, the conclusion forces itself upon us that he did not make this particular voyage to Rome. Not much later, however, we find him at Rome probably upon special summons of his master. Thus Paul's beloved son in the faith ministered to him at Rome as he had done in Asia, Macedonia and Achaia. This accounts for the fact that he is mentioned in three of the "Captivity Letters" ( Philemon 1; Col. 1, 1 Phil. 1, 1 ). There is only one more clue concerning Timothy during the time of the first Roman captivity. He surely was not in Rome during the entire captivity because he is not mentioned in Paul's letter to the Ephesians. From this we gather that he departed from Rome before that letter was written. This argument of silence has an unusual force at this place because of Timothy's close connection with the Ephesian congregation.

At that very congregation in Ephesus Timothy was stationed at the time when Paul wrote his pastoral epistles to him (1Tim. 1, 3). He seems to have worked there for a number of years. When Paul was in his second imprisonment at Rome, he summoned Timothy to himself and told him to bring John Mark along. It may be that even he was arrested upon his arrival in Rome; but it seems that he was released (Heb. 13, 23 ). This is the last information concerning Timothy, which is based on Scriptures. About



his subsequent life's history nothing can be said with certainty. There are many traditions afloat, but none of them bear the marks of certainty.

St Paul uses a large number of terms in various letters, which show his affections for his spiritual son Timothy. He calls him his "own son in the faith" (1 Tim. 1, 2), his "loved son" (2 Tim. 1, 2), his "son loved and faithful in the Lord" (1 Cor. 4, 17), his "fellow worker" (Rom. 16, 21) and many other terms, that breathe the affection and confidence, which he had in the young Timothy. He showed the great confidence, which he had in him when he sent him to cope with a rather serious situation, which prevailed in the distant congregation at Corinth (1 Cor. 4, 17; 16, 10).

Scriptures show us a marked difference between Timothy and the other preacher Titus. Timothy seems to have had a rather delicate constitution, which demanded of him that he take good care of his body (1 Tim. 5, 23), while Titus was more of a robust nature.

The letters of Paul contain a few more personal data, which help us to establish the character of Timothy. He was affectionate to tears (2 Tim. 1, 4), rather timid (1 Cor. 16, 10) and reluctant to assert himself (1 Tim. 4, 12). Nevertheless he was a zealous worker, of whom Paul says: "working the Lord's work as I do" (1 Cor. 16, 10), "the slave of Jesus Christ" (Phil. 1, 1) and one "who seeks the things of Jesus Christ" (Phil. 2, 31). In other words he was a faithful companion, a beloved spiritual son and a sincere and faithful pastor.



Among all the important companions of Paul Titus is the most enigmatic figure in early Christian history. His name has been entirely omitted from the Acts of the Apostles. Therefore it is rather difficult to account for his usual whereabouts. If we recognize how complete Luke's historical insight and power of selecting and grouping details is, we can arrive but at one conclusion, namely, that the complete omission of the name of Titus like that of his own is intentional.

Different conjectures have been made regarding the omission, but most of them have not met with acceptance. Among other things it has been said that Titus was the second name of some one of Paul's other companions. Fruitless attempts have been made to identify him with Timothy, with Silas and with Titius Justus(Acts 18,7). Also the suggestion of Bishop Lightfoot is very improbable. He tries to solve the difficulty by stating that Titus was not important enough to deserve mention in Acts (Biblical Essays p.281). This solution is highly improbable especially if we consider that Paul mentions him nine times in the second letter to the Corinthians and always as a person of great importance and distinction. Hence Lightfoot's explanation does not explain.

Another theory, which must remain a theory but a very probable one, is the conjecture that Luke and Titus were related. Eusebius found this statement in an old tradition, which was attached to the remark in II Corinthians, where Titus (by name) and Luke( as a probability) are associated as envoys to Corinth. The following is a quotation cited from Ramsay's volume, "Paul the Traveler and the Roman Citizen"(p.390): "Luke, as we may suppose , thought it right to omit his relative's name as he



(as he) did his own, from his history. There is not sufficient evidence to justify an opinion; but this conjecture brings together an enigmatic expression in Eusebius and a serious difficulty in Acts and finds in each a satisfactory solution of the other."

Since the Book of Acts gives us no information regarding the life of Titus, we must look to other places for any statements regarding his work and activities. It stands to reason that the notices are very scanty. The main sources are found in Paul's letter to the Galatians(ch.2,1-11), the second epistle to the Corinthians and the pastoral letter of Paul, addressed to Titus personally.

Concerning the family and birth-place of Titus it can only be said that he was a Gentile (Gal.2,3), who had probably been converted by Paul himself (Titus 1,4). He was living at Antioch fourteen years after Paul's conversion when the dispute arose about the circumcision of the gentiles. Paul took him along to Jerusalem. There, as St Paul tells the Galatians, an attempt was made to compel Titus to be circumcised. But the Apostle refused to do this, because Titus was not a Jew. We note the different behavior of Paul in the case of Titus. In the case of Timothy he had performed the circumcision in order to avoid offense, because Timothy was a half-Jew.

It seems as though the offence and the stir, which the companionship of Titus had caused, had been a warning to Paul that it was not expedient to take the Greek Titus, who had not been circumcised, with him especially since he taught in Jewish



16

synagogues in several of the cities. His main companion on the second journey had been Silas, a Roman Jew and Timothy, a half-Jew. But on the third journey, when Paul, according to his Galatian letter, was pulling down Judaistic tendencies, he took Titus along. On that journey he is mentioned in connection with the incidents of the two Corinthian epistles. His name occurs nine times in II Corinthians.

Titus is made so much of in the second letter to Corinth that it is natural that one should enquire why there is no reference to him in the first epistle to that City. One very good suggestion has been made, which is noteworthy and also quite reasonable, namely, that he was the bearer of I Corinthians. Thus everything, which might be noteworthy to relate to the Corinthians with reference to Titus, would be amply taken care of by his personal presence in their midst. This would also explain the solicitude of Titus for the Corinthian congregation because we are told that he was very anxious to return thither on a second mission (2Cor.8,16).

If we accept the statement that Titus was the bearer of I Corinthians, then we may conclude pretty safely that he was in Corinth three times during the third journey. The first time he went thither as the bearer of a letter. At this occasion he probably also made preliminary arrangements regarding the collection for the needy at Jerusalem, to which Paul had alluded in the last part of the letter (1 Cor.16,1,2.). The second time he might have gone there to quell some opposition, which had arisen in Corinth. It may have been Timothy, who, as Paul's representative, had been opposed and insulted. Soon after the departure of Titus



Paul also left Ephesus and came to Troas. There he waited for the return of Titus, anxious to get some definite information concerning the state of affairs at Corinth. He expected to meet him at Troas, but no Titus appeared. Apparently the crisis had required a longer time than Paul had expected. It is possible that Paul came to Troas late in the fall, expecting to find Titus coming to Troas direct from Corinth. But this was impossible during the winter months. Therefore, being detained, Titus had to make the trip by land over Macedonia. So he met Paul at Philippi. Evidently he came back with some glowing reports from the congregation at Corinth. (2 Cor. 7, 13). Almost immediately he was sent back to the Isthmus with the second letter. He was very anxious to go (2 Cor. 8, 17). With him Paul sent two other companions. These men should go to Corinth and under the leadership of Titus, who was Paul's personal representative, should complete the collection for the saints at Jerusalem.

In subsequent biblical history there are no references to Titus except in the Pastoral Letters. Evidently he did not go along to Jerusalem to deliver the collection but remained in Europe. The personal letter, which bears his name, implies that after the first Roman imprisonment he and Paul landed at Crete and preached the Gospel in several cities (Titus 1, 5). But St Paul was unable to stay. Therefore he left Titus behind to appoint presbyters and to complete the organization of the congregations. After Paul's departure he wrote an encouraging letter to his faithful co-worker. This letter mentions a item of historical interest. Paul requests Titus to be ready to meet him at Nicopolis, where probably the second Roman captivity began. It may have been from there that he was sent to Dalmatia. (2 Tim. 4, 10).



