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PREFACE

When reading the New Testament one cannot avoid being struck with the prominence of Roman customs throughout. This is, of course, to be expected, as Judæa was at that time under the direct government of Rome, being ruled by governors sent by the Emperor himself.

Two events of this character arrest the attention of the least observant reader—the trial of our Lord before Pilate, and St. Paul's appeals to his privileges as a Roman citizen. Other similar incidents speedily claim notice—Augustus's census of the Empire, the tribute due to Cæsar, the conduct of the provincial governors at Philippi and in other cities. And finally, numerous smaller details present themselves, all together combining to show how completely Roman law and custom dominated the very life of the people, in spite of their incongruity with the national character.

In the following pages an endeavour has been made to present these facts of Law and History in as concise a form as intelligible language will allow.

SEPTIMUS BUSS.

GRESHAM STREET, E.C.

October, 1901.
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ROMAN LAW AND HISTORY
IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

CHAPTER I
HEROD AND THE NATIVITY

"The New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ" naturally begins with the Birth of the Saviour, of Him who is acknowledged by universal consent to be the best, the wisest, and the greatest of all who have stood upon this earth. Christians believe in Him as the Son of God, as God Incarnate, as the Redeemer from sin and death; Unitarians and others, denying His Divinity, yet accept Him as their Lord and Master; and all the rest of mankind, in all ages since His appearance on earth, amid their multifarious beliefs, speculations, and opinions, combine with one voice to hail Him as hero and philosopher; a leader of men, the great Example—of a character and an all-prevailing influence, unique in the history of the world—a character and an influence which even Renan declares to be unapproachable: "Whatever may be the unexpected phenomena of the future, Jesus will not be surpassed. His worship will constantly renew its youth, the tale of His life will cause ceaseless tears, His sufferings will soften the best hearts; all the ages will proclaim that, among the sons of men, there is none born who is greater than Jesus."

The Birth of Jesus took place, says S. Matthew (ii. 1),
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"in the days of Herod the king," on which account we have, in this chapter, joined together "Herod and the Nativity."

The Nativity was an event so momentous in the history of the world that it gave rise to a new era. Attracting but little attention at the moment, unheard of for years afterwards, it yet became eventually recognised as the point to which all eyes were directed, the crisis of the world's history, the division between ancient and modern chronology, from which it seemed natural, at least for the Christian nations, to date their reckoning of time.

The use of such an era could not, it is obvious, begin at the time of the Nativity itself, except by Divine direction; and no such command having been given, the computation did not begin, as a matter of fact, until several hundred years afterwards. In the light of modern history it is undoubtedly the best possible fixed point from which to make a departure, the only objection to it being the necessity to reckon backward as well as forward. For this reason, to date from the creation of the world might seem a still better plan, if it were only possible to arrive at some measure of agreement on the subject. The ancient nations differed from each other by thousands of years in the date they assigned to the Creation; and the Bible itself, in its various versions, displays a similar variety, the Hebrew, the Samaritan, and the Septuagint differing from one another by nearly two thousand years. It was shown by Hales that more than one hundred opinions existed upon the subject, and had he continued his investigations he could have doubtless collected many more. The chronology of the Babylonians, Egyptians, and Chinese extends thousands of years further back into hoar antiquity than the usually received era of the Creation; and recent researches in geology have placed it beyond doubt that our world is far more ancient than any nation has ever claimed it to be.

Before the Christian Era was adopted each nation had its
own fixed point or epoch, from which its chronology was computed.

The Jews dated from the Creation (Anno Mundi), which they have now fixed at 3,760 years before the Christian Era.

The Egyptians, whose authentic history has been proved to extend backwards several thousand years before Christ, adopted the system of Manetho, who arranged the sovereigns of Egypt into thirty dynasties, extending to the time of Alexander the Great.

The Greeks, following Eratosthenes, counted by Olympiads, the first of which, that in which Corœbus was victor, corresponded with B.C. 776.

The Romans reckoned from the foundation of Rome (A.U.C.), which was supposed to have occurred B.C. 753. They also indicated a year by giving the names of the consuls for that year; and more recently (after January 1st, 313 A.D.) by a cycle of fifteen years known as an Indiction, first employed by ecclesiastical historians, and afterwards by the popes; a system which was followed during the Middle Ages and used side by side with the Christian Era, and not altogether discontinued till the end of the fifteenth century.

The Moslems reckon time from the Hegira, the time of Mahomet's flight from Mecca to Medina, A.D. 622.

Besides these there were many other systems of chronology, mostly of national observance only.

Thus there came to be a great variety in the methods of indicating dates, which was naturally the cause of great confusion. The only scheme that would seem applicable to the nations of Europe was that of A.U.C., which was a reasonable date to employ, as the influence of the Roman language and customs extended far into the Middle Ages. But as soon as the era A.D. was suggested it was favourably received, as possessing the advantages of universality and appropriateness, since all the nations of Europe had by that time embraced Christianity.
The Christian Era

This era was originated in the sixth century by Dionysius Exiguus, whence it used sometimes to be called the Dionysian Era, a designation, however, likely to lead to confusion, there being so many of that name famous in history.

*Dionysius Exiguus* was abbot of a monastery in Rome. He was a Scythian by birth, and was surnamed Exiguus, either from his small stature, his humble birth, or the humility of his character. He died about *A.D.* 556. His learning was extensive, and his writings very numerous, consisting of collections of canons and decrees of councils and of popes, and of many other theological and ecclesiastical works, the most famous of which was his *Cyclus Paschalis*, in which he uses the era from the Birth of Christ as the basis of chronology. It occurred to him that as the Roman Empire was dismembered, and the modern nations of Europe had risen from its ruins, it was no longer useful to date from the foundation of the City; and as the civilised world at large had become subject to the religion of Jesus Christ, it was appropriate that Christians should date their events from the Birth of their Lord.

Accordingly in this work, the *Cyclus Paschalis*, disregarding Olympiads, Consulates, Indictions, and all other eras, he dates only from the Birth of Christ.

This plan was so obviously suitable to the circumstances of the time, and so likely to be of permanent usefulness, that it was soon adopted, and eventually became universal.

We find it applied by Ethelbert, king of Kent, to date a certain document, “anno ab Incarnatione Christi, DCV.” The Venerable Bede uses it in his *Ecclesiastical History*, and not long after, it was employed for public transactions in Gaul by Pepin and Charlemagne.

But it was most unfortunate that he made an error in his calculation. He dates the Birth of Christ in *A.U.C.* 753,
which is at least four years too late, as we shall see from the following considerations.

Data for Computing the Birth of Christ

Starting from the definite statements made by the Evangelists, we shall be able to discuss the question and arrive at a satisfactory conclusion.

The data to be gathered from the Gospels are:

S. Luke ii. 1. That the Birth of Christ took place in the reign of Cæsar Augustus, during the days of the "taxing." This will be discussed in the next chapter and need no detain us now.

S. Matthew ii. 1. In this passage we have the definite statement that "Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judæa in the days of Herod the king."

S. John ii. 20. That Jesus was in the first year of His ministry forty-six years after the commencement of the rebuilding of the Temple.

S. Luke iii. 1, 23. That Jesus was about thirty years of age in "the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Cæsar."

These three, especially the last, give us reliable indications of date.

There are three other considerations (in addition to the taxing, which will be considered separately) which will help our calculations and afford corroborative evidence, though not of so reliable a character:

S. Luke i. 5. The time of office of the course of Abia.

S. Matthew ii. 1. The star in the East; and finally

The Roman Consuls in the year of the Nativity.

I. The Death of Herod

Jesus was born in the days of Herod the king (S. Matt. ii. 1), and not long before his death, as appears from verse 22.

The date of Herod's death is easily ascertained. It
occurred, according to Josephus (Antiq. xvii. 8, 1), "thirty-four years from the time when he had procured Antigonus to be slain, but thirty-seven years since he had been declared king by the Romans." From Antiquities xiv. 14, 5 we learn that his appointment as king was made in the 184th Olympiad, during the consulate of Caius Domitius Calvinus and Caius Asinius Pollio, i.e. in the year A.U.C. 714 (B.C. 40). The thirty-seventh year after this brings us to A.U.C. 750. The conferring upon him of the royal dignity was an honour unexpected by him, and was due to the friendship of Antony. The death of Antigonus, the last of the Asmonæan family, took place three years later in the 185th Olympiad, when Marcus Agrippa and Caminius Gallus were consuls, A.U.C. 717 (Joseph., Antiq. xiv. 14, 5). This death cleared all the rivals to Herod out of the way.

The date of Herod's death is verified by the occurrence of an eclipse of the moon on the night of one of Herod's massacres. He had erected over the great gate of the Temple a large golden eagle of great value, which he had dedicated to the Temple. Angry at this breach of the Law of Moses, and encouraged by the knowledge that the king was lying on his death-bed at Jericho, Judas and Matthias, two rabbis learned in the Law and well-beloved by the people as educators of their children, persuaded some of their scholars to break down the idolatrous emblem of the Roman power and hew it in pieces with axes. They were immediately attacked by the king's guards, and forty of the band of zealots with the two leaders were sent down to Jericho for trial. Herod, unable to sit or stand, was conveyed on a couch to the theatre, and after a speech in which he praised his own good government, condemned them all to die. They were burnt alive; "and that very night," says Josephus (Antiq. xvii. 6, 2–4), "there was an eclipse of the moon." This eclipse happened on March 13th, B.C. 4.

Herod after this altered his will, substituting Archelaus
for Antipas in the kingdom, and ordered his son Antipater to be put to death, five days after which last crime he died, universally execrated, about a week or ten days before the Passover, which in that year took place on April 12th. Thus the death of Herod is fixed with almost absolute certainty towards the end of March, A.U.C. 750.

Josephus gives a full account of Herod’s last days and decease, with many circumstantial details, specially as to the nature of his disease and the remedies applied in the attempt to alleviate his sufferings (Antiq. xvii. 6–8).

The passage is too long to quote: we may substitute for it the description given in the picturesque language of Dean Farrar: “It must have been very shortly after the murder of the Innocents that Herod died. Only five days before his death he had made a frantic attempt at suicide, and had ordered the execution of his eldest son, Antipater. His death-bed, which reminds us of Henry VIII.’s, was accompanied by circumstances of peculiar horror, and it has been noticed that the loathsome disease of which he died is hardly mentioned in history, except in the case of men who have been rendered infamous by an atrocity of persecuting zeal. On his bed of intolerable anguish, in that splendid and luxurious palace which he had built for himself under the palms of Jericho, swollen with disease and scorched by thirst—ulcerated externally and glowing inwardly with a ‘soft slow fire’—surrounded by plotting sons and plundering slaves, detesting all and detested by all—longing for death as a release from his tortures, yet dreading it as the beginning of worse terrors—stung by remorse, yet still unslaked with murder—a horror to all around him, yet in his guilty conscience a worse terror to himself—devoured by the premature corruption of an anticipated grave—eaten of worms as though visibly smitten by the finger of God’s wrath after seventy years of successful villainy—the wretched old man, whom men had called the Great, lay in a savage frenzy awaiting his last hour. As he
knew that none would shed one tear for him, he determined that they should shed many for themselves, and issued an order that, under pain of death, the principal families in the kingdom and chiefs of the tribes should come to Jericho. They came, and then, shutting them in the hippodrome, he secretly commanded his sister Salome that at the moment of his death they should all be massacred. And so, choking as it were with blood, devising massacres in its very delirium, the soul of Herod passed forth into the night.

"In purple robes, with crown and sceptre and precious stones, the corpse was placed upon its splendid bier, and accompanied with military pomp and burning incense to its grave in the Herodium, not far from the place where Christ was born. But the spell of the Herodian dominion was broken, and the people saw how illusory had been its glittering fascination. The day of Herod's death was, as he had foreseen, observed as a festival. His will was disputed; his kingdom disintegrated; his last order was disobeyed; his sons died for the most part in infamy and exile; the curse of God was upon his house; and, though by ten wives and many concubines he seems to have had nine sons and five daughters, yet within a hundred years the family of the hierodoulos of Ascalon had perished by disease or violence, and there was no living descendant to perpetuate his name."

Thus perished Herod, miscalled the Great, in the seventieth year of his age and thirty-seventh of his reign, at the end of March or the beginning of April, A.U.C. 750 (B.C. 4).

Our Lord's Birth was closely associated with the death of this man. S. Matthew and S. Luke relate several events in the life of the infant Saviour which took place while Herod still lived; and if we allow sufficient time for these events, we shall be able to arrive at a tolerable certainty, within narrow limits, as to the exact date of the Saviour's Birth.

