

je ne doute pas qu'on doive l'identifier avec l'ambon ; c'est même, si je ne me trompe, l'exemple le plus ancien de *gradus* dans ce sens. Ce déplacement provoqua des murmures à Ravenne : *nec uos locorum mutatio tam propinqua et spatia sic artata aut reddant desides, aut faciant murmurantes*. Böhmer croit que l'on murmure quand l'évêque prêche de son siège, parce qu'on est plus à l'étroit dans l'abside. Mais le peuple n'entrait évidemment pas dans l'abside pour écouter, il conservait sa place, il n'y était pas à l'étroit. Quand l'évêque prêchait à l'ambon, l'espace entre l'évêque et le peuple était plus étroit, les regards et les remontrances du prédicateur atteignaient plus directement les coupables. Je comprends que ceux-ci n'approuvaient pas cette insistance, cette proximité menaçante, qui était probablement une innovation. Il y a là un trait de mœurs qu'il ne faut pas proposer à l'imitation, mais qu'il est intéressant de noter.

Les citations bibliques du Chrysologue mériteraient une étude, mais dans l'état actuel des textes, elle serait prématurée. Dans le sermon 143 nous lisons '*super humilem et mansuetum et trementem uerba mea* (Is. lxvi, 2). *Humilem et mansuetum, quantum mansuetus est . . . , inmansuetus tantum est . . .*' Qui douterait de la variante '*mansuetum*' si bien attestée? Cependant le Vaticanus a '*humilem et quietum . . .* *Humilem et quietum, quantum quietus est . . . inquietus est . . .*' D'un côté ou de l'autre il y a eu une revision systématique.

DONATIEN DE BRUYNE, O.S.B.

THE TRIAL OF ST PAUL AT EPHESUS

THE theory that Paul was for a considerable period in prison during his three years stay in Ephesus while upon his third missionary journey (Acts xix), and the attempt to date from Ephesus the extant Captivity-letters, have met with a growing interest and appreciation. This is shewn by the literature upon the subject, the most complete bibliography of which is given by A. Deissmann in his work, *Paul: a study in social and religious history* (translated by W. E. Wilson, 2nd ed., London 1926, pp. 16-17). That numerous English scholars have applied themselves to the study of this hypothesis is proof that in England also the question has received special attention. As the dating of the letters of the captivity of Paul is of far-reaching consequence, not only for the historical representation of the Apostle's life but also for the understanding of his religious thought, as well as for the practical exposition of his letters by the preacher and teacher, the lively interest in the discussion of our hypothesis does not need ex-

planation. In the following article, I try to present the most important points of view, referring the reader in quest of fuller argument and proof to the literature, especially to my own monograph, *Die Gefangenschaft des Paulus in Ephesus und das Itinerar des Timotheus: Untersuchungen zur Chronologie des Paulus und der Paulusbrieve* (Neutestamentliche Forschungen, herausgegeben von Otto Schmitz: 1. Reihe, Heft 3, Gütersloh 1925), the writing of which I owe to the inspiration of my teacher, Adolf Deissmann.

We must, first of all, bring under consideration the circumstances of the origin of the letter to the Philippians. It is clear that we must observe the methodological principle that only when the hitherto accepted belief that Philippians was composed in Rome (or Caesarea) is disproved can its composition in Ephesus be supposed. It is not admissible to set aside the tradition regarding the writing of Philippians without reason for doing so, just as in any case it is undesirable to frame new hypotheses when there are no difficulties in a current tradition that make a new hypothesis requisite. For this reason the methodological justification of the hypothesis that Philippians was written in Ephesus must needs lie in the improbability or impossibility of the letter being composed in Rome (or Caesarea). The more convincingly the impossibility of the dating of the letter from Rome (or Caesarea) can be shewn, the stronger becomes the hypothesis of its dating from Ephesus. Therefore the question must be put and answered:

A. *On what grounds may it be supposed Philippians was not written in Rome (or Caesarea)?*

I. There is no evidence which decisively or exclusively favours Rome (or Caesarea) as the place of composition.

(a) The letter itself gives no evidence as to the place of its origin. That 1 Corinthians was written in Ephesus emerges from its own plain statement (xvi 8), but Philippians gives no similar self-witness.

(b) The mention of the praetorium i 13 and of the slaves of Caesar iv 22, does not point, as has often been shewn, exclusively to Rome. There were praetoria elsewhere, e. g. in Jerusalem (Matt. xxvii 27) and Caesarea (Acts xxiii 35), and slaves of the imperial household were to be found throughout the whole Empire.