18

The scriptural references in II Corinthians as well as in Galatians must impress us with the business ability and the tact of Titus. Paul sent him to Corinth to do the principle work there in connection with the organization of the collection for the saints at Jerusalem. This charge was carried out so minutely and tactfully that the Corinthian congregation contributed bountifully. In other words Titus must have been a man, who in the good sense of the term had an eye for business.

In spite of the scanty references concerning Titus and the comparatively limited information even concerning Timothy yet such decided differences are noticeable between these two men that the suggestion that both of these names refer to one and the same man is absolutely out of the question. A comparison of the passages I Timothy 4,12 and Titus 2,15 perhaps suggests that Titus was older than Timothy. The relation of the two to the Corinthian congregation seems to point to the fact that Titus possessed more boldness and self-confidence than the younger Timothy. This might also explain why Paul seems to worry more about the younger Timothy than the older and more independent Titus.

The comparison has not been brought to show that Paul did not think highly of Titus. On the other hand he is very anxious about Titus. Concerning his arrival at Troas and his vain searching for his companion at that port he writes to the congregation at Corinth: "I had no rest in my spirit, because I found not Titus my brother". (2 Cor.2,13). The anxiety with which Paul waited for him at Troas showed his love for the Corinthians; but we can not refrain from mentioning that it also



showed his marked affection for "his brother Titus". Titus had won not only the affection of the Apostle but also that of the congregation at Corinth. (2Cor.7,13). He in turn had a warm spot in his heart for the Corinthian Christians as we may gather from the fact that he was so anxious to return to them that he without having been told previously made up his mind to return to Corinth (II Cor.8,17).

In general the references to Titus make the impression that he proved to be one of the most congenial and useful of Paul's assistants. He appears as the Apostle's laborious minister and as a source of his consolation and support hardly less strikingly than the younger disciple, whom Paul had taken on his previous journey from Lystra. As we have acknowledged before, the information regarding Titus is very limited. Yet his conduct sets before us an exceptional character, which claims our admiration for an extraordinary combination of enthusiasm, sincerity, integrity and discretion.

.....

"Luke, the beloved physician", is the way in which St Paul speaks of this faithful companion of his when he writes the letter to the church in Colosse during his first Roman imprisonment. (Col.4,14). This is that one of the three direct references to Luke, which throws the most light upon this interesting and faithful companion of Paul.

The name Luke is very uncommon in the Greek. It is a contracted or shortened form of Loukios, which is more frequent. We have analogous cases in the names of Apollonius (Apollo) and Silvanus (Silas). Also the title of the Gospel in earlier copies was frequently given as "cata Lucanum".



Paul calls him "beloved". In the following it will be evident that Luke was one of the steadiest companions of the Apostle in his travels as well as in his captivities. He appeared on the scene at Troas during the second missionary journey and was the only companion of Paul in Rome during the last months of the second captivity when Paul declared to the pastor at Ephesus: "only Luke is with me" (2Tim.4,11). Their close companionship leads us to say that they must have been very kindly disposed toward each other because they were kindred spirits. Both of them were educated men with scholarly habits and literary ability. Possibly, however, there were still better or more imperative reasons than personal pleasure in comradeship to account for the close connection between the two men and the sincere affection, which prompted Paul to call his traveling companion "beloved". But he was not only beloved by the Apostle. Otherwise he would not add this adjective when he wrote to the Colossians. Of one of the companions, of Titus on his mission to Corinth, we are told that his praise was in all the churches (2 Cor.8,18). This brother has almost unanimously been identified with Luke. Therefore the term "beloved" shows the general high regard, which the churches had for him. He probably was beloved for his medical skill, his lovable personality, his enthusiastic mission endeavors, and his true Christian piety.

But Col.4,14 does not only call him "beloved" but the "beloved physician". Many favorable comments have been made and many books have been written regarding the standing of Luke as a doctor. Ramsay, who has written a number of books about apostolic times, has devoted an entire book to the subject, "Luke the Physician". Dr. Hobart has written a book on the medical lan-



guage of Luke ,in which he gives testimony to the "physicians" ac- 21  
curacy in the use of medical terms as compared with those used  
by Galen, Hippocrates and other ancient medical writers of note.

Luke entered into the drama as a companion of Paul in the  
city of Troas. How do we know this? The answer of this question  
calls our attention to the fact that a "we-passage" begins here.  
The expression, "we-passages", is used to designate a series of  
sections in the Book of Acts, where the first person plural is  
used instead of the third person singular. These "we-sections"  
are found in chapters 16, 20, 21, 27 and 28. It is almost univer-  
sally recognized that Luke employed this method in these sec-  
tions to denote his presence. This may be seen especially by the  
abrupt change from the first to the third person as soon as Paul  
and Silas leave the city of Philippi (Acts 17, 1.).

This is the nearest approach to personal references  
that we have in Luke's writings concerning himself. The indi-  
cations in the letters corroborate the theory of the "we-passages";  
for nowhere do we find any disagreement between the "we-passages"  
and the occasional tags in the Pauline epistles. If this premise  
concerning the "we-passages" would be false; then our knowledge  
concerning the author of the third gospel would be indeed very  
meager. But because of its decided probability there is very  
little objection raised at this point.

All indications point to the fact that Luke and Paul met  
in Troas as strangers (Acts 16, 10.). Concerning any earlier data  
he has enveloped himself in a veil, which we can not penetrate.  
He is not to be confused with Lucius, an official of the Anti-  
ochian congregation @ Acts 13.)



It has been said that it was the figure of Luke, the "Macedonian", which appeared to Paul in a vision at Troas. He is said to have met him and the next night to have beheld him in a vision. It is claimed that a stranger would not have been recognized as a Macedonian. This brings us face to face with the question whether Luke was an Antiochian or a Macedonian. Ramsay takes the view that Luke was a Greek from Philippi. He mentions the fact that all the sea journeys are enlarged upon while the land journeys are not. Thus he tries to show him as a Greek and a lover of the sea. "Luke shows himself the Greek when he talks of the Maltese as the "barbarians"; when he regards the journey to Jerusalem as a journey and nothing more;..... when he catches with such ease the character of Paul's surroundings in Athens" (p.209). Over against Ramsay there are a number of scholars, who consider Luke as the Antiochian. Among them we have Harnack, Hayes, and others. Some of the arguments for this view are the following: (1) Jerome tells us explicitly that Luke was a physician of Antioch; (2) Among the seven deacons at Jerusalem there was "Nicholas of Antioch", the only one of the seven whose home is mentioned. Eusebius says of Luke, "being according to the birth of those from Antioch". This, however, would not stamp him as a native of Antioch but on the contrary as no Antiochian but only having relatives in the Macedonian settlement in Antioch.

It is impossible to say with absolute certainty whether Luke was a Macedonian or an Antiochian. Neither Philippi nor Antioch can be accepted conclusively as his birth-place. One thing is certain, however, namely, that Luke was well acquainted with Macedonia and especially Philippi and even resided there for some time,



Although the question of Luke's birth-place must remain uncertain, yet we can speak more positively concerning his nationality. In all probability he was a Gentile. The following reasons may be advanced for such a statement: (1) Luke's name is Greek; (2) His style compares favorably with the Greek of the classical period.- The logical conclusion would be that he himself was a Greek; (3) When Paul wrote to the Colossian congregation, he sent greetings of Aristarchus, Mark and Jesus Justus to the Colossian brethren; and he said of them "these are of the circumcision". Then he continued to send salutations of Epaphras Luke and Demas. The logical inference would be that these last ones were not of the circumcision and therefore Gentiles. These three reasons prove quite conclusively that Luke was of gentile birth.

After the night vision had extended the Macedonian call to Paul, Luke proceeded with Paul to Philippi. He seems to have escaped the persecution to which Silas and Paul were subjected in the prison at Philippi. Probably this was due to the fact that he had been in Philippi before and was highly respected by the citizens, especially as a doctor. When Paul and his companions moved southward toward Athens and Corinth, he remained at Philippi. Since several years later Luke accompanied the Apostle from Philippi toward Jerusalem, it is rational to suppose that he in the meantime established himself in Philippi for a period as a doctor at the same time being active in mission endeavors in the vicinity. He is not mentioned until Paul returned on his second European journey. There the supposition lies close that the "brother" of 2Cor. 8, 18 is Luke, the physician and Macedonian missionary.