After the birth of a male child, the mother was bound by the Law of Moses to remain at home for forty days, at the
conclusion of which period she presented herself with the child for purification in the Temple, and offered the sacrifices prescribed in Leviticus xii. It must have been at some time during these forty days that the visit of the Magi to the cradle at Bethlehem was paid. After this there followed the flight of the Holy Family into Egypt. Bearing in mind the leisurely mode of travelling in those primitive times, when journeys were necessarily made on foot—remembering also that the distance from Bethlehem to Cairo (near to which place tradition locates the resting-place of Joseph during his absence) was considerable—we must allow several months for the sojourn in Egypt, not less than three, and probably more, even though the time spent there was brief.

Many legends are associated in the apocryphal gospels with this sojourn—legends of robbers and wild beasts, of miraculous springs, and of wondrous cures, so absolutely destitute of probability, and so utterly at variance with the authentic history of our Lord, that we forbear to mention them; one only—that the idols of Egypt fell to the ground and were broken in pieces—being worthy of mention.

Adding together the forty days between the Birth of the Saviour and the Purification of the Virgin, and the period of the sojourn in Egypt, we conclude that several months must have elapsed between the Nativity of our Lord and the death of Herod. This has been variously estimated. Wieseler decides in favour of December, January, or February, preferring the last month, which allows only two months to Herod’s death, and is not sufficient for the intervening events.

II. The Building of the Temple

Just before the first Passover kept by our Lord in the first year of His ministry He purged the Temple courts of those who were guilty of desecration by turning them into an aviary, a cattle-market, and a bank. “When He had made a scourge
of small cords, He drove them all out of the Temple, and the sheep, and the oxen; and poured out the changers' money, and overthrew the tables; and said unto them that sold doves, Take these things hence; make not My Father's house an house of merchandise." When the Jews asked for a sign in justification of His act He replied, "Destroy this Temple, and in three days I will raise it up," to which the Jews rejoined, "Forty and six years was this Temple in building, and wilt Thou rear it up in three days?" (S. John ii. 13–21).

Here we have a distinct mark of time. The Jews assert that the Temple, which our Lord thus cleansed, had occupied in building forty-six years up to that time, i.e. to the first Passover during our Lord's ministry, when He was about thirty years of age. It was to that Temple that the Jews referred, though it has been suggested that a previous Temple was meant. But this could not be, for Solomon's Temple was seven and a half years in building (1 Kings vi. 1, 38); and the second Temple about twenty years, viz. from the third year of Cyrus, b.c. 535, to the sixth year of Darius, b.c. 515.

That second Temple had fallen into disrepair, and Herod, anxious to regain his lost popularity, willing also to gratify his passion for building, announced that he would restore the Temple to more than its original splendour. He had already adorned Jerusalem with magnificent edifices, with palaces and fortresses; he had built and fortified towns in various parts of Palestine; and in his desire to gain favour at Rome, had even built idolatrous temples in towns that were inhabited by Gentiles; worse than all he had constructed amphitheatres in which games could be celebrated after the fashion at Rome. This action, so inconsistent in one who professed obedience to the Law of Moses, and his many acts of tyranny and cruelty, had rendered him hateful to his most influential subjects. With a view to conciliation, he determined to restore the ruinous Temple to a condition exceeding in glory
the building erected by Solomon. The magnificent Herod should surpass "Solomon in all his glory," and Herod's Temple should be more "exceeding magnifical" than that of Solomon himself.

Accordingly vast preparations, occupying full two years, were made. As in the first Temple, so in this, an enormous amount of material, of stone and marble, of timber and metals, was collected; and all persons throughout the land, especially among the Levites, who were skilled in architecture and in the ornamental arts, were invited to take part in the work. The old building was removed by degrees, and the edifice which took its place was planned upon a considerably larger scale, so that the ambition of Herod to excel the glory of Solomon was gratified to the full. Josephus gives a long and detailed account of the work in the *Antiquities* (xv. 11), showing that a thousand waggons were employed in conveying the stones for the building, ten thousand skilful workmen planed the wood and carved the stone, and a thousand priests, instructed for the purpose, superintended the whole work.

And when, in a year and six months, the first part of the work was finished by the completion of the Holy Place or Sanctuary, the building had already become a world-wide wonder for its colossal foundation stones, its variegated pavements, the costly embroidery of its curtains, and its roof overlaid with gold.

This was the Sanctuary only. The surrounding courts, with their piazzas, colonnades, and porches, and the numerous buildings and chambers required for the sacrifices and the residence of the priests, were the work of the next eight years, and further fresh additions were made from time to time. The work was still going on when our Lord visited the Temple in the last year of His ministry; and it was from the débris accumulated round the workmen that the stones were selected which the Jews cast at Him (S. John viii. 59). The work indeed lingered until the time of Agrippa II., and
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was not brought to an end until A.U.C. 818 (A.D. 65), the year before the Jewish war, and only a few years before the final destruction of the Temple by the Roman army under Titus (Joseph., Antiq. xx. 9, 7 and xv. 11, 3). Thus the whole work occupied no less than eighty-four years. But in our Lord's time it had been in operation for forty-six years.

In order to arrive at the year of our Lord's Birth from this starting-point of the forty-six years of the building of the Temple, the following calculations must be made from materials extracted from Josephus's Antiquities of the Jews.

Josephus, then, informs us that Herod began to build the Temple in the eighteenth year of his reign. Josephus sometimes dates the commencement of Herod's reign from the time of his appointment by Antony and Octavianus, A.U.C. 714 (B.C. 40), and sometimes from the death of Antizonus, A.U.C. 717 (B.C. 37). In this case he seems to use the later date. Reckoning from that date the eighteenth year of Herod would fall in A.U.C. 734. Forty-six years after this brings us to A.U.C. 780 (A.D. 27), and as our Lord was then in the thirty-first year of His age, His Birth may be assumed to have taken place in A.U.C. 749, or B.C. 5, i.e. some months before the death of Herod, which occurred in the spring of A.U.C. 750, as we have already seen.

III. The Fifteenth Year of Tiberius

In the fifteenth year of Tiberius, S. John the Baptist began his ministry, Jesus Christ being at that time about thirty years of age (S. Luke iii. 1, 23).

Augustus died on the 19th of August, A.U.C. 767 (A.D. 14). His reign had been an unbroken success from beginning to end, the only exception to its prosperity having been the disaster to the three legions in Germany, inflicted by Arminius or Hermann upon Varus. Augustus, however, was unhappy in his domestic relations: he divorced his first two wives,
Clodia and Scribonia; and his third wife, Livia, a most hateful, unscrupulous woman, was the cause of untold misery to him. He spent the latter part of his life under her control. Her aim was to procure the sovereignty for her own two sons by her former husband, Tiberius Claudius Nero, and to put out of the way, by any means, the relatives of Augustus himself. Augustus adopted in succession M. Marcellus, Caius Caesar, and Lucius Caesar; but all three died at an early age, not without suspicion being raised against Livia as having been instrumental in their death. Eventually Augustus fixed upon Tiberius, the son of Livia and Tiberius Claudius Nero, as his successor. The tribunician power was conferred upon him for ten years, and in the year 765 he was appointed censor and invested with the title of princeps, and formally associated in the government of the empire by Augustus. Two years later Augustus himself died.

We have here, then, two dates from which to reckon the commencement of the reign of Tiberius, the year 12 A.D., when the joint reign began, and the year 14 A.D., when Tiberius became sole emperor by the death of Augustus.

Accepting the first of these dates, A.U.C. 765 (A.D. 12), we take the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Caesar to be A.U.C. 780 (A.D. 27). But as our Lord Jesus Christ was then "about thirty years of age," His Birth would have taken place in A.U.C. 749 or 750.

These three events, then—the death of Herod, the building of the Temple, and the reign of Tiberius—are the only reliable data available for determining the year of the Nativity of our Lord.

There are, however, other indications which, though not reliable in themselves, we may accept as confirmatory evidence of conclusions already arrived at.

(a) An early tradition places the Crucifixion in the year of the consulship of Caius Rubellius Geminus and C. Fufius Geminus, i.e. in the year A.U.C. 782. Reckoning backwards
thirty-three years and a few months, this would bring the Nativity to A.U.C. 749 or 748.

(b) Astronomical calculations connected with the appearance of the Star to the Magi have not much force, seeing that that Star was obviously miraculous and special to the occasion. A star or a planet, or a conjunction of planets, however brilliant in splendour, could be no guide to a person travelling from place to place on this planet.

It is, however, interesting to record here that Kepler, having observed a conjunction of the planets Jupiter and Saturn in the constellation Pisces, thought it well to calculate backwards the occurrence of such phenomena; and as a result he ascertained that in A.U.C. 747 such a conjunction in the same zodiacal sign did actually occur, with the addition of the planet Mars in the following spring, all three heavenly bodies shining together and combining their rays so as to form in appearance one star of extraordinary splendour. This conjunction in that year is admitted to be an astronomical fact. Such an unusual appearance in the midnight sky would naturally excite universal attention, and would attract the special attention of men who, like the Magi, were engaged in astronomical observations. Their attention being thus aroused as to the probability of a great event being imminent, we can believe, on the authority of S. Matthew, that some luminous, meteoric body, moving within the limits of our own atmosphere (for such conditions were necessary to be observed if the Star was to be available for guidance), would lead them on from place to place till "it came and stood over where the young child was." The first appearance of this conjunction must have occurred at least some months before the Birth of Christ. Accordingly this calculation of Kepler's adds further probability that the date already assigned to the Nativity is the true date.

(c) The last illustration we shall adduce depends upon the mention of "the course of Abia," in S. Luke i. 5. This
we bring forward as speculative and only incidentally confirmatory. It is given at length by Wieseler and by Greswell.

The priests had grown so numerous by the time of David that it became necessary to divide them into twenty-four courses, the names of which are given in 1 Chronicles xxiv. 7–18, the eighth being that of Abijah or Abia. Each course took its turn of service from one Sabbath to another. Hence it follows that in 168 days the whole of the courses would have served their time once. Now, as that of Jehoiarib or Joarib was the first on the list, his course would be again on duty on the 169th day. According to Mishna iii. 298, 3, Annott., when the Temple was destroyed by Titus, on the 9th of the Jewish month Ab, a.u.c. 823, it was the turn of Joarib to officiate. Reckoning back from the 9th of Ab, 823, to the same day of 748, there are 75 Julian years; or, calculating by days, 27,393 days, a number divisible by 168 with a remainder of 9. If, then, we may assume that the twenty-fourth course of the priesthood was actually in office on or about the 9th of Ab, 748, it would come again into office on or about the 1st of Ab, 823, and go out of office on or about the 8th; so that Joarib, according to the above tradition, might be actually in office on or about the 9th of Ab, when the Temple was taken (Greswell, Dissertations, p. 383). Following out these calculations, the course of Abia would come into office about the 6th of Tisri, and go out about the 13th. As all the courses were obliged to attend at the great solemnities, and to minister in common, without interfering with the regular rotation, it may be assumed as certain that Zacharias would not return home at least before the 23rd of Tisri, the day after the close of the Feast of Tabernacles, which answered in that year to about the 6th of our October. The conception of John could not take place before the middle of October, nor his birth before the same time in July in the next year.
This would place our Lord's Birth, which occurred six months after that of John, in January, A.U.C. 750.

This elaborate calculation, given in full by Wieseler and Greswell, is curious and interesting, if not very convincing.

Thus we have sufficient evidence to show that the Birth of our Lord may be dated some months before the death of Herod, viz. in the autumn or winter of A.U.C. 748, or early in 749. This is as near as we can approach to certainty. We cannot follow Greswell in fixing upon an exact day. This he assumes to be the night of April 5th or the morning of April 6th, A.U.C. 750, which brings it too close to the day of Herod's death.

However the case may be, there is sufficient evidence to show that the calculation made by Dionysius Exiguus was incorrect; it is quite certain that he made an error of at least four years. We must come to the conclusion that the Nativity took place about A.U.C. 749 instead of 753.

Thus the whole chronology of the world is thrown into error. It is most unfortunate, but it cannot be altered after the lapse of so many hundred years, and historians and chronologists must patiently endure the inconvenience.
CHAPTER II

CYRENIUS AND THE "TAXING"

S. Luke states that a decree from Caesars Augustus was the determining cause of the Birth of the Lord Jesus Christ at Bethlehem in Judæa. Otherwise, as the family of Joseph was at that time dwelling at Nazareth in Galilee, the Birth of the Redeemer would have taken place in that city. In connection with this journey from Nazareth to Bethlehem, S. Luke states "this taxing was first made when Cyrenius was governor of Syria."

Around this passage a fierce controversy has raged for many years, in which the leading theologians on both sides have been engaged; the one party denying, the other upholding the historical authenticity of the statement.