(c) Ancient tradition does indeed date Philippians from Rome. Rome is stated as the place of writing in the postscripts to the letter in the MSS and in the Marcionite prologue to Philippians. But these statements must without doubt be traced to i 13 and iv 22 having been taken as referring to Rome, and cannot therefore be given the value of

independent witness. Moreover, one may venture to say that they are not free from a suspicion of being inspired by a tendency of a definite kind. It would seem certain that the letters of Paul were collected at an early period, and first in the districts of the Apostle's missionary activities in Asia Minor or Corinth. But that the final, or what may be termed the canonical, collection took place in Rome may also be surmised. At this time the Roman Church was doubtless imbued with a strong interest in dating, as far as possible, the letters of this collection as from (and to) Rome. That such a tendency on the part of the Roman Church was not without influence on the formation of the canon, seems to be revealed in the uncertainty in the tradition of the Roman address of the epistle to the Romans and with regard even to the integrity of that letter itself. This influence is an element in the question to which attention has not yet been sufficiently directed. Such considerations diminish appreciably the value of the tradition that Rome was the place where *Philippians* was written.

(d) It has often been stated that the language of *Philippians* (and of the Captivity-letters as a whole) differs from that of the other letters, and that in this letter the 'ageing' Paul is speaking. This argument is of an extremely dubious nature, as can be exemplified by numerous instances drawn from the wide field of universal literature; and examination of the individual phrases, that might seem to support it, renders it untenable. The epistles of Paul which have been preserved to us form so small a portion of his correspondence that we can frame from them no canon of diction. It is only, therefore, with the utmost caution that we can draw evidence from linguistic differences within the letters which have chanced to survive.

(e) The same consideration qualifies the statement that the content of *Philippians* (and of the Captivity-letters as a whole), so far as it reveals the religious and theological thought of the Apostle, differs in theological character from the rest of the letters of Paul and indicates a later stage of development. This affirmation is based on the unjustifiable assumption that Pauline conceptions, from the period of the third missionary-journey onwards, must have undergone an 'evolution'. But this, again, cannot be established, as investigation of particular instances in question can shew. The fact that the whole extant correspondence of Paul is of a fragmentary nature, and that the few letters we possess from him are of an occasional kind (*Gelegenheitsschreiben*), precludes us from constructing a canon of Pauline theology by means of which an 'evolution' of his thoughts can be diagnosed. When his writings are subjected to examination, the thesis that in them there is and must be a uniform system of thought, does not secure judgement in its favour.

II. The following considerations are decidedly unfavourable to the view that *Philippians* was composed in Rome (or Caesarea):

(a) The letter discloses that before the time of writing there had been journeys between Philippi and the locus of its composition, and that for the period after its composition more journeys between Philippi and the place from which the letter was written are contemplated. In this connexion we must reflect that the distance between the two places has either already been travelled eight times, or is to be so; and if we compute the distance between Philippi and Rome (or Philippi and Caesarea) the impossibility of dating the letter from Rome (or Caesarea) becomes apparent. For even if the journeys between Philippi and Rome (or Caesarea) had followed close upon one another and had occupied the shortest possible time, they cannot be fitted into the scheme of Pauline chronology. Further, the 'soon' of ii 19, ii 24 seems to signify that it is not any very great distance which the author of the letter has in view. This argument, which is based on the data of distance as being decisively against the composition of *Philippians* in Rome, is represented by Deissmann in his *Zur ephesinischen Gefangenschaft des Apostels Paulus* (in 'Anatolian Studies' presented to Sir William Mitchell Ramsay, Manchester, 1923, pp. 121-127).

(b) The projected travels and missionary plans of Paul, from the time of the third missionary-journey, had the West in view. Acts xix 22 and xxiii 11 prevent us from assuming that Paul, while imprisoned in Caesarea, expressed his purpose, in the event of obtaining freedom, of journeying not to Rome but to Philippi (or indeed, if we take account of Colossians and Philemon, into the interior of Asia Minor). Also, altogether apart from the question whether Paul could accomplish the journey to Spain, Rom. xv 24 renders it impossible for us to believe that Paul while in prison in Rome expressed the intention of proceeding, if freed, not to Spain but to Philippi (or the interior of Asia Minor). This objection loses, of course, some of its significance if the possibility of a second Roman imprisonment be postulated, and if the notes which appear in the Pastoral epistles be held to be genuine: but it does not even then fall to the ground.

(c) Phil. ii 12 indicates that Paul, when he wrote the letter, had only once been among the Christians in Philippi, namely at the founding of the Church there. At the time, however, of the imprisonments in Caesarea and Rome he must have been at least twice, if not three times, in Philippi (Acts xx 1; cf. 2 Corinthians, as also clearly Acts xx 6).

(d) Also from Phil. iv 15, 16 it appears that Paul, after the foundation of the Church on the second missionary-journey, had not been

again in Philippi, and therefore that the recollections of this time are the last and are yet comparatively fresh.