After the collection at Corinth had been completed, Luke<sup>24</sup> and Paul proceeded toward Philippi in Macedonia leaving the other companions to sail directly toward Troas. After the passover had been celebrated, they also sailed to the city of Troas. There they spent a few weekdays and then conducted services there in an upper chamber. At that occasion Paul restored the life of the young man Eutychus. The people<sup>(s)</sup> who had gathered<sup>(s)</sup> remained together until the dawn of Monday morning. Thereupon the band of missionaries and helpers continued their journey toward Jerusalem. On that journey Luke shows himself as a close observer. He gives us a number of details concerning the different cities and ports (Acts 20.21).

The arrival at Jerusalem marked the beginning of the Caesarean captivity, which passed over into the first Roman captivity. During all this time Luke seems to have been the faithful companion of the Apostle (Acts 27.28; Col. 4, 14; Philemon 24). Whether or not Luke accompanied Paul after the first Roman captivity on his journeys in Europe and Asia, we do not know. Short-ly before the great apostle's death he was with him again at Rome as his only companion; for St Paul informed Timothy saying "only Luke is with me (2 Tim. 4, 11).

Luke was among the most respected and beloved members of the early church. "His praise was in all the churches" (2 Cor. 8, 18). The people of his time probably admired him especially as a skillful physician and an intrepid and enthusiastic missionary. We, who do not know him personally, must admire him especially as a writer. Luke and Paul are the most prolific writers of the New Testament. If these two writers had not written, the New Testament would be less than half its present size.



A thorough discussion of Luke as a writer alone would fill a volume. Therefore we can only deal in generalities as far as Luke's Gospel and the Acts are concerned. His Gospel is noted for its accuracy. Next to the Letter to the Hebrews the third Gospel contains the most beautiful Greek in the New Testament. It is the largest book among the N.T. writings . The Acts of the Apostles is next in size. It may be safely said that Luke is without a peer among the historical writers of all ages; for besides giving us the life's history of the God-man he wrote another volume, describing the origin and the growth of Christianity, the most powerful force, which has influenced the world.

.....

The other companion who is known for his writing is John Mark, more commonly known only as Mark. Of his father we know absolutely nothing. His mother was Mary, a prominent Jewish woman among the early Christians at Jerusalem. Her house seems to have served as a meeting place for the disciples at Jerusalem. It was to the house of Mary that Peter made his way when he had been released from prison by the angel of the Lord (Acts 12,12). According to the reference in the Epistle to the Colossians he was a cousin of Barnabas( sometimes given as sister's son) and therefore on his mother's side of the tribe of Levi.

It is difficult to say just when Mark was converted to Christianity. Attempts have been made to identify him with the youth clothed with a linen garment, who followed Christ when he had been taken captive (Mark 14,51). But this is an arbitrary attempt and has no scriptural basis. Therefore nothing definite can be said as to the time of his conversion. According to Acts 12 it may be inferred that Peter was intimately acquainted with Mary



and her family. Peter calls Mark his son (1Peter 5,13) in the same spiritual sense of the word in which Paul gives this name to Timothy and Titus. The inference then would be that Mark was converted to Christianity by Peter. 26

Mark was one of the companions of Paul on his first missionary journey. But he was not on the same level with Barnabas. He was "minister " or "attendant" of the two missionaries. It belonged to his duties to make provisions for travel, and in general to take care of temporal matters. Just why he was taken along on the journey, we do not know. One reason possibly was that the missionaries needed an attendant. Still another thought comes to us. Jerusalem was the scene of bloody persecutions at this time. This surely was not the place for a young man. Therefore with the affection of Abraham toward his nephew Lot Barnabas took his youthful kinsman away from the scene of persecution. Incidentally he received part of his ministerial training during this first journey.

Luke has been criticised as superficial because he only mentions John Mark in an apparently haphazard manner as the third traveler. But Luke surely had an object in so doing, namely, to emphasize the secondary character of John Mark in view of the incident which was to happen in Perga of Pamphylia. He was not essential to the expedition and had not been formally delegated by the church of Antioch.

With the exception of a few minor incidents the journey progressed smoothly until the small band arrived at Perga in Pamphylia. Here Mark left the two missionaries, Paul and Barnabas, and returned to Jerusalem



In spite of his youth this action of Mark merits severe 27  
criticism. "The child of a religious mother, who had sheltered  
in her house the Christian disciples in a fierce persecution,  
he had joined himself to Barnabas and Saul when they traveled  
from Jerusalem to Antioch on their return from a mission of  
charity. He had been a close spectator of the wonderful power  
of the religion of Christ -- he had seen the strength of faith  
under trial in his mother's home-- he had attended his kinsman  
Barnabas in his labors of zeal and love -- he had seen the word  
of Paul sanctioned and fulfilled by miracle -- he had even been  
the "minister" of <sup>the</sup> apostles in their successful enterprise (Acts 13, 5)  
and now he forsook them, when they were about to proceed through  
greater difficulties to more glorious success. We are not left  
in doubt as to the real character of his departure. He was drawn  
from the work of God by the attraction of an earthly home. As he  
looked up from Perga to the Gentile mountains, his heart failed  
him and he turned back with the desire toward Jerusalem. He  
could not resolve to continue persevering "in journeyings often,  
in perils of rivers, in perils of robbers" (Conybeare and Howson)

The desertion left a deep and painful impression upon  
Paul, which remained rankling in his breast for some time. It was  
this desertion, that also brought about the altercation between  
Barnabas and Paul, which caused these men to separate (Acts 15, 39)  
Paul distrusted the steadiness of John Mark's character and de-  
parted on his second journey with Silvanus while Barnabas and  
John Mark sailed to Cyprus.

The estrangement with Mark, however, was not a lasting  
one. Christian love soon healed the breach. The three scattered.



notices, which we find in the Pauline epistles, <sup>show very clearly</sup> that Paul bore 28  
no grudge against John Mark because of his former weakness. In  
Col.4,10 he implies his restored confidence in Mark and tells  
the people at Colosse to receive him kindly. He commends him  
to them as "a fellow worker unto the kingdom of God" and "a com-  
fort" to himself. These people probably had heard something a-  
bout Mark's unfaithfulness, since Colosse is only about 110 miles  
from Perga.

After the separation at Antioch very little is said about  
Mark. There are only four scattered references in the letters.  
We find him at the side of the Apostle in the first Roman cap-  
tivity on the point of returning to Asia Minor. There Paul re-  
commended him to the Colossian brethren (Col.4,10). At about the  
same time the letter to Philemon was written, in which John Mark  
sent greetings along (Philemon 24). At some later date we find  
Mark together with Peter at Babylon (Rome), where he worked to-  
gether with his spiritual father. (1Peter 5,13.). The most touching  
remark concerning the evangelist we find 2 Tim.4,11: "Take Mark  
and bring him with thee: for he is profitable to me for the minis-  
try". These words were written from Rome during the second cap-  
tivity shortly before Paul's execution. The Apostle had forgot-  
ten the youthful error of St Mark in the remembrance of his more  
recent fidelity. This last reference gives us a clue as to his  
abode at that time. He must have been in Asia Minor in the neigh-  
borhood of Ephesus, where Timothy was stationed.

It is a pleasant task to speak of the later years of  
Mark's life because the earlier references regarding his charac-  
ter, if they were not supplemented by others, would create the



(the) wrong impression. But that Mark, who had been the unhappy 29  
cause of the separation of Barnabas and Saul, who had once been  
rejected by Paul as unworthy to attend him, because he had previ-  
ously abandoned the work of the Gospel out of timidity or indo-  
lence, is found at Rome administering obediently to the very  
apostle who had formerly repudiated his services. This fidelity  
of Mark seems to have persevered to the end. Paul even sends  
for him to cheer him during his last captivity (2Tim. 4,11).

Although Mark did not feature as a writer while he was  
a companion of Paul, yet it would be proper to say a few words  
about Mark, the author. It is the unanimous <sup>testimony</sup> of the early church  
that John Mark wrote the Gospel which is usually attributed to  
him. Also most of the commentators agree that the Gospel was  
written by a certain Mark. But the question has been raised a-  
bout the number of Marks who featured prominently in apostolic  
times. Some scholars imagine a Petrine and a Pauline Mark. It  
is easily conceivable, however, how Mark got acquainted so well  
with both apostles.