Renan states simply that "Jesus was born at Nazareth," and regards the Birth at Bethlehem as legendary—a mere invention of enthusiastic partisans to support the Messianic character attributed to Jesus, and to prove His royal descent.

Strauss, De Wette, Keim, and others have arrayed a number of objections against this statement of S. Luke's, which they consider prove satisfactorily that the statement is destitute of foundation, and can only be regarded as mythical.

On the other hand, Tholuck, Hales, Wieseler, Mommsen, Kitto, Farrar, and many more uphold the absolute historical veracity of S. Luke, either in respect of the Birth of Jesus at Bethlehem or of the census taken by Cyrenius at the same date.
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The controversy involves so many difficult questions, historical, chronological, archæological, numismatical, and otherwise, that it will probably never be solved. But the whole subject is discussed exhaustively in all its bearings in Das Geburtsjahr Christi, Leipzig, 1869, by A. W. Zumpt, who comes to the conclusion that, in all probability, Cyrenius was governor of Syria twice. There are also valuable articles in the Speaker’s Commentary and in Smith’s Dictionary.

The literature on the subject is voluminous, and will probably never be exhausted.

Thus Cyrenius has become a most interesting personage.

Who, then, was he? What is known of him?

The History of “Cyrenius”

Tacitus, Annal. iii. 48, writes of him thus:—

“Sub idem tempus, ut mors Sulpicii Quirini publicis exequis frequentaretur, petivit [Tiberius] a senatu. Nihil ad veterem et patriciam Sulpiciorum familiam Quirinius pertinuit, ortus apud municipium Lanuvium: sed impiger militiae et acribus ministeriis consulatum sub divo Augusto, mox expugnatis per Ciliciam Homonadensium castellis insignia triumphi adeptus, datusque rector Gaio Cæsari Armeniam optinenti Tiberium quoque Rhodi agentem coluerat. Quod tunc patefecit in senatu, laudatio in se officiis et incuso M. Lollio, quem auctorem Gaio Cæsari pravitatis et discordiarum arguebat. Sed cæteris haut laeta memoria Quirini erat ob intenta, ut memoravi, Lepidæ pericula sordidamque et præpotentem senectam.”

(The incident concerning Lepida is narrated in iii. 22.)

To this account by Tacitus, Josephus adds (Antiq. xvii. 13, 5; xviii. 1, 1; and B. J. vii. 8, 1):—

“Cyrenius, a Roman senator, and one who had gone through other magistracies, and had passed through them till he had been consul, and one who, on other accounts, was
of great dignity, came at this time into Syria, with a few others, being sent by Cæsar to be a judge of that nation, and to take an account of their substance. Coponius also, a man of the equestrian order, was sent together with him to have the supreme power over the Jews. Moreover, Cyrenius came himself into Judæa, which was now added to the province of Syria, to take an account of their substance, and to dispose of Archelaus's money; but the Jews, although at the beginning they took the report of a taxation heinously, yet did they leave off any farther opposition to it, by the persuasion of Joazar, who was the son of Boethus, and high priest. So they, being over persuaded by Joazar's words, gave an account of their estates without any dispute about it: yet there was one Judas, a Gaulonite, of a city whose name was Gamala, who, taking with him Sadduc, a Pharisee, became zealous to draw them to a revolt, who said that this taxation was no better than an introduction to slavery, and exhorted the nation to assert their liberty.”

From these two passages, and from other notices elsewhere, we gather that Cyrenius was a man of considerable importance, who took a prominent part in the affairs of the empire at this time; and we are enabled to sketch his career with a sufficient amount of detail to throw light upon the transaction which induces S. Luke to introduce his name into the gospel narrative.

Publius Sulpicius Quirinius was not of patrician birth, though his nomen seemed to suggest a connection with the old patrician family of the Sulpicii, but sprang from the municipality of Lanuvium, on the Appian way not many miles from Rome. After serving under Augustus in various capacities, and especially distinguishing himself in military affairs, he rose to the dignity of the consulship, A.U.C. 742 (B.C. 12), and was afterwards awarded the honour of a triumph for the capture of the forts of Homonada, in Cilicia. He was further appointed as “rector” to Gaius Cæsar, who held at
that time the governorship of Armenia, but died A.D. 4. When Tiberius was at Rhodes, Cyrenius visited him with a view to further promotion, and became legatus Caesaris in the province of Syria. It is this appointment which is most interesting to us. It took place in A.D. 6, and is fully described in the passage quoted above from Josephus. Archelaus had rendered himself unpopular by his cruelties, to which S. Matthew alludes (ii. 22), and which caused Joseph to be afraid of living within his jurisdiction. He had also amassed great wealth by extortion. For this misgovernment Archelaus was deposed, his dominion was added to the province of Syria, and Cyrenius was sent as imperial legate to rule over both Syria and Judæa, which were henceforth regarded as one province.

Cyrenius also was commissioned to confiscate the property of Archelaus, and (which is more important to us in connection with the statement of S. Luke ii. 2) to take a census of the inhabitants of both Syria and Judæa, and to assess their property with a view to taxation. It was this which aroused the opposition of Judas of Galilee (Acts v. 37), and was the cause of many misfortunes to the Jews, large numbers of whom were slain, as is testified both by S. Luke and by Josephus in the passages to which we have already alluded.

We may conclude this notice of Cyrenius by mentioning that Tiberius was always friendly to him, and when he died, in A.D. 21, demanded of the senate the honour of a public funeral for him. Nevertheless, in his later years Cyrenius had deteriorated in character, as shown by his conduct in the matter of Lepida (Tac., Annal. iii. 22), and by his growing avarice and extortion.

It is agreed by all that in A.D. 6 Publius Sulpicius Quirinius was governor, i.e. imperial legate (legatus Caesaris) of Syria; that his province included Judæa; that he took a census of the inhabitants of his province; that taxation was imposed at that time; and that, in consequence of this taxation, a
revolt was led by Judas of Galilee. These statements are accepted, without dispute, by all. Josephus, in the passage quoted above, calls him “Judas, a Gaulonite, of the city of Gamala,” as though he belonged to the east of Jordan instead of to Galilee. But elsewhere he himself several times speaks of him as “Judas of Galilee,” just as S. Luke does.

It is now time to turn to the famous passage in S. Luke ii. 2, which has given rise to a controversy which will, in all probability, never be concluded as long as the world lasts, for there are not sufficient data, and doubtless never will be, to decide the question under dispute with absolute certainty.

The passage in S. Luke runs thus:—

Δότη ἡ ἀπογραφὴ πρῶτη ἐγένετο ἡγεμονεύοντος τῆς Συρίας Κυρηναίου.

In this passage S. Luke asserts (or seems to assert, for other renderings have given rise to a controversy which will be considered further on) that Cyrenius made a “taxing” (A.V.) or “enrolment” (R.V.) at the time of Christ’s Birth, B.C. 4; and in Acts v. 37 he speaks of another ἀπογραφή, or enrolment, ten years later, in A.D. 6.

Thus it is a matter of certainty, accepted by all, that there was an “enrolment” made by Cyrenius, as imperial legate of Syria, in A.D. 6.

And S. Luke states, or seems to state, that there had been a previous “taxing” ten years earlier, when Cyrenius was legate.

The question, then, is: *Were there two such enrolments, or only one?* and *Did Cyrenius hold the office of “governor” twice, or only once?*

For the enrolment and tenure of office in A.D. 6 the testimony is undeniable. For the previous enrolment and tenure of office S. Luke is the only authority.

There is no substantial reason to doubt this statement by S. Luke. He is known to be accurate in the various historical references found in his writings, and why not also in this? In S. Luke i. 5 his mention of Herod and Zacharias and the
course of Abia is correct, as also is the enumeration of the Emperor and of the various rulers of Palestine, in iii. 1, 2. The same remark applies to his historical notices in S. Luke viii. 3, xxiii. 1, 7, and the numerous references found throughout the Acts in such passages as xii. 20, xiii. 1, xxiii.-xxvi., where he speaks with perfect accuracy of Roman officials such as Felix, Festus, Gallio, and others. He even uses the exact technical word, ἀνθρώπαρος, to describe the official position of Sergius Paulus and of Gallio. He has never been proved in the wrong. We can rely upon his historical accuracy in all these details. Why, then, should we disbelieve him when he states that Cyrenius, the governor of Syria, organised the census in Palestine in the year that Herod died?

But this statement has been impugned by Strauss, Keim, De Wette, and others on the following grounds:—

I. The silence of contemporary writers.

II. That Palestine being an independent kingdom would have been exempt from this edict of Augustus's.

III. That this "taxing" in Herod's dominions would have stirred up opposition.

IV. That the registration, if it had taken place at all, would have been conducted at the ordinary place of residence.

V. That the presence of the female members of the family was not required either by Roman or Jewish custom.

Let us deal with these objections in order.

I. The Argument from Silence

Is there any reason to doubt S. Luke's statement? If the previous census could be met by direct contradiction, there would be something to say on the side of those who refuse to accept S. Luke as a true witness. But there is no such evidence, except such as may be assumed from the silence of contemporary historians.

S. Luke is certainly entitled to stand upon a level with other
writers; yet some modern critics (as Renan, Strauss, Keim, and others) consider themselves justified in rejecting his testimony upon points in which he is not corroborated by others whom they hold to be of higher authority, though these same authorities do not contradict his statement. It is unjust, uncritical also, to deal thus with S. Luke. His veracity, when impugned in other passages, has always been sustained, and we hope to show that on this question also his evidence is to be received.

First of all, we cannot escape from the difficulty by treating the passage in S. Luke ii. 2 as a gloss; the MS. evidence is against such an opinion. The verse is found in all the MSS., the variations being the omission of η after ἀνάγω, with A, B, and D, the transposition of πρώτη and ἐγένετο, and the following various readings for Κυρηνίων, viz. Κηρυνίων, Κυρεινοῦ, and Κυρινοῦ.

We must, then, admit the passage as genuine, written actually by the hand of S. Luke himself. This being so, two questions arise, which can be discussed separately.

(1) Was there a census carried out in Judæa in the year that Herod died?
(2) If so, Was that census undertaken by Cyrenius?

THE CENSUS, B.C. 4

Was there a census carried out in Judæa in the year that Herod died?

This is denied by Keim (Jesus of Nazara, vol. ii. pp. 114–122), by Strauss, and by others. If Tacitus, Josephus, or Suetonius had mentioned such a census, Keim and others would have accepted the statement as authentic; but because it depends only on the authority of S. Luke, they regard themselves at liberty to meet it with a flat denial. There is, however, no reason why S. Luke should be summarily dismissed as unworthy of belief, and no passage from any other writer can be quoted as conflicting with S. Luke's.
But, it is said, there is an entire silence of contemporary writers upon the subject. Such a census finds no place in Tacitus, Josephus, Dion Cassius, or Suetonius. That these writers do not mention the "taxing" is quite a different matter from denying that such an event took place. To pit a statement by some contemporary historian against a statement by S. Luke is one thing; to argue that what they pass over in silence never occurred at all, even though it is stated by another writer, is quite another. We cannot allow S. Luke to be thus placed under a ban. No proof is adduced that such a census did not take place; and until such evidence is forthcoming we are entitled to rely upon S. Luke.

Besides, the silence of these historians can be easily accounted for. Tacitus begins his *Annals* at the death of Augustus, long after the death of Herod; Suetonius's *Lives of the Caesars* is ill-arranged, and might easily pass over such an event; Dion Cassius's *History of Rome* is incomplete just at this point; and Josephus's works relate to the history of the Jews, and not of the Roman Empire. Thus there is no reason why any reference to this "taxing" of S. Luke ii. 2 should of necessity be found in their writings; and if, as we propose presently to show, such censuses were not unusual, it would be quite likely that they would be left unrecorded. The argument from silence, therefore, has no force, and if it has any force we can adduce it on S. Luke's side, for we can put by the side of this silence of historians the silence of opponents of Christianity. If Celsus, Lucian, or Porphyry could have questioned the accuracy of S. Luke on this subject, we may be sure they would have done so. They raised objections against the gospel history wherever they could; yet not against this. The argument from silence, then, tells as much in favour of S. Luke as against him.

There is a very great probability, apart from the statement of S. Luke, that a taxation, enrolment, or registration was
carried out in all parts of the Roman Empire at the time stated by him.