Thus, since nothing in the evidence we have before us points particularly or exclusively to Rome (or Caesarea), but much on the contrary particularly away from Rome (or Caesarea), the methodological justification of the hypothesis that *Philippians* was written in Ephesus during the third missionary-journey, is clearly brought to light, and we can now turn to the second question.

B. *Why must we regard Philippians as written from Ephesus?*

I. Before submitting reasons for the composition of *Philippians* in Ephesus, we may attempt to remove the objections to this supposition. What are these objections? Are they valid?

(a) It is true that *Acts* does not report an imprisonment of Paul in Ephesus or any judicial trial of the Apostle there. But the narrative of *Acts* of the three years' stay of Paul in Ephesus is certainly fragmentary, and it would appear as if Luke had definite reason for passing over this period with relative brevity. Also the account of St Paul summoning the elders of the Church of Ephesus (*Acts* xx 17) to Miletus, and the avoidance on his journey on that occasion of a visit to Ephesus, suggest that in this city difficulties had confronted him which were both more considerable and of another sort than *Acts* xix communicates. The objection that St Luke may have indeed omitted less important events, but that he could hardly have left the fact of an imprisonment in Ephesus unmentioned, is not one that can be urged with effect. For the list of trials and sufferings, 2 Cor. xi 23, which Paul experienced on his missionary campaigns demonstrates that *Acts* leaves us widely uninformed of unfortunate experiences of the Apostle. The use of the plural 'imprisonments' in xi 23 of 2 Corinthians, a letter written before the imprisonments in Caesarea and Rome, proves that Paul was more often in captivity than *Acts* relates. According to the First Epistle of Clement v 6 he was 'seven times in bonds'.

(b) As little as the speech and outlook of *Philippians* speak for the composition of the letter in Rome (or Caesarea), so little do they speak against its composition in the time of the third missionary-journey (cf. A. I, d, e).

II. What can be said on behalf of the composition of *Philippians* in Ephesus?

(a) The journeys which the letter presupposes (cf. A. II, a), if we consider the distance to be covered as Philippi to Ephesus, are possible (cf. *Acts* xx 6-17).

(b) In Ephesus there was assuredly a praetorium, though its site has not yet been established by excavation with certainty.

(c) In Ephesus were stationed, as can be proved, slaves of the imperial household.

(d) When Paul was in Ephesus he had only been once in Philippi (cf. A. II, c and d), namely, when the Church there had been founded.

(e) The Marcionite prologue to Colossians states: *ergo apostolus iam ligatus scribit eis ab Epheso.*

(f) The Muratorian Canon places the letters Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians next after 1 Corinthians.

(g) A watch-tower which yet remains as part of the city-wall of pre-Christian times is called in the local tradition 'Paul's prison'.

(h) 1 Cor. xv 32 reports that, in Ephesus, Paul was in danger of being condemned to fight with wild beasts. The literal interpretation of the technical expression 'to fight with beasts' cannot be gainsaid. (Cf. C. R. Bowen, 'I fought with beasts in Ephesus', *Journal of Bibl. Lit.*, vol. xlii, Parts I and II, 1923, pp. 59-68.)

(i) The historical, personal, and local data of Philippians fit into the period of the third missionary-journey strikingly well. Particularly illuminating is the equation, Acts xix 22 = 1 Cor. iv 17, xvi 10 = Phil. ii 19. In all these passages the reference is to one and the same journey of Timothy, the route being Ephesus—Macedonia (Philippi)—Corinth—Ephesus. Equally clear also is the equation, Acts xix 21 = 1 Cor. xvi 3-9 = Phil. ii 24, where the reference is to one and the same journey by the route Ephesus—Macedonia—Corinth—Jerusalem. The accomplishment of this journey is recorded by Acts xx 1 f, 2 Cor. ii 12, 13, vii 5 f, viii 1, and Rom. xv 25, 26. Further combinations, for which I refer the reader to my book, cannot be indicated in this short sketch, but the above passages provide opportunity for decision as to the possibility of placing Philippians in the period of the third missionary-journey.