Another thing is quite certain, namely, that Mark wrote  
under Peter's supervision. In his Ecclesiastical History Eusebius  
has preserved for us the statements and testimonies of some of  
the earliest church men. Among these are Papias, Justin Martyr,  
Irenaeus and Origen. All of them agree that Mark worked under  
Peter's supervision. One of them even goes so far as to call the  
Gospel the "memoirs of Peter". There are also some things in the  
Gospel, which make it very plausible that Mark was very strongly  
influenced by Peter. (1). The large number of detail betrays the  
eye witness. (2). Four times Peter is mentioned by Mark while not



by the other evangelists. (3) On the other hand his name is omitted in the narrative of certain incidents as for instance the preparation of the passover( Mark 14,13 --Luke 22,8). The omission at this place is ascribed to Peter's modesty.

Just when the second Gospel was written, can not be definitely stated. It must have been written after the Letter to the Colossians, because otherwise Paul would have referred to this fact instead of simply calling attention to Mark's relationship to Barnabas. It was written before the destruction of Jerusalem, otherwise Mark would not have omitted to record such a remarkable fulfillment of our Lord's prediction. It has been suggested that it was written during the time that Mark stayed with Peter at Rome. This suggestion would agree very well with the testimony of Eusebius, Clement, Jerome, and Epiphanius.

Concerning the Gospel of St Mark certain characteristics may be mentioned. As far as external features and characteristics are concerned the point of view of this gospel is Gentile; the general aspect is Roman; the style is terse and precise; the most striking characteristic is compression, and the language is Hebraistic. As far as contents are concerned we may say that it gives the events more in their detail than the other gospels. Finally in its portraiture of Christ Mark's gospel presents him mainly as the King of the world, who enters into his ministry preceded by a "voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord"(Mark 1,2). Throughout the Gospel Christ is painted as the monarch, who has authority to subdue all things to the will of heaven and to establish on earth a kingdom, that can not be shaken.





Next to the two preachers, Timothy and Titus, and the two authors there are no other men that stood so close to Paul as Barnabas and Silas. The information which we have in the Book of Acts concerning these co-workers is comparatively plenteous.

The first one is Joseph, who is more generally known as Barnabas. He was a Jew of the tribe of Levi. He hailed from the island of Cyprus. Acts 4,36.37 he is mentioned as one of the men who sold their land and brought the money to the apostles for the purpose of alleviating the poverty of the needy brethren in Jerusalem. In the Bible he appears for the first time in connection with Paul after the memorable conversion near Damascus. When Paul came to Jerusalem after his escape from Damascus, the disciples shunned him, believing that he was still an enemy of Christ and His church. It was then that Barnabas vouched for him and conducted him to the brethren.

It is probable that Paul and Barnabas were acquainted with each other before. Cyprus is only a sail of a few hours from Cilicia. Therefore the schools of Tarsus may have attracted the Levite Barnabas. It was probably there that the friendship began, which carried these men through so many vicissitudes during the first missionary journey.

At the time of the persecutions many of the early Christians were scattered abroad. Some of them, filled with the zeal of their faith, preached to the people in the various regions. Especially at Antioch there was a great number of people who believed and turned to the Lord. When these tidings reached the disciples at Jerusalem, Barnabas was delegated by the brethren to go to



Antioch in Syria. Very probably the brethren at Jerusalem wanted some first hand information regarding the status of the Christianity of the people of that city. It had been noised abroad that a large number had turned to the Lord. But the brethren at Jerusalem did not want to establish fraternal relations with the Christians at Antioch unless they were sure of their doctrinal stand. The duty as visitor placed quite a responsibility on Barnabas. It showed the faith which the Christians at Jerusalem placed in the Cyprian. Thus Barnabas became the first teacher of the mother church to the new disciples at Antioch.

The man was well chosen, and the journey proved to be a great blessing. When he arrived at Antioch, he was glad to find real serious minded Christians in that great oriental metropolis (Antioch had about 500,000 inhabitants at the time). Upon his arrival Barnabas admonished and exhorted the Antiochians. His preaching was very effective for "much people was added unto the Lord" (Acts 11, 24).

Since Antioch was a very large city, the missionary opportunities were so great that Barnabas felt the need of a co-laborer. He then remembered a man, whose missionary zeal, courage and strength of character were well known to him. He thought of Saul, who was at that time in Tarsus. Tarsus, a city of Cilicia, is not so very far from Antioch. Barnabas came to Tarsus; and when he had found Saul, the two men returned to Syria. Thereupon they worked together in the church of Antioch for a whole year.

The cooperative work of the two men had its beginning here at Antioch. For some time now we find them laboring side by side. This joint labor continued throughout the first missionary journey of Paul.



After Barnabas and Paul had labored so effectively at Antioch, they left that city to return to Jerusalem. They carried with them a bounteous collection from the Christians of Antioch since a certain Agabus had predicted that a great famine would come over the land. Many of the old church historians like Eusebius, Josephus and Tacitus have a reference to this famine. It took place in 44 or 45 A.D. After the money had been given over for the use of the suffering Christians, the two returned to Antioch taking John Mark, the kinsman of Barnabas, with them.

During their second stay in Antioch (Acts 13,2) Barnabas as well as Paul received a direct call from the Lord to do the work for which he had especially intended them, namely, to proclaim the gospel among the gentiles. After they had been properly ordained by the laying on of hands together with praying and preceded by fasting, they were sent on what is commonly known as the first missionary journey of Paul. Barnabas figured very prominently in this first missionary journey to the gentiles.

It was early in 46 A.D. that the missionaries left Seleucia, the port of Antioch, and embarked for the island of Cyprus in the Mediterranean, the former home of Barnabas. This dissertation does not call for a detailed itinerary of Paul and Barnabas. In order to gain our end, however, namely, to portray Barnabas as a companion of Paul, it will be necessary to note some of the important incidents of the first missionary trip of the great Apostle.

While on Cyprus Barnabas and Paul journeyed through the island and came to Paphos, where they were opposed by the sorcerer Bar-Jesus, more commonly known as Elymas. Acts 13,9 tells us that Saul, "who is also called Paul;" --as Luke remarks at this place--



stepped up against him. It may be noted that Paul here assumed the leadership, which till now he had yielded to Barnabas. The historian Luke does not waste many words in explanation but simply says: "Saul (who is also called Paul)". In one other way Luke emphasizes the fact that the leadership has changed hands. Heretofore we read of the men as "Barnabas and Saul"; now the order is reversed to "Paul and Barnabas". Ramsay discusses this change of leadership at some length: "In the first place, he (Paul) was taking the leading place instead of being, as heretofore, the subordinate following Barnabas. Hence in the narrative we find that Barnabas introduced Saul to the apostles; Barnabas brought Saul to Antioch; Barnabas and Saul carried the Antiochian alms to Jerusalem; Barnabas and Saul brought back John Mark from Jerusalem; Barnabas was first and Saul last in the body of prophets and teachers of the Church at Antioch; Barnabas and Saul were selected by the Spirit; and Barnabas and Saul were invited to the proconsul's presence. But now Paul took this new departure and Paul and his company sailed away from Paphos to Pamphylia; Paul and Barnabas addressed the Gentiles in Antioch; Paul and Barnabas disputed with the Judaizing party on their return to Syrian Antioch; and henceforth the regular order places Paul first" (pp.83-84 in Ramsay's "Paul the Traveler and the Roman Citizen"). To this rule there are only two exceptions. At the Council of Jerusalem Barnabas is mentioned first. But then they were among Jews, who followed the order of seniority and Jewish precedence (Acts 15,12.25.). The other instance is the episode at Lystra. But there the very things which mark him out as a leader to us marked him out to the populace of Lycaonia as the spokesman and subordinate.