It is well known that the Emperor Augustus was anxious upon this point, and that from the very first, dating back to B.C. 27, when he made the division between the senatorial and imperial provinces, he was accustomed to require from the officials in all parts of the empire reports concerning the population and resources of the countries under their government. Such statistical reports were essential for the settlement and consolidation of the empire. The new empire needed an improved census. Such censuses occurred both before and after the Birth of Christ, and are mentioned as having been carried into effect in A.U.C. 746 (B.C. 8), 757 (A.D. 4), and at various other dates. Strabo (under Tiberius) speaks of them as of common occurrence, μιᾷ τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς τυχόσεων. This practice had fallen into abeyance for some time past, during the confusion of the civil wars, and it had now become a prime necessity that it should be revived. Even before Augustus's time this necessity had been felt, and Julius Caesar ordered a census to be taken in Italy. Up to this time this had been done in Rome, but Julius Caesar extended it to the whole of Italy, and required the chief ruler in each community to make a systematic registration of each citizen, with the name of his father or manumitter, as the case might be, the district to which he belonged, his age, and the nature and amount of his property. And, with a view to the application of a similar system to the provinces, he ordered a general survey of the whole empire to be forwarded to him. This example was followed by Augustus, who had this survey completed wherever it was defective. He even drew up with his own hand a Rationarium of the empire, which was afterwards epitomised into a Breviarium, and appointed twenty commissioners to organise the work (Suidas, s.v. ἀπογραφή). This breviarium totius imperii ordered by Augustus was not a superfluous work, set in hand merely for the gratification
of vanity; it was a real necessity in the interests of the civilised world. Taxation throughout Italy had almost disappeared, and, as Mommsen shows, the provinces had been plundered to support the capital state. Provincial governors were enriching themselves at the expense of the people they ruled, and even wealthy countries were pauperised by these extortions. A reform was essential, but could not be carried out without definite and detailed information. And this Augustus obtained by a continual series of reports always reaching him from every part of the empire. Even Tacitus, who is supposed to testify against S. Luke's "taxing" by his silence, writes (Annal. i. 2): "Opes publicae continebantur: quantum civium sociorumque in armis, quot classes, regna, provinciae, tributa aut vectigalia et necessitates ac largitiones."

Thus the probability of such a registration as that mentioned by S. Luke is very great. And as to a special census at this particular time, i.e. just about the time when Jesus was born, nothing would be more likely. Unless Augustus was prepared to let the empire fall to pieces, he must prevent discontent in the provinces by ensuring a just system of taxation; he must take steps for keeping up the strength of his legions: and to this work he had addressed himself ever since he had attained to supreme power after the Battle of Actium. Much had already been effected in this direction by the tentative and doubtless incomplete reports he had hitherto received. And now, with the experience already gained, with the disturbing elements of civil strife now at rest, with the whole world at peace, what more likely than that he would embrace the opportunity of crowning the work by ordering a general enumeration of the peoples under his sway, and the general resources of his empire? At any rate, S. Luke states definitely that he did this; and if the testimony of a writer like Tacitus or Suetonius on this point would be admissible, why should S. Luke's be rejected? We may hold, therefore, that "all the world was taxed" at this time.
Cyrenius and the "Taxing"

But was this "taxation" undertaken by Cyrenius?

To answer this question it is necessary to ascertain who were the "governors" of Syria during this period.

IMPERIAL LEGATES OF SYRIA, B.C. 9 TO A.D. 6

This question has been fully discussed by A. W. Zumpt, in his essay, Das Geburtsjahr Christi, Leipzig, 1869.

Bearing in mind that our Lord was born B.C. 4 or 5, it will be sufficient for our purpose if we go back as far as nine or ten years before the Christian Era. At that time, as we learn from Josephus (Antiq. xvi. 8, 6), M. Titius was legate, or "president" of Syria, and was followed by Sentius Saturninus, B.C. 9, who ruled the province for three years, viz. until B.C. 6, when Publius Quintilius Varus took his place. This Varus was the man who is chiefly remembered in history through the loss of three legions of Roman soldiers in Germany (A.D. 9). After he left Syria he was appointed by Augustus commander of the army in Germany, with orders to administer the district as a Roman province; but the Germans under Hermann attacked him, and broke up the three legions, a disaster which extorted from Augustus the cry, "O Varus, give me back my legions!" This was the only serious reverse sustained by the Roman arms during the rule of Augustus. Varus remained governor of Syria till B.C. 4.

From this time until the appointment of Cyrenius, in A.D. 6, there appears to be no record of these governors. Here, then, we have an interval of ten or twelve years, viz. from the appointment of Varus, B.C. 6, to that of Cyrenius or Quirinius, A.D. 6. Varus could not have continued in office during the whole of that period, for he was administering the province in Germany between the Rhine and the Weser during part of that time. Who, then, were the missing governors?

One of them was L. Volusius Saturninus, whose name is found as legatus Syria, on a coin of Antioch dated A.D. 4 or 5.
This still leaves a space between Varus ending B.C. 4 and Volusius about A.D. 4. What happened during those eight years? Augustus had established a rule in regard to the imperial provinces that no one should hold office for less than three or more than five years. What is more natural than to accept the statement of S. Luke, as we should accept a similar statement by Tacitus or Josephus, that "Cyrenius was governor of Syria" during part of this period, viz. during the first part of the period when the decree from Cæsar Augustus was in force, "that all the world should be taxed"?

The circumstances of Cyrenius's history, as given by Tacitus in the passage already quoted, add much force to this contention. In B.C. 12 he was consul; soon after this he was in Cilicia at the head of an army engaged in the capture of the Homodanensian strongholds. Now, as commander of an army, he must have been governor of a province, or a legate of the Emperor's legate. Zumpt thinks it likely that at this time Cilicia, though popularly called a province, was in reality annexed to the province of Syria, and that Quirinius was himself imperial legate of that province. Zumpt marshals an array of facts also from other sources, making it extremely probable, and even almost certain, that Quirinius was legate after the departure of Varus, just at the time that the census was being taken. Thus the solution of the difficulty, in his opinion, is found in this, viz. that Quirinius held office in Syria twice—in B.C. 4 and in A.D. 6—on both of which occasions a census of the Roman Empire was in progress. And thus the historical accuracy of S. Luke is substantiated in this as well as in other statements which have been impugned. Hence the ἀπογραφὴ in S. Luke ii. 2 may be called the "first," πρωτη, in opposition to the second or more noted census, which he had in his mind without mentioning it here, though he was well aware of it, and alludes to it in Acts v. 37.
Cyrenius and the "Taxing"

To make this more clear we give below the legates of Syria during this period, including the suggestions made by Zumpt:

,, 745 ,, 9, Sentius Saturninus.
,, 748 ,, 6, Publius Quintilius Varus.
,, 750 ,, 4, Publius Sulpicius Quirinius (according to Zumpt).
,, 753 ,, 1, M. Lollius.
,, A.D. C. Marcius Censorinus.
,, 757 ,, 4, L. Volusius Saturninus (according to the coin of Antioch).
,, 759 ,, 6, Publius Sulpicius Quirinius (the second term of office).

In support of this view that Cyrenius held office twice in Syria, an inscription, discovered in 1764, describes a Roman official who had been proconsul in Asia, and had twice been governor of Syria. The name of this official is unfortunately missing. Mommsen holds it to be Cyrenius, and Zumpt applies it to Sentius Saturninus.

On this corroborative evidence we are entitled to believe, on the authority of S. Luke, in spite of the objection that has been taken against it, that there was a census of the inhabitants of Palestine and of the Roman Empire at large taken B.C. 4, and that this work was carried out by Cyrenius or Quirinius.

II. The Independence of Palestine

It is asserted that, even if it be granted that such a census of the Roman Empire did take place at this time, Palestine would not have been included, because Herod the Great was an independent sovereign, and his dominions would have been exempt from registration and taxation.

This assertion cannot be maintained.
(1) Tacitus shows, in the passage from *Annal. i. 11* already quoted, that returns were made to the Emperor from "kingdoms" as well as from "provinces," and he states that, some years later, the King of Cappadocia was subjected to a census carried out by order of a δῶγμα, or decree from the Emperor (*Annal. vi. 42*).

(2) But it has been alleged that Herod the Great occupied the position of a *rex socius*, or ally, and in that independent position would have been free from liability to submit to such an interference with his subjects as would be involved in the taking of a census by imperial edict. This, however, does not appear to have been the case, any independence on the part of sovereigns of realms formally included in the Roman Empire being only by sufferance of the superior power and at the will of the Emperor himself.

(3) Further, at the very time of this "taxing," viz. in B.C. 4, in the thirty-third year of Herod's reign, Herod was out of favour at Rome. He had been a nominee of Antony, B.C. 41, when he was appointed tetrarch of Judæa, and was afterwards, by Antony's influence, made King of Judæa. During the war between Antony and Octavius Herod had supported the pretensions of Antony; and although he had become reconciled to Octavius at Rhodes after the Battle of Actium, he had given him further offence some years later by leading an army into Arabia, B.C. 7. On this occasion the Emperor sharply reproved him by letter, and informed him that, having hitherto treated him as a friend, he should in future regard him as a subject; that, in fact, he should be reduced from the rank of a *rex socius*, or ally, to the inferior position of *rex amicus*, a title depending upon the pleasure of the Emperor. When Herod sent an embassy to explain, Augustus refused to receive it, and Herod had to submit to all the indignities passed upon him (*Joseph., Antiq. xvi. 9*). The chief indignity was the reduction of Palestine to the condition of a Roman province, and the requiring an oath of fidelity to Cæsar and to Herod
conjointly from all the subjects of Herod. And this oath was actually enforced, and was taken by all Herod’s subjects, with the exception of six thousand Pharisees (ib. xvii. 2, 4). This occurred towards the close of Herod’s reign and about the time of the decree of enrolment and the Birth of Jesus Christ.

To speak of Judæa as being independent of Rome is unhistorical. Judæa had been liable to the payment of tribute ever since its reduction by Pompey, and this tribute had, no doubt, been paid regularly ever since, even after Herod’s appointment, first as tetrarch and afterwards as king.

There are consequently no grounds for asserting the immunity from registration of Herod’s dominions. The ἐνομον of “Caesar Augustus that all the world should be taxed” was applicable to Herod’s kingdom as well as to the rest of the Roman world.

In further illustration of Herod’s dependent position we may add that he was always required to consult the Emperor upon matters of importance, and to obtain permission from him before venturing to take action; and that, though he did actually devise his kingdom to his sons, it was necessary to obtain authority from Rome for the execution of that Will, a permission which was not given without a display of the supremacy of Rome.

The registration throughout Palestine being peremptorily required, the task was committed to Cyrenius, according to S. Luke ii. 2. And he was exactly fitted for a post so invidious. Tacitus describes him as “an active soldier and a rigid commissioner,” one who therefore would not fail to execute a decree of the Emperor, however distasteful it might be to a subject king. The work was accordingly set on foot; and in deference to Jewish customs, the registration was allowed to take place at the forum originis, the city or town to which each person belonged. Hence Joseph and his wife travelled from Nazareth to Jerusalem, and were duly enrolled
in the city of David, being of the house and lineage of David.

It would seem, however, that the census, on this occasion, did not proceed beyond the first step, viz. the enrolment by the censitor in the Roman register. Herod sent a trusted agent, Nicolaus of Damascus (Joseph., Antiq. xvi. 9, 4), as ambassador to Caesar, who offered explanations as to Herod’s conduct in the Arabian war, and persuaded the Emperor to suspend the proposed census. And thus it would appear that the registration was completed, but that no further tax was imposed at that time. However, ten years afterwards, on the deposition and banishment of Archelaus, the whole work was completed, Cyrenius being the second time the agent of Rome. This time Cyrenius came with full powers, as imperial legate of Syria, aided by an armed force, and not only enrolled the inhabitants of the country, but levied a tax upon them, an act of oppression which led to the insurrection of Judas of Galilee and the dispersion and slaughter of his adherents (Act v. 37; Joseph., Antiq. xviii. 1).

III. The Risk of Rebellion

It has been urged that it was very unlikely that any such enrolment and taxation would have been forced upon Palestine, taking into account the danger of a revolt, the answer to which supposition is that a mere. ἀπογραφή, or registration, which is all that S. Luke asserts, would not be likely to stir up rebellion, though a registration involving direct taxation might do so, as, in fact, it afterwards did in the days of Judas of Galilee.

But the Romans of the empire were wise, and knew the limits of their power; and while they would not enforce an obnoxious tax at an untimely moment, they were quite prepared to face the difficulties of any crisis whenever necessary, backed up as they were by the admirable organisation of their
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army, which would render opposition useless, as on this occasion, when the revolt of Judas of Galilee was easily suppressed.

IV. The Method of Registration

According to Roman law, the registration would have been effected at the ordinary place of residence, and there would have been no compulsion upon the inhabitants to go, as S. Luke declares, "every one into his own city."

But this permission, to resort to the place of birth or home of the family, i.e. to the forum originis, was one of those acts of deference to provincial prejudice, which the Romans, like the modern British Government, were always prepared to make, provided that no serious interference with their plans was thereby entailed. And therefore, as the Jews were very tenacious of their ancient customs and of their endless genealogies, it was a harmless concession on the part of the Roman legate to allow them to present themselves to be enrolled, each in his own city. Hence the nomen and cognomen, "the house and lineage" of Joseph of Nazareth, were registered at Bethlehem of Judaea.