The reasons for and against the Ephesus-hypothesis have naturally different degrees of cogency. Those which count less clearly in its favour are, however, supported by those which are admittedly more telling, among which I would especially emphasize those marked B. II, a and z. But what now are the consequences of our dating Philippians from Ephesus? Paul was in captivity in Ephesus. This imprisonment presupposes a judicial process. Since Paul, in the event of his condemnation, would have had to fight with beasts, the charge against him must have been one which had attached to it this kind of punishment. Presumably the charge was that of exciting to the breach of the peace and was preferred against Paul by the Jews. The Jews of Thessalonica, Acts xvii 6, also bring this accusation against Paul. In

the course of the trial at Ephesus it comes to light nevertheless that Paul has been accused on account of his Christian faith and his missionary success, and that the specific charge against him of disturbance of the peace of the realm cannot be substantiated (Phil. i 12, 13). The judicial proceedings then took, for the Apostle, a fortunate turn, as they had in a similar case in Corinth (Acts xviii 14, 15). Philippians was written at a time when Paul was still under arrest, but could count upon release and entertain plans of journeys for the near future (Phil. ii 19 f, 25, 26). 1 Corinthians is written when Paul is again free and can look back upon the danger that had threatened him, of being sentenced *ad bestias*, as upon a peril of the recent past well known to the Corinthians (1 Cor. xv 32). That Paul had not been sentenced to this punishment, is evident from the argument of 1 Cor. xv where it is not deliverance from the danger of death (for, as he remains alive, escape from the danger must be supposed) but the experience of such danger which alone can have the force of proof in the reasoning for a belief in a resurrection of the dead. If 1 Corinthians was written about Easter A.D. 55, then Philippians was composed about the middle or the end of the winter 54/55, and the imprisonment began in the autumn or winter of 54. With the Demetrius-riot (Acts xix 23 f) or the 'trouble' mentioned in 2 Cor. i 8 the trial of S. Paul has no connexion.

With regard to the other Captivity-epistles, the placing of them in the period of an imprisonment in Ephesus is not without difficulty. But for Philippians so far as I can judge, the proof of its composition at that time can be adduced with a fair degree of assurance. The significance of this dating is that the reports of the third missionary-journey, and especially of the three years' stay in Ephesus, thus receive a considerable enrichment, and new light from the new situation and circumstances is thrown on the interpretation of the letters of this period.

Further, for the solution of the question of the unity and origin of the Pastoral Epistles we are given a greater freedom of movement. The Pastorals would consequently be separated from all the other letters by an interval of time such as does not appear in the chronological connexion of the other letters. The character of the Pastoral Epistles as distinguished from the other epistles of Paul is, on our hypothesis, more easily explicable and intelligible than when, as hitherto, they were brought into close relationship of time with the Captivity-letters. Finally there is this additional result. If, with the exceptions of the Pastorals, all the letters of Paul which have been preserved to us, derive from the same period—for, as I believe, the letters to the Thessalonians also belong to the period of the third missionary-journey—in the biblical-theological exegesis of the concep-

tions of these letters we must proceed upon the supposition of their unity. Differences, for instance, in the eschatological ideas cannot any longer be explained as due to a 'development', but must be regarded as disparate elements (*Spannungen*) which are present in the unity of the Apostle's religious concepts. The recognition of this fact is of the greatest importance, not only for the representation of the 'theology' of Paul, but also for the understanding of the Pauline religious thought in the evangel of the Christian Churches.

W. MICHAELIS.

WAS THE GOSPEL OF MARK WRITTEN IN LATIN?

THE question here posed is not so extravagant as it seems at first sight. It has been seriously asked by Dr P. L. Couchoud in the *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions* for 1926, pp. 161-192, and it now appears in an English translation by M. S. Enslin, revised and enlarged by Dr Couchoud, in the *Crozer Quarterly* for Jan. 1928. The idea that Mark was originally written in Latin is not even contrary to tradition, for (as Couchoud points out) the Peshitta colophons at the end of the Gospel of Mark, followed by many (late) Greek MSS—and he might have added Ephraim's Commentary on the Diatessaron (*Moesinger*, p. 286),—assert that it was written in Latin. Dr Couchoud, it must be stated at once, recognizes in Codex Bobiensis (*k*) a surviving fragment of the lost original.

I think it not out of place, before examining Dr Couchoud's arguments and examples, to consider the thesis from a general point of view, whether it be admissible or conceivable. What bearing would it have, were it accepted, on 'the Synoptic problem'? Forty years ago, when most critics believed in 'Ur-Marcus', or in a written 'Common Synoptic Tradition', Dr Couchoud's thesis would have hardly obtained a hearing. Notwithstanding continual and characteristic variations the amount of Greek words and phrases common to Matthew, Mark, and Luke makes it quite clear that they have a common Greek source, and further, that common source must have been very much like our Greek Gospel of Mark. If then Mark were composed in Latin, the common source, the Ur-Marcus, must be a translation from the Latin, which seems absurd. But the theory of an 'Ur-Marcus' is now, very properly, out of favour. The 'common tradition of the Synoptic Gospels' has resolved itself into our Greek Mark. 'Mark', we now believe, as used by Matthew and Luke, did not differ from the text of B or Westcott and Hort more than B differs from D or W. If the original was in Latin, these differences, i. e. the differences between B and D and W