From Cyprus the two missionaries embarked for Perga in Pamphylia. Here John Mark left them. But this action of Mark did not keep Paul and Barnabas from carrying out their plans, to push through the Pisidian Highlands until they arrived at Antioch in Pisidia. Here they preached the gospel with great success. Finally, however, they were expelled from the city because of the hatred and jealousy of some of the Jews. But undaunted by the expulsion, the missionaries shook off the dust of their feet, as a testimony against them, and proceeded to Iconium.

For a considerable time they preached at that place unimpeded by any persecutions. But the Jews finally succeeded in exciting and exasperating also the souls of the inhabitants of Iconium against the two missionaries. Without waiting for an open outbreak of the enmity the men departed for Lystra and Derbe.

In Lystra Paul healed a cripple, who had been lame since the day of his birth. Lystra was also the city where the people considered the travelers as gods. They brought oxen and wreaths of flowers to the city gates intending to do obeisance to the strangers and to sacrifice. They suggested that Paul be called Hermes and Barnabas Zeus since they considered the latter the chief dignity while the former was the chief speaker and hence the messenger of the gods. Paul and Barnabas objected vigorously to this form of idolatry and used all of their persuasive power to disillusion the Lystrans. But persecution also came to Lystra and forced them to leave.

After they had spent some time in Derbe proclaiming the gospel, they decided to retrace their steps through the cities where the word had gained a foothold. This journey required some real



36  
missionary zeal since their travels took them through those very cities where they had been persecuted and whence they formerly been expelled. When this task had been completed, the two travelers returned to Antioch in Syria and remained there for some time resuming their former duties.

While Paul and Barnabas were in Antioch, a dispute arose with certain men concerning circumcision. It was finally agreed upon that they should go to Jerusalem, which they did. A great discussion followed. The result was that the stand of Paul and Barnabas was sanctioned and a letter was sent to the congregations and the brethren in Antioch, Syria and Cilicia. Gal.2,9 tells us that "the recognized pillars of the Church" gave pledges to Paul and Barnabas of a joint scheme, by which these men should work among the gentiles. It is noteworthy that in all these discussions Barnabas played a very important part since he is always mentioned together with Paul.

After Paul and Barnabas had continued for a period in Antioch teaching and preaching, Paul suggested to Barnabas that they make another journey to visit the brethren. Barnabas agreed; but he determined to take Mark along again. Paul was not in sympathy with that idea because Mark had deserted them at Pamphylia. The contention was so sharp that the two men separated. Paul took Silas along on the second journey, while Barnabas and John Mark departed for Cyprus. It is not probable that the final parting was made without being preceded by an amicable arrangement to divide the region.

Barnabas is not mentioned again in the Acts of the Apostles; but from the respect and sympathy with which St Paul refers to him



37

in his letters (1 Cor.9,6; Gal.2,13; Col.4,10;) we are entitled to draw the inference that, although they did not actually work together again, the old friendship was not forgotten. As to the later acts of Barnabas we are dependent upon traditions, which are at best uncertain. His tomb is shown at Salamis and it is possible that he did some successful work at that place.

Barnabas impresses himself upon us as a very important companion of Paul and a zealous and enthusiastic missionary. Luke speaks very highly of him: "He was a good man and full of the Holy Ghost and of faith" (Acts 11,24). Here we see that even Luke, who usually is rather sparing of words, could not refrain from stating that Barnabas was well qualified for the work of visitation, which he was to undertake at Antioch. Also the people of Jerusalem showed that they had great trust in the man's ability since the visitation placed quite a responsibility on the Cyprian.

It was Barnabas to whom the Antiochian congregation really owed its sound establishment. Therefore he is mentioned first in the list of prophets and teachers of that congregation (Acts 13,1). The historian of the Acts <sup>emphasizes</sup> this fact not only by mentioning Barnabas first on the list but also by placing this information just at this place. Surely it is not merely accidental collocation that the flourishing state of the Antiochian congregation with its large number of teachers is mentioned immediately after the return of Paul and especially Barnabas.

For the sake of completeness we must also refer to a certain weakness in the character of Barnabas. Paul calls attention to that Gal.2,13. When Peter and the Judaisers separated themselves from the gentiles, Barnabas also yielded to their influence. But this



was only for a short time. Not long after that he was again on Paul's side fighting valiantly for the right.

Therefore, in spite of this incident of weakness, Barnabas is a good Christian character, who is worthy to be considered among the great missionaries of the first Christian era. A.T. Robertson says of him: "Christianity can never forget the work of Barnabas even though he does not reveal the genius of Paul and John. He was a man for a critical period of early Christianity and helped to tide over the transition from the Jewish to the Gentile phase of Christian activity" (Expositor Vol. XVII page 19).

.....

After the disagreement with Paul at Antioch Barnabas and Mark set sail for Cyprus. It is for this reason that we find Paul accompanied on his second missionary journey by another companion. That man was Silvanus, more commonly known as Silas.

Silas was one of the delegates sent by the brethren in Jerusalem to the city of Antioch in order to communicate to the Christians of that city the resolutions of the Council of Jerusalem. The other delegate was Barsabas. These two men delivered the epistle (Acts 15,13), When the message had been delivered, Judas Barsabas returned to Jerusalem while Silvanus remained at Antioch, whence he set out with Paul on the second journey.

We do not know much about the person of Silas. Nothing is said about his place of birth. As to his nationality we have only one clue. According to Acts 16,37 he was a Roman citizen. As to the mode in which he obtained the Roman citizenship we are entirely ignorant.



Silas was the companion of the second journey. Possibly he had shown his special fitness by his ministration in Antioch and the fact that he preferred to stay at Antioch instead of returning to Jerusalem. These two men now traveled through Syria and Cilicia and confirmed the churches. It was of great importance that Silas accompanied Paul because his oral report might strengthen the document which they had with them from the pillars of the church at Jerusalem. From Cilicia they passed on to Galatia. Therefore Silas is included when Paul says Gal.1,8:"But though we, or an angel from heaven .....

"The first part of the journey leaves much to the imagination until we arrive at Lystra, where Paul and Silas met with young Timothy and took him along.

After they had traveled in Asia Minor for some days, Paul received the vision which urged him to go over into Macedonia. This vision came to Paul while he was yet at Troas, a seaport on the Aegean. After the company had been augmented by Luke, the physician, they sailed for Europe and arrived at Neapolis, the harbor of Philippi, which is about two miles from that city.

While in Philippi Paul and Silas met a certain woman named Lydia. She was a seller of purple of the city of Thyatira, who had probably moved to Philippi because it was a place well suited to her trade. When she heard these men preach, she attended diligently unto the things which were spoken of Paul and Silas. Soon she and her whole household were baptized. She also constrained the men to stay at her house during the time which they spent at Philippi.

But not all the inhabitants of Philippi were so kindly disposed toward these strangers and their preaching. Luke tells us an incident Acts 16,16-21:"And it came to pass, as we went to prayer  
*a certain damsel possessed with a spirit of divination met us*  
 a certain damsel possessed with a spirit of divination met us,



which brought her masters much gain by soothsaying: The same followed Paul and us, and cried, saying, These men are the servants of the most high God, which shew unto us the way of salvation. And this did she many days. But Paul, being grieved, turned and said to the spirit, I command thee in the name of Jesus Christ to come out of her. And he came out the same hour. And when the masters saw that the hope of their gains was gone, they caught Paul and Silas, and drew them into the marketplace unto the rulers, and brought them to the magistrates saying, these men, being Jews, do exceedingly trouble our city, and teach customs, which are not lawful for us to receive neither to observe, being Romans". Thereupon Paul and Silas were beaten and lashed unmercifully. They had to exchange the hospitable home of Lydia for the innermost dungeon of the prison at Philippi. Still they were not permitted even there to move about freely, because the jailer had been charged to fasten their limbs in the stocks. But in spite of these adverse conditions "Paul and Silas prayed and sang praises unto God" (Acts 16,25).

Through miraculous intervention, however, Paul and Silas were soon released. In the course of the night there was an earthquake, which caused the prison doors to be opened. When the jailer noticed that, he wanted to commit suicide, imagining that his prisoners had made their escape. Paul prevented that by saying: "Do thyself no harm, for we are all here". The jailer fell down before Paul and Silas and asked: "What must I do to be saved?" Upon their answer to this question he took them into his house, washed their bruises and in general tried to make them comfortable. Instead of being his prisoners they now became his honored guests. In time the two men instructed and baptized the whole household of the jailer. On the next day the magistrates were informed that their priso-



ners were Romans. They were frightened by this report and came to them and besought them and brought them out of the city. The company now traveled toward the Southwest through Thessalonica and Berea.