V. The Presence of Women

This last objection has the least force of all. Joseph went up, says S. Luke, to Bethlehem, "to be taxed with Mary his espoused wife." The presence of women, it is urged, was not required for purposes of registration, and there was therefore no necessity for Mary to put in an appearance. Neither Jewish nor Roman custom, it is asserted, demanded the appearance of women before the censitor, or registrar. Even if this were so, this custom would not have extended to the prohibition of women from attendance, and under the circumstances of the approaching Birth of the Saviour (S. Matt. i. 18–25), Joseph may have deemed it expedient that his wife should be, at such an anxious time, under his own care and protection. And,
indeed, both Mary and himself may have thought it desirable that the Child should be born at Bethlehem, and would have availed themselves gladly of the opportunity of the census for their removal to the City of David.

Such are the principal objections brought against this passage in S. Luke's narrative of the Nativity; and the answers to them, given above, may be held to be satisfactory in all points. We are of opinion that they justify Zumpt in his contention that the whole narrative of S. Luke is strictly accurate, and that the census was twice taken in Palestine (B.C. 4 and A.D. 6), and that Cyrenius officiated on both occasions as governor, or imperial legate of Syria. Other solutions of the difficulty, however, have been given, and these we may now enumerate briefly.

**Other Solutions**

(1) That the "taxing" was conducted by Cyrenius, then a Roman senator, but afterwards known as "governor" of Syria.

(2) That the work was actually commenced by Saturninus, and carried on by succeeding governors, Varus and Cyrenius, and was allowed to linger for nine or ten years.

(3) That Cyrenius, though not actually legate of Syria at the time of the census, may have assisted the ruling governor in the work; or Cyrenius may have been joint governor with Saturninus, as a few years previously had been the case when Volumnius had been joined with Saturninus. Josephus several times (Antiq. xvi. 9, 1, and 10, 8) mentions these two together as "presidents of Syria." Volumnius may have been recalled and Cyrenius substituted. Thus Cyrenius would then have been ἥγεσις under Saturninus, or with him, and would have acted as assistant in the work of registration, returning ten years later as sole official.

(4) Dean Farrar, in his *Life of Christ*, writes: "Great as are the historic difficulties in which the census is involved,
there seem to be good independent grounds for believing that it may have been originally ordered by Sentius Saturninus, that it was begun by Publius Sulpicius Quirinus, when he was for the first time legate of Syria, and that it was completed during his second term of office."

(5) Cyrenius may have been appointed to manage the business of the census over the head of Saturninus, the legate in office at the time, taking precedence of him as "rector" of Gaius Cæsar and extraordinary legatus Cæsaris, a position which would invest him with authority sufficient to override that of the legate.

Solutions Depending on Verbal Construction

These now remain for final consideration. It will help us if we have the actual words of S. Luke before us.

Εξήλθε δόγμα παρὰ Καῖσαρος Ἀνώνυμου ἀπογράφεσθαί πᾶσαν τῆν οἰκουμένην. Αὕτη ἡ ἀπογραφὴ πρώτη ἐγένετο ἡγεμονεύοντος τῆς Συρίας Κυρηναίου. Καὶ ἐπορεύοντο πάντες ἀπογράφεσθαι, ἐκατοστος εἰς τὴν ἱδίαν πόλιν.

As the matters with which we are dealing belong to Roman law and usage, the Latin of the Vulgate version will also be an assistance:—

Exiit edictum à Cæsare Augusto, ut describeretur universus orbis.
Hæc descriptio prima facta est à præside Syriæ Cyrino:
Et ibant omnes ut profitterentur singuli in suam civitatem.

We may combine with the enumeration of other solutions that have been suggested by various commentators a few brief notes on the words employed by S. Luke.

Δόγμα.

In classical Greek this word is used of any formal pronouncement of a recognised authority. It is rendered by edictum in the Vulgate. The Roman law draws a distinction
between *edicta* and *decreta*, which are both included, with *rescripta* and *mandata*, under the general term, "Constitutions of the Emperor." The edicts were general ordinances issued by him in his capacity of magistrate; the decrees were judicial decisions pronounced either on final appeal or in the exercise of his summary jurisdiction. In this case the *δόγμα* was an edict, issued by Cæsar Augustus in his capacity as censor. The duty of registration was anciently exercised by the consuls, but was afterwards transferred from them to the censors, who not only undertook the work of the census, but also took the general oversight of public morals.

The issuing of edicts was not confined to the emperor, but was exercised by all the principal magistrates, whether consuls, praetors, ædiles, censors, or quaestors; and there were different kinds of edicts, of which the most important were the *edicta perpetua*. The emperor's edicts derived their force from the fact that he exercised the power as the representative of the people.

The word *δόγμα* is applied in the New Testament not only to this edict of Augustus, but to the "decrees ordained of the apostles and elders" at the Council of Jerusalem (Acts xvi. 4) to the "decrees of Cæsar" (Acts xvii. 7); and in Ephesians ii. 15 and Colossians ii. 14 to the "ordinances" of the Law of Moses. The Revised Version follows the Authorised Version: and the Vulgate, while it has "edictum" in S. Luke ii. 2, has "decreta" in the other three passages.

Πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην.

By this phrase we are to understand the civilised world under the rule of Cæsar Augustus. It has, however, by some been limited to the land of Palestine, under the impression that the registration affected only the dominions of Herod; and it has even been suggested that S. Luke was confusing an ecclesiastical census by the priests with a census ordered by authority of the Roman Emperor.
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Πάσα ἡ οἰκουμένη is equivalent to universus orbis, or orbis terrarum, but is, of course, applicable only to the Roman Empire.

Ἀπογράφεσθαι, ἀπογραφή.

The ἀπογραφή is a registration, or enrolment. The most natural Latin equivalent is census; but the classical writers usually express it by descriptio, or professio, though neither of these words was a technical law term. The Vulgate uses both terms in S. Luke ii. 2 (hoc descriptio, ut describeretur), and in verse 3 ut profiteretur; in Acts v. 37, in diebus professionis. The usefulness of a census is obvious, and such enumeration of the people was a republican institution effected quinquennially, which ceased under the empire. Amongst the objects of the ἀπογραφή were the enrolment with a view to military duty, and also for purposes of taxation. When the ἀπογραφή included taxation, it was known as ἀποτίμησις τῶν οὐσίων. The registration at the Nativity was ἀπογραφή only, being probably limited to population. The tax office, or censuale officium, was under the control of the magister census, who dealt also with testamentary documents and with other Government affairs. A Roman citizen who evaded inscription on the census was punishable by the loss of liberty, for he was guilty of an endeavour to escape from the obligation to military duty. On the other hand, if a master enrolled his slave on the census, the slave was by that act manumitted.

The verb ἀπογράφεσθαι is in the middle voice, which (says Winer, in his Grammar of the Greek New Testament) not unfrequently denotes an action which takes place at the command or by the permission of the subject, where a German would use the auxiliary (sich) lassen, and where in Latin we should commonly find curare, e.g. ἀδικεῖσθαι, to let oneself be wronged; ἀποστερεῖσθαι, to let oneself be defrauded (1 Cor. vi. 7); and so ἀπογράφεσθαι, to have oneself en-
rolled. Compare also βαπτίζωθαί, γαμείωθαί, and many others.

As for its connection with the words that follow—ἀπογρα-
φεσθαι πάσαν τήν οἰκουμένην—Winer remarks that the infini-
tivus epexegeticus is the infinitive, which is added to a
sentence as a complement, usually to express design; and
that certain forms of epexegetical infinitive attach themselves
more easily to a sentence, or a member of a sentence, and
assumed the form of a word under grammatical government,
for which they were in some cases taken by the older gram-
marians, as in this verse, and in S. Luke viii. 8: ὅ ἔχων ἄτα
ἀκοῦειν ἄκονέτω.

Αὐτή.

Oosterzee and others prefer to read αὐτή (ipsa) instead of
αὐτή (ea), to which there can, of course, be no objection,
as the ancient uncial MSS. were written without accents.
Thus they would make S. Luke distinguish between the
decree for the enrolment and the enrolment itself, which
was not, according to their view, carried into execution till
some years later. Yet the ἀπογραφή was really ordered and
begun at the Birth of Christ, interrupted in Judæa for a
time by the death of Herod and by subsequent political
changes, and eventually continued and carried out under
Cyrenius. Hence Oosterzee’s version is, “The taxing itself
was made for the first time when Cyrenius was governor
of Syria.”

Kohler, Paulus, and Lange make the distinction between
the publication of the decree (v. 1), and its execution (v. 2)
ten years after.

Hales, Calvin, Valesius, and Wetstein also hold a dis-
tinction between the ἀπογραφή, or registration, and the
ἀποτίμησις, or taxation which followed the registration, and
took place only when Cyrenius was legate.
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Πρώτη.

On this word the comments are numerous, and some of the commentators, as Wieseler, Ewald, Greswell, and Tholuck, in their anxiety to rid themselves of the difficulties of the passage, ascribe to S. Luke grammatical errors in Greek construction, of which, judging from his general style, so lucid, clear, and accurate, he would not have been guilty. They assert that he here uses the superlative in the sense of the comparative, πρώτη for προτέρα, and makes the genitive phrase, ἡγεμονειόντος τῆς Συρίας Κυρηνίου, dependent upon this supposed comparative. Under this idea they render the verse, "This taxing took place before Cyrenius was governor." A similar construction, they point out, is found in S. John i. 15, 30, and xv. 18. Πρῶτος μον and πρῶτον ἤμον, and other examples are given from Aelian, Athenæus, and Chrysostom, S. Luke's object in inserting this verse as a parenthesis being to guard his readers against confusing this taxing at our Lord's Birth with the later one held by Quirinius, A.D. 6, of which S. Luke was well aware, as he himself mentions it in Acts v. 37. But Winer says, "This is quite erroneous. If such were Luke's meaning, his language would be not only ambiguous (for the closest and most natural rendering is, 'it took place as the first under the government of Quirinius'), but also awkward, if not ungrammatical. Huschke has not succeeded in finding an example which is really parallel; he merely illustrates the very familiar construction of πρῶτος with the genitive of a noun." Such a construction with a participial clause after an adjective of time in the comparative degree is sometimes found, but would be very harsh and unlike S. Luke; and with a superlative, would be impossible with him.

Another suggestion is πρῶτον for πρώτη, with the meaning, "this taxing first took effect," joining πρώτη with ἐγένετο.

Again, πρὸ τῆς has been made a conjectural substitute for
πρώτη, and also (by Theodore Beza) as an addition after ἐγένετο. "This enumeration took place before that which Quirinius executed."

There is no reason why the reading should be altered or the grammatical construction be disarranged, for S. Luke’s meaning is clear as the words stand; and so the R.V. renders the verse, "This was the first enrolment made when Quirinius was governor of Syria." He thus distinguishes this enrolment as "the first" from the subsequent enrolment in A.D. 6, as if he said, "I am aware of the census by Quirinius mentioned by Josephus, which was followed by the insurrection of Judas of Galilee, but I do not mean that census, but an earlier one." Πρώτη has no sense unless it refers to the previous sentence, indicating some peculiarity belonging to the enrolment, the most obvious peculiarity consisting in the contrast between the two. Hence, as Bishop Wordsworth suggests, should any of S. Luke’s readers desire to find the names of Joseph and Mary in the Roman archives, and to obtain official evidence of Christ’s Birth at Bethlehem, they must not look in the register of A.D. 6, but refer to the earlier registration of B.C. 4, which is entitled πρώτη ἀπογραφή, because it was succeeded by a δεύτερα, or second ἀπογραφή, which was known as the taxing, ἡ ἀπογραφή (Acts v. 37) being the more celebrated of the two. The first registration, descriptio prima, is that of S. Luke ii. 2; the second, descriptio secunda, that of Acts v. 37, both being in the mind of S. Luke as he penned the words.

Ἐγένετο.