Paul and Silas must have spent quite some time at Thessalonica because Paul plied his trade during the stay (1Thess.2,9.). They undoubtedly spent a few months there since the Philippians sent him money twice during his sojourn(Phil.4,16). They stayed at the house of a certain Jason. But soon the position of the strangers became very precarious in that city. Jason, their host, got into some serious trouble with some of the people because of his hospitality toward the missionaries. Therefore the believers sent them away by night to the city of Berea.

At Berea Paul met with much hostility. So he soon moved on. But Silas and Timothy remained there. In the meantime Paul had been conducted to Athens by some of the brethren. He soon dismissed them with the charge to Silas and Timothy to join him in Athens as soon as possible. But before they arrived at Athens, conditions forced him to leave that city. Therefore they did not meet with him until they arrived at Corinth on the Isthmus.

While Paul was busy with his two-fold employment of labor in the workshop and weekly discussions in the synagogue, Silas and Timothy arrived at the Isthmian capital. Upon their arrival they gave a favorable report to Paul concerning the Macedonian congregations especially Thessalonica. This moved Paul to send a letter to the Thessalonians, which was written in the name of Silas, Timothy and himself(1Thess.1,1). Paul stayed in Athens over a year with his companions, so that they were still with him when he wrote the second



letter to the Thessalonians (2Thess.1,1).

We do not know what happened to Silas after this. Acts 18,18 seems to indicate that he did not go with Paul when the latter left Corinth. His name disappears from the historical section of the Bible. The last mention of his name is found 1 Peter 5,12, where he is called "a faithful brother unto them". Thus the same disciple is seen in the last mention of his name as one of the first to be cooperating for the welfare of the the church both with St Peter and with St Paul.

According to all indications Silas was a very faithful co-worker of Paul, who worked diligently and suffered much for the kingdom of God. His work is especially noteworthy in the Macedonian cities of Thessalonica and Berea. At the latter he continued to work independently after Paul's departure. Also in Corinth he was busily engaged in teaching the congregation (2Cor.1,19). Also the sufferings, which he endured for the Gospel's sake, must not be minimized. Even while Paul was already in Corinth, his flesh still rebelled at the cruel and shameful treatment which he and also Silas had endured at the hand of the Philippians when he wrote to the Thessalonians ch.2,2:"We had suffered and were shamefully entreated".

The two noteworthy characteristics of Silas were his trust and his meekness. When Silas and Paul were lying in the Philippian dungeon, they sang praises to God in spite of imprisonment, smarts and stocks. Their trust in God was so great that it elicited admiration even from the other prisoners. The other quality is meekness. When they were called "Sirs" by the jailer at Philippi, they did not glorify themselves as supernatural, but they pointed the jailer to Jesus as the only hope of salvation. Silas was indeed a good



companion; a pious Christian, a zealous missionary and, as St Peter calls him, "a faithful brother" (1 Peter 5,12).

.....

Among the companions of Paul at the time of the riot of Ephesus Aristarchus, the man from Macedonia, is especially mentioned (Acts 19,29). Nothing is known about his family interest, but there are a few statements in the Acts and Epistles, which give us other valuable information.

Aristarchus was among the men who accompanied the bountiful collection to its destination in Jerusalem. Although there is no definite statement to that effect, yet it may be presumed that Aristarchus was in Paul's company when he left Ephesus after the riot. When Paul and his company had arrived in Macedonia, he dispatched Titus to the Corinthian congregation with the second letter. Two of the brethren were sent with him. It has been quite generally accepted that one of them was Luke, the physician, "the brother, whose praise is in the gospel throughout the churches" (2Cor,8,18.). Concerning the other one Paul writes the following: "And we have sent with them our brother, whom we have oftentimes proved diligent in many things, but now much more diligent, upon the great confidence which I have in you". The name of the brother is not mentioned; but all the attending circumstances point quite clearly to Aristarchus.

As a Macedonian he was also a European and therefore the logical man to send to the European congregation at Corinth. This fact probably added to his choice. We find other incidents and instances where the attending circumstances and advantages were employed. In the earlier narrative of the Acts we are told that some



of the Grecian women had been slighted in the disbursements of 44 money for the poor. At that occasion most of the men who were appointed as caretakers of the alms had Grecian names. Seemingly these brothers were sent by the Macedonian churches. Therefore they would sooner pick a representative from Macedonia than for instance Trophimus an Ephesian, who would not be so well acquainted with European conditions.

This Macedonian companion was among the attendants of Paul during the Caesarean captivity. The impression is also given that Aristarchus was among the companions on the journey to Rome. Acts 27,2 we read: "And entering into a ship of Adramyttium we launched, meaning to sail by the coasts of Asia; one Aristarchus a Macedonian of Thessalonica being with us". This seems to indicate that Aristarchus went along to Rome. At second thought, however, this impression wanes. The question would arise why he is mentioned especially from the company. Again, we ask, why would his home be mentioned? The following is offered as a solution. Aristarchus was intending to go home. The main Asiatic port for ships traveling to Macedonia was Troas (Adramyttium was near Troas). The details concerning Aristarchus were just given in the biblical account to tell the readers that he took the same boat as the other men did; but while they went to Rome, he just made his way to his home in Macedonia. No doubt this was done with the Apostle's sanction, since it would be the proper thing for someone to go to Macedonia and give the Macedonians a financial report and some information regarding the blessings worked by the collection, in which they had been so deeply interested and toward which they had contributed so bountifully (2 Cor. 8,2). From there he may have proceeded to Corinth in order to report to them also.



~~time~~ ~~time~~.

From Corinth Aristarchus probably proceeded to Rome, where we find him as "fellowprisoner" saluting the Colossian congregation. Also in the letter to Philemon greetings are sent along from Aristarchus. No more information is available except that of traditions, which state that he suffered martyrdom under Nero.

.....

The report of Luke in the Acts concerning the departure from Ephesus and the sojourn in Macedonia in the course of the third missionary journey is very meager. We may draw the inference from Acts 20,4, which describes these incidents during this same apostolic progress, that Tychicus and Trophimus were two of the companions at Paul's departure from Ephesus. Hence they were at the riot in that city of the goddess Diana.

Both of these men seem to have remained faithful to the Apostle in spite of all the calamities which followed. Both of them exerted themselves in his influence and executed many of his orders. Both are also mentioned as his friends and followers almost with his dying breath (2 Tim. 4, 12, 20).

Tychicus as well as Trophimus came from western Asia Minor. Trophimus came from Ephesus (Acts 21, 29) while the remarks in Acts 20, 4 and Eph. 6, 21, 22 lead us to believe that Tychicus also had his home in or near Ephesus.

Trophimus, the Ephesian, was with Paul at the end of the third journey. His presence in the temple was the chief cause for the riot at Jerusalem since he was a gentile. The only other passage in the New Testament where his name occurs is 2 Tim. 4, 20, where



46

St Paul says: " Trophimus I left sick at Miletus". This incident, as we know, happened after the first imprisonment and probably while Paul was making his journey from Ephesus to Nicopolis in the fall before his death at Rome.

Tychicus is mentioned four times in the Pauline epistles. He was the bearer of the letter to the Ephesians (Eph.6,21.22). and that to the Colossians (Col 4,7). In him Onesimus, the slave, had a good companion on his journey to Colossae (Col.4,9). After the first captivity at Rome Tychicus seems to have been near the Apostle since Paul expects to send either him or Artemas to Crete(Titus 3,12). He probably did send Artemas and kept Tychicus for another mission. According to 2Tim.4,12 he was sent to Ephesus. This might have occurred shortly before Paul entered the severe second captivity. Just how these last statements of Paul concerning Tychicus may be harmonized, we are not in a position to say. At any rate we may draw the conclusion that he was a co-worker of Paul, who is well worthy of the praise accorded to him Col.4,7:"Tychicus,,,,, who is a beloved brother, and a faithful minister and fello-servant in the Lord".

.....

There is among the companions of Paul a certain person, who may be considered as a kind of parallel to John Mark, the evangelist. That man is Demas. In the Letter to Philemon Demas is called a "fellowprisoner". Whence he came and when he joined the Apostle, can not be definitely ascertained either from the Acts or the Epistles. There are, however, a few probable suppositions. When Demas departed from Paul, he went to Thessalonica (2 Tim.4,14). Hence we may conclude that he was a Macedonian from Thessalonica.

The following is an explanation of how we may account for



his presence in Rome during the first captivity. When the collection for the needy had been completed in Europe, several of the companions of Paul went directly to Troas. Then Luke goes to tell us: "These going before tarried at Troas. And we sailed from Philippi!" Who is meant with "we"? Surely not only Luke and St Paul since in all probability the collection was divided between the two companies. Therefore this second portion needed more than just two men to have it in safe keeping. Therefore we conclude that there must have been more than two in this party. Accordingly we may suppose that Demas of Thessalonica was among them. He probably accompanied Paul to Caesarea and from there to his captivity in Rome. There he is among those saluting Philemon and the Colossian congregation (Philemon 24; Col.4,14). We do not know what Demas did in the space of time between the first and second Roman captivity. He may have been Paul's companion ministering to the Apostle as Timothy and Mark had formerly done.

A suggestion has been made to compare Demas with Mark. The comparison is made because of a certain sad incident in the life of both of the man. During the second captivity at Rome Demas forsook Paul and returned to Thessalonica. It is with a note of sadness that Paul writes to Timothy: "Demas has forsaken me , having loved thêspresent world, and is departed unto Thessalonica!" (2 Tim,4,10). He also gives the reason:"having loved this present world". Paul had two distinct reasons for being sad. The one was very likely his sympathy for the man who had deserted him. The other was his feeling of friendlessness. Therefore he asked Timothy and John Mark to come.

The Bible gives us no more information as to what happened



to Demas in later years. It may be added that as the fault of Mark and Demas was similar so the repentance of John Mark may also have been paralleled by that of Demas.



It is still an undecided question whether the two names Epaphras and Epaphroditus refer to the same person or not. In reading the remarks which Paul makes concerning them we arrive at the conclusion that they very probably were two distinct names since Epaphras is mentioned mainly in the Epistle to the Colossians while Epaphroditus figures prominently in the Letter to the Philippians.

Epaphras was a native of the city of Colosse (Col.4,12); It is possible that he was the founder of the Colossian congregation(Col.1,7:"as ye also learned of Epaphras"). He may also have preached the Gospel in the neighboring towns of Laodicea and Hierapolis.(Col.4,12.13.).

While Paul was in his first Roman imprisonment, Epaphras visited him and communicated to him the unwelcome tidings that the faith of the Colossians was in danger of being perverted by false teachers(Col.1,4-8). While he was yet in Rome, Paul sent greetings to Philemon from "Epaphras my fellowprisoner". This would not necessarily have to mean that Epaphras was lying in bonds, but it may indicate that he lived in the same house with Paul, which was at the same time his prison. He is the only one besides Timothy whom Paul designated as a "bond servant of Jesus Christ"(Col.4,12). In the same epistle Paul gives him another favorable comment and speaks of him as "a faithful minister of Christ"(Col.1,7).

Epaphroditus is known to us only by a few allusions in



the Epistle to the Philippians. He may have been a native of Philippi. At any rate he was sent by the Philippians to visit Paul in Rome and to bring him some pecuniary aid. Instead of returning home at once he stayed there for some time and ministered to the Apostle(Phil.2,25). But it seems as though he had overtaxed his strength. He is spoken of as "sick nigh unto death"(Phil,2,26). Upon his recovery he was very anxious to return to Philippi. Paul approved of this and at the same time made him the bearer of the Letter to the Philippians.

Paul's high regard for Epaphroditus is shown by these three expressions:"my brother and companion and fellowsoldier". Lightfoot comments on these three words as denoting "common sympathy, common common work, and common danger toil and suffering".

.....

The name Erastus is not given among the men carrying the collection for the needy at Jerusalem. But there is another trace of him, which would put <sup>him</sup> among the companions of the third journey. While Paul was prolonging his stay at Ephesus, he sent Erastus to Macedonia together with Timothy. Some scholars have tried to prove that he was subsequently one of the companions who went with Titus to Corinth. But we have decided on Luke and Aristarchus to fill these places. It is probable, however, that he was on the latter part of the third journey although he is not mentioned among the men of Acts 20,4. Like others he may have traveled with that group which traveled to Troas via Philippi and evidently carried part of the collection by that route.

It is questionable whether this is the same Erastus who is called the chamberlain of the city of Corinth(Rom.16,23), who also



stayed in the city of Corinth according to 2Tim.4,20. But we lack the necessary historical information to make any definite statement to that effect.

.....

Among the people that are mentioned in connection with Paul the name of Gaius occurs four times. Twice it is used of a certain Christian at Corinth, whom Paul had baptized and whose hospitality he had enjoyed in Achaia (Rom.16,23; 1Cor.1,14;). But the other two times the name refers to companions of Paul. The one is called Gaius of Derbe, who accompanied Paul on his last journey to Asia (Acts 22,4) and the other Gaius the Macedonian, who was dragged into the amphitheater at Ephesus during the riot(Acts 19,99). A suggestion has been offered to identify the last two. In the narrative of the Ephesian riot there are certain manuscripts that read "Gaius and Aristarchus, the Macedonian". The reason for this explanation becomes very plausible if we remember that the following word is the plural noun "companions". It would only mean the omission of an "s". We know, of course, that an argument of this kind is not strong enough to form the basis of an opinion, but nevertheless it sounds plausible. Otherwise we must think of two men among the Pauline companions bearing the name Gaius, one a Macedonian and the other a man from the city of Derbe.

.....

Besides this last group of companions, which we have classed as minor characters, there is a host of others. But the information regarding those men is so limited that very little may be said about them which is based on history. Among them there is Judas, surnamed Barsabas, who was sent by the brethren from Jerusalem to the Antiochian congregation as the other representative besides



Silas (Acts 15,22). There was Crescens, who traveled to Galatia <sup>51</sup> (probably Gaul) in order to preach there as Titus was to do in Dalmatia (2Tim.4,10). The carrier of the Letter to the Romans was Phebe, a deaconess of the Corinthian port of Cenchrea (Rom.16,1). Greetings were sent from Rome by Lucius, Sosipater, Jason the Thessalonian, who had been Paul's host at Thessalonica (Acts 17,5), and others. If we were to mention all the other people who are only mentioned by name in the various letters and concerning whom we have no further information, we would be forced to prepare a long list of names, which would really serve no purpose.

"After these things Paul departed from Athens, and came to Corinth; and found there a certain Jew named Aquila, born in Pontus, lately come from Italy, with his wife Priscilla; (because that Claudius had commanded all Jews to depart from Rome:) and came unto them". (Acts 18,1,2.) This is the way in which Luke introduces the couple, which played such an important part in the early mission history and also in the life of St Paul. The historian does not tell us very much about these people, but yet there are a few items of interest. Aquila was "a certain Jew from Pontus", a province in Asia Minor east of the Euxine Sea. Equally or even more important was his wife Prisca, or Priscilla. No definite information may be obtained concerning the nationality of Priscilla. The omission of such information in Acts 18,2 seems to indicate that she was not a Jewess. It has been noted before that just such little details in Luke's writings often are the clue to some valuable information. Hort, who made a special study of this question, suggests that Priscilla was a member of a distinguished Roman family. The supposition, that it was a Roman family, is based on the fact that Aquila



and Priscilla had lived in Rome before they came to Corinth. The conjecture, that Priscilla was of high social rank, originated from the fact that her name is occasionally mentioned before that of her husband (Rom. 16, 13; 2 Tim. 4, 19). Another point in favor of this view is the fact that, unlike most cases, her name is always especially referred to whenever the couple is mentioned, while, otherwise we often find allusions in the Scriptures only concerning the husband. This conjecture concerning Priscilla's nationality, however, is only a plausible suggestion and must not be rated as an established fact.