This verse, as we have just said, is a parenthesis; the sense would be complete if it were removed from the text, and it was probably added with the view of explaining the previous verse and guarding himself against misconstruction. Two statements are made: verse 1, an edict was published by Augustus; verse 2, it was carried into effect by Cyrenius.
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The object of the parenthetical note is to distinguish between the edict and the execution of it. The edict went out "in those days," but it "took effect," or was completed later on under Cyrenius. S. Luke uses ἐγένετο, not ἦν. Had he intended to say, "This was the registration under Cyrenius," he would have used ἦν. The same expression occurs in Acts xi. 28, where the same meaning is conveyed. Speaking of a predicted dearth, he says, Ἐγένετο ἐπὶ Κλαύδιον, "it took place in the days of Claudius." Thus some take the meaning to be: The edict of Augustus was published towards the close of Herod's reign, viz. that Herod's dominions should be included in the general census of the provinces. And Herod, whose ambition was to be an independent prince, might hesitate as to obeying this command; but bearing in mind the sharp rebuke he had undergone previously, he wisely took steps to set the inquiry on foot, and thus obviate a charge of disloyalty; but, apprehensive of the opposition of his subjects on religious and patriotic grounds, he would delay the completion as far as he dared, and thus, as he died soon after, the work was left unfinished, "did not take effect till the governorship of Quirinius." This view, supported by Kohler, Ebrard, and others, requires προῶτη to be understood as equivalent to πρῶτον.

Ἡγεμονεύοντος.

The word Ἡγεμών is used in the New Testament in a very wide sense, as leader, ruler, chieftain, or prince. In S. Mark xiii. 9 and I S. Peter ii. 13 it is applied to officials under the king; in S. Matthew xxvii. 2 to the procurator Pilate; in the verse under consideration to the imperial legate, or praetor, Cyrenius; in S. Luke iii. 1, to the Emperor Tiberius; and in S. Matthew ii. 6 to the Lord Jesus Christ Himself.

It is obvious, then, that a word of so general an application
cannot be tied down to any specific meaning. We cannot therefore insist that Cyrenius was imperial legate of Syria at the time of our Lord’s Birth, as he undoubtedly was at a later date; any official position in Syria would satisfy the meaning of the word. He may have been a subordinate to the proprætor, or his superior as extraordinary legate, as we have already suggested on page 34, or joint governor with Saturninus. In dealing with a word like ἥγεμων we have not before us a technical word with a definite meaning, such as ἀνθίπατος, or Ἀσσύρχης, but a word with a signification so wide that it embraces all rulers or chieftains from the officials under a king to the emperor himself.
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CHAPTER III

AUGUSTUS AND THE PROVINCES

The Emperors of Rome

ONLY three of the emperors of Rome are mentioned in the New Testament by name—Augustus, Tiberius, and Claudius. The emperors during the first century were as follows:

Augustus . . . . B.C. 30 A.U.C. 724
Tiberius . . . . A.D. 14 " 767
Caligula . . . . " 37 " 790
Claudius . . . . " 41 " 794
Nero . . . . " 54 " 807
Galba . . . . " 68 " 821
Otho . . . . " 69 " 822
Vitellius . . . . " 69 " 822
Vespasian . . . . " 70 " 823
Titus . . . . " 79 " 832
Domitian . . . . " 81 " 834
Nerva . . . . " 96 " 849
Trajan . . . . " 98 " 851

The following references are quoted from the Revised Version:

Augustus. "There went out a decree from Cæsar Augustus, that all the world should be enrolled" (S. Luke ii. 1).

The name "Augustus" appears also in Acts xxv. 21, 25 and xxvii. 1. But these are noted below.

Tiberius. "In the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Cæsar." A.U.C. 780 (A.D. 27).
Augustus and the Provinces

The following also apply to Tiberius:—

"Is it lawful to give tribute unto Cæsar or not?" "They say unto Him, Cæsar's. Then saith He unto them, Render therefore unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's" (S. Matt. xxii. 17–21; S. Mark xii. 14–17; S. Luke xx. 22–25).

"If thou release this man, thou art not Cæsar's friend: every one that maketh himself a king speaketh against Cæsar" (S. John xix. 12).

"Forbidding to give tribute to Cæsar, and saying that He Himself is Christ a king" (S. Luke xxiii. 2).

Claudius. "A great famine over all the world, which came to pass in the days of Claudius" (Acts xi. 28).

"Claudius had commanded all the Jews to depart from Rome" (Acts xviii. 2).

"These all act contrary to the decrees of Cæsar" (Acts xvii. 7).

In the following passages the reference is to Nero, though he is not mentioned by name: "Nor against Cæsar, have I sinned at all." "I am standing before Cæsar's judgement-seat." "I appeal unto Cæsar." "Thou hast appealed unto Cæsar: unto Cæsar shalt thou go" (Acts xxv. 8, 10, 11, 12).

"When Paul had appealed to be kept for the decision of the emperor" [A.V. Augustus] "as he himself appealed to the emperor" [A.V. Augustus] (Acts xxv. 21, 25).

"A centurion named Julius, of the Augustan band" (Acts xxvii. 1).

"Fear not, Paul; thou must stand before Cæsar" (Acts xxvii. 24).

"I was constrained to appeal unto Cæsar" (Acts xxviii. 19).

"The man of sin," "the son of perdition" (2 Thess. ii. 3).

"Cæsar's household" (Phil. iv. 22).

In our Lord's prophecy of the destruction of the Temple we may assume an implied reference to Titus, not however Emperor until nine years later; and in S. John's mention of Patmos in Revelation i. 9 we may follow the tradition connecting this exile with Domitian and Nerva.
Hence we propose to treat of the following subjects:—

Augustus and the Provinces.
Tiberius and the Tribute.
Claudius and the Jews.
Nero and Trial on Appeal.
Titus and Jerusalem.
Domitian and Patmos.

Augustus and the Provinces

At the time when the Lord Jesus Christ was born, the world was in a condition in which it had never been before, at least in these two particulars: the world was at peace, and it was under the dominion of one man. This statement does not of course express the whole truth, for there were occasional conflicts on the frontiers of the Roman Empire; and beyond those limits there were great kingdoms possessing an ancient civilisation. But in the main our statement is true—unity and peace prevailed on earth, and helped to facilitate the progress of mankind towards that better peace and unity which the Saviour of the world came to proclaim. The crisis of the world's history was at hand, when, in the fulness of time, the Prince of Peace was born.

At this time the Romans were the masters of the world, and Augustus was the representative of the ancient Republic. The Senate and the Roman people were still the ostensible rulers, "S.P.Q.R." was inscribed upon the Roman banners and sculptured on its public buildings; but for all practical purposes the Republic was at an end, and its powers were vested in one autocratic ruler, uniting in his sole person all the great offices of the State, while at the same time he professed to be the servant of the Senate and the people.

There had been great empires before this. Assyria, Babylon, and Persia had in their turn ruled over many provinces in the East, but none had wielded so extensive a sway as that of the
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Roman Empire. In 750 years Rome had grown from a small principality of 115 square miles, until it embraced nearly the whole extent of the civilised world. And at the time when Jesus Christ, the King of kings, was born that He might make proclamation of the "Kingdom of God," the sceptre of the world was in the hand of Augustus, and all mankind submitted to his rule.

Augustus. B.C. 30 TO 14 A.D.

Caius Julius Cæsar Octavianus, Imperator and Augustus, belonged to the Octavian family, of Velitræ, in the country of the Volsci. He was born B.C. 63, and at an early age was adopted by his great-uncle, Julius Cæsar, changing his name, according to Roman custom on adoption, from Octavius to Caius Julius Cæsar Octavianus. He was the son of Caius Octavius by Atia, a daughter of Cæsar's sister Julia.

When Julius Cæsar was assassinated in the Senate, Octavius was at Apollonia, in Illyricum. He was but a youth of nineteen, yet he acted with great decision and boldness. Contrary to the advice of friends, he determined to proceed to Rome to claim the property he had inherited from Cæsar and to carry out the provisions of his will. The troops stationed at Illyricum offered themselves as his bodyguard, an offer which he deemed it advisable to decline. On landing at Brundusium he was welcomed by the veterans there, and saluted as "Cæsar." A second time he declined the assistance of the troops, having determined to enter Rome as a private person. It was a bold step to take, for Antony was in possession of power at Rome, and had even appropriated the whole of Cæsar's property and expended large sums in the payment of his own debts. Octavianus prudently satisfied himself with demanding the property devised to him under his uncle's will. At the same time he promised that he would strictly comply with the conditions of his inheritance in the payment of the benefactions to the people under that will. His moderation
and prudence procured him the support of the Senate, and he gained great popularity amongst the people. Public opinion was thereby brought to bear upon Antony, who was compelled to pay over the balance of Cæsar's property.

Meanwhile Octavianus, aided by Cicero in a series of orations known as Philippics, was growing in popularity, and at length became such a power in the state as to arouse the active enmity of Antony. After several engagements, in which Antony was worsted, a conference between the two rivals was arranged by Lepidus. The meeting took place on a small island in the River Rhenus, a tributary of the Po, not far from the present site of Bologna. Here it was agreed that contention should cease, and a Triumvirate, consisting of the three conspirators Octavius, Antony, and Lepidus, should be established. The provinces were divided amongst them, while Italy was to be held in common. This was in B.C. 43. In order to make this position secure, all opponents were proscribed and put to death, Octavius shamefully consenting to the death of Cicero, who had by his advocacy rendered him such signal service.

The Triumvirate did not last very long. Soon after the defeat of Brutus and Cassius at Philippi and the death of both by suicide, Lepidus, a man of smaller ambition, was put on one side; and the contest for supreme power now lay between Octavius and Antony.

A second division of the provinces was made. Africa was assigned to Lepidus, the eastern provinces to Antony, and the rest of the Roman world to Octavianus. Lepidus, however, was afterwards superseded, and having accepted the office of Pontifex Maximus, which he retained till his death in B.C. 12, retired into private life. And now the struggle for supremacy began in earnest, and the character of the two competitors determined the result.

Octavius returned to Italy and increased his power and prestige in the army by the distribution of lands amongst
the veterans and by the establishment of military colonies. But Antony yielded to the temptations of the wealthy and luxurious East, and presently fell under the fascinations of the Egyptian Queen Cleopatra, with whom he spent the rest of his life. He had summoned her to meet him in Cilicia, an order which she willingly obeyed, sailing up the Cydnus to Tarsus in a vessel propelled by silver oars that moved in unison with the sweetest strains of music. Nothing was omitted that would enthrall the senses; the odour of the incense of Arabia, the charms of beautiful attendants, the delights of a luxurious banquet, and above all, the irresistible fascinations of Cleopatra herself, completed the subjection of Antony, who from that day fell under her influence so completely that he abandoned all else for her sake. His army had already sustained serious reverses in Parthia, and now his ruin was complete. Cleopatra became his evil genius. To her he assigned kingdoms—Cœle Syria, Judæa, Cyprus, and Armenia. For her he neglected and divorced Octavia, the sister of Octavianus, whom he had married. In this way he alienated both the people of Rome and his colleague.

War was declared against Cleopatra, and the fleet was put under the command of Agrippa, while Octavianus led the army. The crisis came with the Battle of Actium, September 2nd, B.C. 31. Cleopatra had insisted upon a naval battle, her ships being twice as numerous as those of the enemy. But the Roman vessels were smaller and more easily handled. At first the issue was doubtful, but soon victory fell to Agrippa. Cleopatra herself took to flight, followed by the Egyptian war vessels, and Antony speedily sailed after her. At first he reproached her for her desertion, but overcome once more by her witchery, he went on board her vessel and accompanied her to Alexandria. Meantime Antony’s land forces, consisting of seventeen legions, awaited the return of Antony in vain and surrendered to Octavianus.

The victor sailed to Egypt in the spring of B.C. 30, and
attacked Alexandria by land and sea. The Egyptian fleet made no resistance, and the cavalry went over to the enemy. All was lost, and both resolved to die. Antony fell upon his own sword, and Cleopatra ended her life with a viper at her breast, after an unsuccessful attempt to fascinate Octavianus as she had fascinated his great-uncle.

Octavianus was now the master of the world. The Roman Republic was ended, and the Empire was established in its place.

Octavianus now directed his efforts towards making his position secure. Acting with the studied moderation he had ever showed, and remembering the fate of his uncle, he determined to conciliate the people by acting outwardly as a private person, while at the same time gathering into his own hands all the powers possessed by the republican magistrates. His progress was rapid. He had already held the consulship thirteen times, and now honours were heaped upon him in greater profusion than upon his uncle, Julius Cæsar. The latter had been honoured with the title of "father of his country," the month of Quintilis was named "July" after him, his statues were placed in the temples, and he was numbered with the gods. Other titles and offices were conferred upon him. This precedent was now followed in the case of his nephew.

The accumulation of honours began in B.C. 29, when the title of Imperator was given him as a prænomen; this was followed by the titles of Princeps Senatus and Augustus. He was now Imperator Julius Cæsar Augustus. He declined the dictatorship, but he was named Consul every year, and held proconsular power over the whole empire; he obtained tribunician power and became Censor; and at length, on the death of Lepidus, Pontifex Maximus. He was now in possession of all the dignities and offices of the State, and wielded supreme power over the Senate and the people. The whole power of the Roman Empire lay in the hollow of his
hand. The old magistracies continued in name, but the Emperor was supreme.