When Paul met the couple at Corinth, they had just arrived from Italy. They were tentmakers by trade and had probably plied their trade at Rome. Also the reason why they left Rome is given. The Emperor Claudius had issued an edict expelling all the Jews from Rome. This decree was issued in the year 49 A.D.

This meeting between Aquila and Priscilla and Paul is not mentioned merely as an historical detail, but it has its bearing on the subject matter. After Paul had spent some time in the company of these people both in Corinth and in Ephesus, he declared his intention of journeying to Rome (Acts 19, 21). Aquila, no doubt, had told Paul of the importance and necessity of mission work in the great center of Roman life. This may be classed as a parallel of Luke's possible connection with the first Macedonian journey.

Before the final departure of Paul and his company to Ephesus Luke tells us: "And Paul after this tarried there yet a good while, and then took leave of the brethren into Syria, and with him Priscilla and Aquila; having shorn his head in Cenchrea: for he had a vow" (Acts 18, 18). Who made this vow? According to the



English Version of the New Testament Paul makes the vow. But the original Greek seems to imply that the vow was made by Aquila. Such a vow was usually made in times of sickness and danger. Luke does not tell us what caused Aquila to make such a vow. It may have been a serious illness. It may also have been some critical situation in the course of the stormy days at Corinth, during which he had risked to save the Apostle. Paul refers to some incident of that kind when he speaks of the husband and wife as "having risked their life for me" (Rom. 16, 3). The objection might be raised that Priscilla did not make the vow. But this would not be an insuperable objection. This little incident gives us a fine example of Aquila's conscientiousness.

After the vow at Cenchrea had been completed, Aquila and Priscilla sailed with Paul to the City of Ephesus. Verses 18 and 19 of chapter 18 are not a contradiction. They started with Paul on the journey toward Syria but remained at Ephesus while Paul went on to Antioch in Syria. Here they must have stayed for some time because from there they with the congregation in their house sent greetings to the Corinthians (1 Cor. 16, 19).

While Aquila and Priscilla were in Ephesus, a certain Jew from Alexandria, "an eloquent man and mighty in the Scriptures" (Acts 18, 24), came to the city. That man was Apollo. He was an enthusiastic missionary, who spoke the word of God with great power. But he knew only the baptism of John. Aquila and Priscilla received him into their home and "expounded the way of God to him more perfectly" (Acts 18, 26).

"Greet Priscilla and Aquila my helpers in Christ Jesus: who have for my life laid down their own necks: unto whom not only



I give thanks, but also all the churches of the Gentiles." (Rom.16,3.4) These words show the attitude which Paul took toward Priscilla and Aquila. It is a great tribute which Paul pays to them. They had such high regard for him that they were willing to suffer death in order to save him. It is impossible to set a definite time for this incident. It may refer to different similar happenings both in Corinth or during the riot at Ephesus or at any other place.

Also Apollo owed them personal thanks because it was this couple that had "expounded the way of the Lord to him more perfectly. In Rom.16,4 Paul goes one step farther. He states that all the churches of the Gentiles owed them thanks. The Jewish couple must have had many friends in the different congregations because of their hospitality to individuals as well as to the whole congregations and their Christian attitude, which they exhibited wherever they went. Especially did the congregation at Corinth owe them a good measure of gratitude because it was one of their teachers, Apollo, whom this couple had so faithfully instructed.

The last and the most exceptional among the companions of Paul is the slave Onesimus. He was a fugitive Asiatic slave, who belonged to Philemon, a member of the church at Colosse. From the letter which Paul wrote to Philemon we gather the information that he had robbed his master, had fled from Colosse and had finally found his way to Rome. Thus he was not merely a runaway slave and a representative of "the least respectable type of the least respectable class in the social scale" (Lightfoot), but he was also a thief and a robber, who had dared to lay his hands on the goods of his master.

In the letter Paul does not try to conceal the crime of



Onesimus. It seems as though he had sunk to the very bottom. Upon his arrival in Rome the slave had probably "wallowed in the cesspool of humanity as one of the offscouring of humanity" (Robertson). This depravity may be easily explained. Profligate and unprincipled as we know even the most educated society to have been, what must have been in its dregs and offal?

Just how this depraved and runaway slave came to hear Paul, we do not know. It is possible, however, that some Asiatic Christian had recognized him at Rome and had brought him to hear the illustrious prisoner and preacher. However this may be, we know that by God's divine guidance the slave had been dragged from this cesspool of iniquity by the hand of Christian love and had become a Christian. In the course of communications he became so near and dear to the Apostle that he calls him "my son Onesimus, whom I have begotten in my bonds".

The meeting threw a new problem before Paul. He wished to keep Onesimus at Rome and employ him in the service of the Gospel. But yet his "Pflichtgefuehl" kept him from transgressing the law and violating the rights of Philemon by acting in this matter without his consent. So when an opportunity was given to have Onesimus travel to Colosse in good company, Paul made use of the opportunity to send the slave back to his master.

Although Onesimus, the pagan slave, was a black character, yet Onesimus, the repentant sinner, returning home to his master, was a person who had a number of good characteristics. We may get at them a little closer if we look at Paul's plea for him. Paul says to Philemon he is "now profitable to thee and to me". He even



was very anxious to keep him at Rome. Verse 13 we read: "Whom I would have retained with me, that in thy stead he might have ministered unto me in the bonds of the gospel". He calls him "my son begotten in my bonds (v.10). In verse 12 he even tells Philemon: "Receive him that is mine own bowels".

The whole thought of the letter to Philemon is a plea to set Onesimus free, although Paul does not say it in so many words. But Philemon could hardly misunderstand the language of Paul. The question arises, did Philemon set Onesimus free? We do not know. It is hardly imagineable that Paul's plea in behalf of Onesimus was in vain. Tradition (Apostolical Canon) gives the information that Philemon forgave Onesimus and manumitted him. The Bible gives us no definite answer. There are a number of rumors afloat. One of them <sup>is</sup> that he became Bishop of Beroea. According to another tradition he journeyed to Spain. Still another tells us that he was martyred in Rome. The very number of rumors, however, speak for their uncertainty and cause us to <sup>be</sup> beware of any conclusive statements concerning his later life.

.....

It is indeed a mottled crowd that must be considered under the title "Companions of Paul". People from many different walks of life came in contact with the great missionary apostle. Among them there was Luke, the physician, and educated man and yet a believing child of God. Among his close associates there was Mark, the son of a comparatively wealthy woman. There was Titus, a Greek, to whom Paul later entrusted the congregations on the island of Cyprus. Other companions never played such an important part in his life, and yet they were near and dear to him. Besides these we can not refrain from mentioning the couple plying his own trade



trade, to whom he was attracted especially because of their fine Christian spirit and their missionary zeal. Last but not least we find among his associates the runaway but repentant slave Onesimus. In many cases it seems to have been due to the Apostle's influence, humanly speaking, that these companions played the role which they did. Timothy, the Lystran, and Onesimus the slave are the best examples for such a statement. In conclusion we may say that this variegated array is a sure sign of the fact that Paul's principle was the same in practice as it was in the words which he wrote to the Galatians: "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus" (Gal. 3, 28.).



B I B L I O G R A P H Y.

58

- Kretzmann Popular Commentary.
- Hayes Paul and His Epistles.
- Ramsay St Paul the Traveler and the Roman Citizen.
- Fuerbringer Einleitung in das Neue Testament.
- Stalker Life of St Paul.
- Hastings Bible Dictionary.
- Davis Bible Dictionary.
- Ramsay Luke the Physician.
- Conybeare & Howson Life Times and Travels of St Paul.
- Hastings Dictionary of the Apostolic Church.
- Askwith Epistle to the Galatians.
- Weiss Urchristentum.
- Harnack Untersuchung der Schriften Lukas.
- Weidner Commentary on the Gospel of Mark.
- Mezger Apostelgeschichte St Lucä.
- Sell Studies of Great Bible Characters.
- Synodical Report Minnesota 1913.
- " " North Dakota & Montana 1910.
- " " Eastern 1907. 1910. 1912.
- Commentary Jamieson Fausset & Brown.
- Volume XVII The Expositor.
- Buechner Hand-Konkordanz.
- The Expositors Bible.