The rest of his reign was occupied in consolidating and establishing the empire, both at home and in the provinces. He re-formed the Senate, and effected a considerable reduction in their numbers by persuading the less reputable to resign; he passed many useful laws, to which we shall have occasion to refer in a succeeding chapter; he gained many victories in different parts of the world, and to some extent added to the territories of the empire, though somewhat against his will, as he held that the frontiers already arrived at were sufficiently well-defined by Nature, sufficiently distant also from the central authority to render it advisable to avoid any further extension of the empire. In his last will he advised that those boundaries should be retained—the Atlantic Ocean, the Rhine, the Danube, and the Euphrates, and the deserts of Arabia and Africa. The destruction of Varus and his three legions in Germany, the only great disaster he ever sustained, no doubt wrote that lesson on his heart.

His only real trouble came to him from his family. He had no son of his own, and those whom he adopted—Marcellus, Caius, Lucius, and Drusus—all died early. His greatest grief was due to the conduct of his third wife, Livia, and his own daughter Julia. Livia was suspected of complicity in the murder of his adopted sons; and Julia was so abandoned in her vicious life that she was exiled to the Isle of Pandataria.

He died at Nola, near Naples, August 19th, 14 A.D. (A.U.C. 767), asking his friends whether in their opinion he had played his part well throughout life. "If so," said he, "give me your applause." He died in the arms of Livia, who, according to some writers, hastened his death by poison, with the object of securing the succession to her son Tiberius.

There was a considerable element of hypocrisy in his character, of which he showed himself conscious on his deathbed. He had played a part all his life, but all the same, his rule
was an immense benefit to Rome and to the world at large, for he had played his part well. There were elements of danger in many directions which he avoided with great acuteness, and by his organisation of the empire he put upon a permanent footing that which might otherwise have fallen to pieces; and he brought into harmonious union many discordant elements, leaving to his successors the comparatively easy task of carrying on the policy he had initiated. We can hardly wonder that, in an age of superstition, the sorrowing people should have revered his memory and numbered him amongst the gods.

DIVISION OF THE PROVINCES

It is the division of the provinces between himself and the Senate that most concerns us in the history of Augustus, as that arrangement had an effect upon the history of provinces of which mention is made in the Acts of the Apostles and elsewhere in the New Testament.

The etymology of the word is doubtful; it has been derived from pro and vincere in the sense of “to push forward,” or “to drive before one.” Niebuhr connects it with proventus, according to which it would mean “a country paying a tax to the ruling state.” Schmitz, however, regards it as a contraction of providentia, signifying a country intrusted to the care of someone. The first province was Sicily, ceded to Rome at the end of the first Punic war, B.C. 240. As it was the first distinct country outside Italy it was determined to give it a different government. It was to be administered by a Roman governor, sent annually with the title of Praetor or Proconsul, and endued with both civil and military power, potestas and imperium. The governor was assisted by quaestors and other officials. The land itself was the property of the Roman people and Senate, and the occupiers paid tithes on the produce of the soil. Such land as remained in the possession of the provincials was subject to a land tax, which
was not levied on land in Italy itself. When the inhabitants served in the army they were esteemed as auxiliaries, not as allies. The inhabitants of the provinces were ground down by the extortion of the governors and by the many speculators who bought estates and cultivated the land by means of slaves.

Sicily was the first Roman province. The next was Sardinia and Corsica, B.C. 238. The others were added in the following order: Hispania Citerior and Ulterior, Gallia Cisalpina, Macedonia, Illyricum, Achaia, Africa (i.e. the country around Carthage). In B.C. 129 Attalus bequeathed his kingdom of Pergamus to Rome, and it became the province of Asia. Then followed Transalpine Gaul, which was known as "The Province," a name still retained in the modern Provence. After this, in succession, the Republic annexed the Balearic Isles, Dalmatia, Cyrenaica, a kingdom bequeathed by its last king, Ptolemæus Apion, to the Senate and people of Rome, B.C. 96. Next came Syria and Phœnicia, Armenia, Cyprus, and finally Egypt, B.C. 30, after the Battle of Actium and the capture of Alexandria.

In the days of Julius Cæsar there were fourteen provinces—seven in Europe, five in Asia, and two in Africa. Those in Europe were Further and Hither Spain, Transalpine Gaul, Cisalpine Gaul and Illyricum, Macedonia and Achaia, Sicily, Sardinia and Corsica; in Asia there were "Asia," Bithynia and Pontus, Cilicia with Cyprus, Syria and Crete; in Africa, Cyrene and the territory of Carthage designated "Africa." To these Cæsar added three more, making seventeen in all, viz. Gallia Lugdunensis, Belgica, and Illyria (as a separate province).

When Augustus divided the provinces between himself and the Senate, B.C. 27, they were twenty-four in number, about half of which were assigned to the Senate and half to himself, and were known respectively as provinciae Cæsareae and provinciae senatoriae or populi.
Those which he retained were mostly the countries on the frontiers, which were the more likely to be in an unsettled condition and to require the presence of the legions for the purpose of keeping order; they were also for the most part the larger and more wealthy, a feature which a prudent man like Augustus would not be likely to overlook. They consisted of Lusitania and Hispania Tarraconensis, Gallia Lugdunensis and Aquitania, Rhaetia, Vindelicia, Dalmatia, Pannonia, Moesia, Pontus, Cilicia, Syria, and Egypt.

The senatorial provinces were: Hispania Baetica, Gallia Narbonensis, Achaia, Macedonia, Bithynia, Cyprus, "Africa," Crete and Cyrenaica, and "Asia."

It was not a nominal distinction that was drawn between these two classes of provinces. The difference was real, and extended over many details, corresponding to their respective character as armed and unarmed provinces.

1. The governors bore different designations as their official titles. The governors of the imperial provinces, as receiving their commissions from the Emperor, were styled legati Caesaris, or legati Augusti, or imperial legates, to which was usually added pro pretore, whence they were sometimes called proprætors. Josephus calls them "presidents," and S. Luke uses the general term ἡγεμόν, which he applies, not only to an imperial legate like Cyrenius, but to inferior officials such as Pontius Pilate and Felix, and even to the Emperor himself (S. Luke ii. 2, iii. 1; Acts xxiii. 33). In addition to the official imperial legate, the Emperor would sometimes appoint to subordinate districts a procurator, or ἐπιτρόπος, such as Pilate, Festus, or Felix, who were governors or procurators of Judæa, at the time a dependency of the large and important province of Syria.

The imperial legates were chosen from the senators, or from those of consular or prætorian rank, and took precedence according to the number of legions stationed in the province.
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The rulers of the senatorial provinces were known as pro-
consuls, legati pro consule, and were theoretically regarded as
deputies of the consuls.

The word consul was derived from the root sol, as in such
words as solium, sella, sedes, etc., and indicated those who
sat together, as for the purpose of deliberation. The corre-
sponding Greek word was ὑπατος, a contraction of ὑπέρτατος,
highest, supreme, a term pointing to the dignity of persons
holding high office in the State. A proconsul was an official
who, having filled the office of consul, had been appointed as
the governor of a senatorial province. In Greek this was
ἀνθύπατος, and S. Luke, always accurate in historical matters,
uses this term of the proconsular governors. Thus Cyprus,
Achaia, and "Asia" were senatorial provinces, and each time
S. Luke correctly designates the governor as ἀνθύπατος.
Three times he so styles Sergius Paulus, in Cyprus (Acts xiii.
7, 8, 12), the Authorised Version translating "deputy"; but
the Revisers, more accurately, rendering it "proconsul."
Again, in Acts xviii. 12, when speaking of Achaia, anoth-
ern senatorial province, S. Luke writes Γαλλίων δὲ ἀνθυπατεύοντος
τῆς Ἀχαίας, using the official term, and the Revised Version and
Authorised Version again rendering the word "proconsul" and
"deputy" respectively. Our third instance is in Acts xix. 38,
ἀνθύπατοι εἰσι, "there are proconsuls" (R.V.)—a curious
expression, for there was, of course, only one proconsul in
the province of Asia; but the meaning of the phrase, in the
mouth of the town clerk of Ephesus, obviously is that, for the
purpose of legal proceedings, the proconsul of "Asia" had
appointed magistrates (consiliarii, or assessors) in Ephesus and
other towns in his province, who, as his representatives, might
appropriately be styled ἀνθύπατοι in popular parlance. And
this will appear more likely to be the true view, when taken in
connection with the preceding phrase. The town clerk of
Ephesus reminds the rioters in the temple of Diana that legal
proceedings were available to them if they had a real grievance,
ἀγόραιοι ἁγονταὶ καὶ ἀνθύπατοι εἰσί, "the courts are open, and there are proconsuls" (R.V.). The proconsul could not, of course, adjudicate personally in every case brought before him, but he was accustomed to hold his courts in Ephesus, as in Sardis, Laodicea, Smyrna, and other cities of "Asia," and the consiliarii appointed by him could hold inquiry into matters under dispute and deliver judgment. This is probably a preferable view to the opinion of those who understand the phrase as a categoric plural, implying that there are such persons as proconsuls. It seems quite unnecessary to suppose, with Conybeare and Howson, that the proconsulship was at this time in commission under Celer and AElius (Tac., Ann. xiii. 1), or that some of the governors of the neighbouring provinces, as Achaia, Cilicia, or Cyprus, might have been present at the public games; for such rulers would have possessed no authority to act beyond the limits of their own province.

2. Another distinction is to be drawn between the two classes of provinces in regard to the mode of appointment and the length of the term of office of the governors.

The Emperor nominated his own deputies in the provinces under his care, selecting them at will from the senators, viri consulares, pretorii, and knights; and they held office at his pleasure for an undefined term, though the rule he appears to have laid down for his guidance, and which he usually followed, was that the period should be not less than three years nor more than five. On the other hand, the Senate and people regulated the appointment of their proconsuls by allotment amongst the senior members who had held high office as consul or prætor for at least five years in Rome; and their term, as in the days of the Republic, was one year only.

3. The main difference between the two classes of provinces consisted, as we have said, in the fact that they were respectively the armed and the unarmed provinces. And this difference was reflected in the status of the respective
governors. The *legati Augusti* were *military* rulers, possessing both *imperium* and *potestas*; the senatorial governors were *civil* rulers only, being invested with civil jurisdiction only, except in the case of the important provinces of "Asia" and "Africa," the nominees to which were always of consular rank, and possessed other privileges, such as the command of a legion, and sometimes of two.

This distinction appeared also in their *style*. The proconsuls were attended by lictors, *φθεγμονες*, bearing six fasces, as against the five fasces of the imperial legates, and were surrounded by the pomp and circumstance of high rank; but being merely civil magistrates, they held no military command.

The imperial legates were military officers; they came to their provinces at the head of legions, and were endowed with the military insignia and costume, and the power of the sword. The civil government was also in their hands.

Over the imperial provinces the Emperor held unlimited power; and this meant really entire control over the whole state. He was at the head of a vast army, estimated by Niebuhr to consist of forty-three or forty-seven legions, as well as the innumerable auxiliaries, amounting to about 400,000 men in all. By this arrangement he assured the Senate, he would preserve peace throughout the Roman world; his legions would take charge of the unsettled districts on the frontiers, and give perfect security to Rome and all Italy.

Thus Augustus, by retaining control over the army, had the Senate at his feet; but with the wisdom which ever characterised his acts, he did not allow this to appear. And the people were contented, for the plan worked well. Augustus kept Italy in hand by means of the military colonies, twenty-eight in number, which he had formed on his return from the war with Antony, by making liberal grants of lands to his veterans. And as a further security to himself he created the famous band which afterwards became known as the Prætorian
Guards. In its origin this band numbered about 8,000 men, who were at first distributed in various parts of Italy, but were gradually brought nearer to the city, until at length they were concentrated in the prætorian camp close to Rome itself. It was these Prætorian Guards who afterwards figured so prominently in history, holding the empire in their power, appointing the emperor, and even putting the empire itself to auction, and selling it to the highest bidder.

4. The last point of difference we shall note consisted in the fiscal arrangements. The revenue in the imperial provinces was called tributum; that in the senatorial stipendium. The first was paid into the treasury, or fiscus, of the Emperor, and the second into the ararium, or public treasury. From the ararium the Senate defrayed the cost of the civil government.

The Emperor was enormously wealthy; all the domain land in both classes of provinces belonged to him, and the revenue accruing from it was at his disposal. There were also several other sources of revenue flowing into the fiscus, "such as the tax levied on legacies and inheritances (vicesima hereditatum), the excise duty on all goods exposed for sale (centesima rerum venalia), the tax levied on persons living in celibacy (uxorium), and others. At a later time the ararium was completely swallowed up by the fiscus, and the latter became the only public treasury, so that the whole finances of the empire were under the control of the emperors" (Schmitz).

Each provincial governor was attended by a finance minister; the proconsul by a quæstor, the proprætor by a procurator Cæsaris.

This organisation of the provinces by Augustus had a most beneficial effect upon the prosperity of the provincials. Hitherto robbery, extortion, and plunder had been the rule, the governor being allowed to exact what he chose from the unfortunate people. "It is attested by Cicero" (says Schmitz) "that the arrival of a governor, even in a peaceful province, was little different from the entrance of a victorious army into
the country of a vanquished enemy. Even men who were of
good repute for their humanity returned to Rome with almost
incredible sums of money after they had been in a province for
some years. What the governors left undone was completed
by usurers and the farmers of the public revenue."

These wrongs were for the most part redressed by Augustus,
and the provinces prospered more and more under his benefi-
cent rule. It was his policy rather to pacify and consolidate the
empire than to add to its extent. As Gibbon says, "It was
reserved for Augustus to relinquish the ambitious design of
subduing the whole earth, and to introduce a spirit of moder-
ation into the public councils. Inclined to peace by his temper
and situation, it was easy for him to discover that Rome, in
her present exalted situation, had much less to hope than to
fear from the chance of arms; and that, in the prosecution
of remote wars, the undertaking became every day more
difficult, the event more doubtful, and the possession more
precarious and less beneficial."

Egypt had been constituted a province after the downfall
of Antony and Cleopatra; but, beyond this, no further
accessions were made to the empire. Augustus even with-
drew his legions from the country between the Rhine and the
Weser after the disaster under Varus, and made the Rhine
the boundary of his dominions in the north-west. And this
policy was followed also by his immediate successors, so that
during the first century of the Christian Era Britain was the
only fresh province.

In A.D. 105 Dacia was added to the empire, and in 114
Armenia; but in 117 Hadrian made the Euphrates the
boundary on the east, renouncing all claim to the territories
beyond.

From time to time exchanges were effected between the
Senate and the Emperor, of which the most interesting to us
is the case of Cyprus. Dio Cassius states that Cyprus was at
first assigned by the Emperor to himself, but was afterwards
exchanged for Dalmatia. Hence when S. Paul and S. Barnabas travelled through Cyprus that island was a senatorial province, and the correct designation of its governor, Sergius Paulus was, ἄνθόπατος, as given by S. Luke in Acts xiii. 7. Tiberius appropriated Achaia and Macedonia without any compensation; and Bithynia was taken from the Senate by Hadrian.

Eventually Constantine made a redistribution of the provinces, which by that time were all under the control of the Emperor. He divided the empire into four prætorian prefectures—the East, Illyria, Italy, and Gaul. These were subdivided into dioceses under vicars, and these again into provinces under proconsuls or rectors.

The Provinces

Having dealt with Augustus and his division of the empire between himself and the Senate, it now remains to consider the provinces separately. Several of these, viz. Gaul, Rhætia, Noricum, Pannonia, Mædia, "Africa," and Numidia, find no place in the New Testament, and are passed by without comment in this chapter.

The chief references to the others are as follows:—

Judæa. Matthew ii. 1, 5, 6, 22; iii. 1; xxiv. 16; Mark iii. 14; Luke xxi. 21; John iv. 3; vii. 3; xi. 7; Acts i. 8; ii. 9; ix. 31; x. 37; xii. 19; xxviii. 21; Romans xv. 31; 2 Corinthians i. 16; i Thessalonians ii. 14.

Samaria. Matthew x. 5; Luke ix. 52; x. 33; xvii. 11, 16; John iv. 4, 9, 39; viii. 48; Acts i. 8; viii. 1, 5, 14; ix. 31; xv. 3.

Galilee. The references are very numerous; we give only the most prominent. Matthew ii. 22; iv. 15; xxi. 11; xxvi. 32; Mark i. 39; Luke iv. 14, 44; xiii. 1, 2; xxiii. 5, 6; John vii. 41, 52; Acts i. 11; ii. 7; v. 37.

Phœnicia. Acts xi. 19; xv. 3; xxi. 2; xxvii. 12.
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Syria. Matthew iv. 24; Luke ii. 2; Acts xv. 23, 41; xviii. 18; xx. 2; xxi. 3; Galatians i. 21.

The above were all included in the great province of Syria.

Cilicia. Acts vi. 9; xv. 23, 41; xxi. 39; xxii. 3; xxiii. 34; xxvii. 5; Galatians i. 21.

Pamphylia. Acts ii. 10; xiii. 13; xv. 38; xxvii. 5.

Lycia. Acts xxvii. 5.

"Asia." Acts ii. 9; iv. 9; xvi. 6; xix. 10, 22, 26, 27, 31; xx. 4, 16, 18; xxi. 27; xxvii. 2; 1 Corinthians xvi. 19; 2 Corinthians i. 8; 2 Timothy i. 15; 1 Peter i. 1; Revelation i. 4, 11.

Bithynia. Acts xvi. 7; 1 Peter i. 1.

Pontus. Acts ii. 9; xviii. 2; 1 Peter i. 1.

Galatia. Acts xvi. 6; xviii. 23; 1 Corinthians xvi. 1; Galatians i. 2; iii. 1; 2 Timothy iv. 10; 1 Peter i. 1.

Phrygia. Acts ii. 10; xvi. 6; xviii. 23.

Cappadocia. Acts ii. 9; 1 Peter i. 1.

Cyprus. Acts iv. 36; xi. 19, 20; xiii. 4; xv. 39; xxi. 3, 16; xxvii. 4.

Crete. Acts ii. 11; xxvii. 7, 12, 13, 21; Titus i. 5, 12.

Parthians, Medes, Elamites, dwellers in Mesopotamia.
Acts ii. 9.

Arabia. Mark iii. 8; Acts ii. 11; Galatians i. 17; iv. 25.

Scythia. Colossians iii. 11.

This list exhausts Asia.

We now turn to Europe.

Macedonia. Acts xvi. 9, 10, 12; xviii. 5; xix. 21; xx, 1, 2; Romans xv. 26; 2 Corinthians vii. 5; viii. 1; ix. 2, 4; xi. 9; 1 Thessalonians i. 7, 8; iv. 10.

Achaia. Acts xviii. 12, 27; xix. 21; Romans xv. 26; xvi. 5; 1 Corinthians xvi. 5, 15; 2 Corinthians ix. 2; xi. 10; 1 Thessalonians i. 7, 8.
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Illyricum. Romans xv. 19.
Dalmatia. 2 Timothy iv. 10.
Spain. Romans xv. 24, 28.

We complete the circuit of the Mediterranean by passing along the north coast of Africa:—

Cyrene. Matthew xxvii. 32; Mark xv. 21; Luke xxiii. 26; Acts ii. 10; vi. 9; xi. 20; xiii. 1.
Libya. Acts ii. 10.
Egypt. Matthew ii. 13, 14, 15, 19; Acts ii. 10; vii. 9, 10, 22, 34, 39; xxi. 38; Hebrews iii. 16; viii. 9; xi. 26, 27, 29; Jude 5; Revelation xi. 8.

At the time when Augustus divided the empire between himself and the Senate there were about twenty-four provinces, of which he retained half, and left the remainder for the Senate. A list of these will be found on page 54.

Italy itself, as being the sovereign state, was excluded from the arrangement. It lay in the middle of the central sea; and Rome, the empire-city, was situated in the centre of the west coast of Italy.

The provinces, regarded as dependencies of the sovereign state, embraced nearly the whole of the civilised world of that period. They were grouped around the Mediterranean, which justly bore the name of the "Central Sea." All the countries which bordered on the Central Sea, with their hinterlands, were subject to the rule of Rome, whose dominion extended on the north to the Rhine and the Danube; on the east to the Euphrates; and on the south to the burning sands of the Great Sahara Desert.

Augustus prudently decided not to march his legions across the Rhine into the wild, inhospitable regions beyond, whose trackless forests and deep morasses were involved in perpetual mist and Cimmerian gloom. The disaster of Varus
in A.D. 9, when three legions were lost from the Roman army, operated as a restraining influence in this direction. Equally did he hold it to be inadvisable to endeavour to extend the empire beyond the limits of the province of Egypt towards the tropical climes of Æthiopia. Twice had the Roman arms been involved in difficulties in the extreme south of the empire: in B.C. 24 an expedition into Arabia Felix resulted in utter failure; and two years later Candace, queen of the Ethiopians, invaded Egypt, meeting at first with considerable success, although eventually driven back. After this Augustus, having secured commercial relations with the interior of Africa, refrained from further aggression towards the south.

In the Far East, beyond the Euphrates, there were powerful empires with which Augustus maintained friendly relations; and he received ambassadors from Scythia and from India. These countries were regarded as being situated too far from the central authority to be effectively administered, and it was deemed better that the relations between them and Rome should be friendly and independent.

This policy of contentment with existing boundaries was consistently maintained all through the reign of Augustus, and was bequeathed by him to his successors, whom in his will, which was publicly read in the Senate, he advised to limit the empire to what seemed its natural boundaries. This advice was faithfully followed, and, during the first century, the only extension of the empire consisted in the addition of Britain.

Thus, at the death of Augustus, the Roman dominions were grouped in due proportion around the Mediterranean, as though around a vast inland lake, and comprised all the fairest and most fertile regions on the face of the earth. Together they formed an empire geographically compact, and capable by wise government of being ranged in stable equilibrium around the central force.
THE PROVINCES TAKEN SEPARATELY

We have already laid aside those provinces which find no mention in the New Testament; and we will now speak in due order of those which are so mentioned, commencing with the Asiatic provinces.

We begin, then, with Judæa, the cradle of Christianity, and will link its history with that of the other two districts of Palestine, Samaria and Galilee, with which it has been so intimately associated ever since the conquest of Palestine by Joshua. The whole three must be taken together as forming part of the great province of Syria.

Passing westward in the track of S. Paul, the great missionary preacher, we come to Cilicia, the province which gave him birth. Pamphylia and Lycia require a passing notice till the great, populous, and important province of "Asia" claims our special attention, as the scene of many stirring events in the history of the great apostle of the Gentiles.

Then, turning back towards the east, we will deal with Bithynia, Pontus, Galatia, Phrygia, and Cappadocia, each in its turn, and so complete the tale of the wealthy and influential provinces of Asia Minor and the East.

The two islands of Cyprus and Crete may next engage our attention; and finally, in Asia, the nations enumerated in Acts ii. 9-11 as being present in the Temple on the day of Pentecost—nations at that time beyond the bounds of the Roman Empire—Parthians, Medes, Elamites, dwellers in Mesopotamia, and Arabians, to which we add the Scythians.

Having thus passed in review the districts in Asia, we shall cross the Ægean Sea, with S. Paul and his companions, to the continent of Europe, landing at Neapolis in Macedonia, and passing thence to Achaia, Illyricum, Sicily, and Spain, not, of course, omitting reference to S. Paul's journey through Italy to Rome itself.

From Spain we cross the narrow strait which separates
Europe from a third continent; and, omitting Mauritania, Numidia, and "Africa," we will speak in the last place of Libya, Cyrene, and Egypt, thus returning to Judæa, whence we started.

**Order of the Acquisition of the Provinces**

*Note.—The dates below are given with as much precision as possible; but as changes were constantly taking place in the constitution of the provinces, perfect accuracy is not attainable in a mere list, without explanatory notes. Some of the later provinces were formed out of territories previously in possession.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>B.C.</th>
<th></th>
<th>Province</th>
<th>B.C.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>241</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sardinia and Corsica</td>
<td>238</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cilicia</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallia Cisalpina</td>
<td>222</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gallia Aquitania, Lugdunensis and Belgica</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispalia, Citerior and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulterior</td>
<td>205</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illyricum</td>
<td>167</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macedonia</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achaia</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispania Bética</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Asia&quot; (bequest)</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallia Transalpina</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyrenaica (bequest)</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bithynia (bequest)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crete</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontus</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pannonia (from Illyricum)</td>
<td>A.D.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cappadocia</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Galatia</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Numidia and Mauritania</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pamphylia and Lycia</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Britain</td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dacia</td>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phrygia</td>
<td></td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Syria, including Palestine**

Syria was a large and important district, extending along the shore of the eastern Mediterranean from the Amanus and Taurus ranges on the north, to the border of Egypt on the south. Inland it extended eastward to the River Euphrates, and the still more effectual barrier of the Arabian Desert, altogether, including Palestine, more than 450 miles from north to south, and of a breadth varying from 50 to 150 miles. Its area it would be impossible to state with accuracy, but it
might be estimated at more than 40,000 square miles. Including Phœnicia and Palestine, it was geographically distinct from other districts. Disregarding the comparatively low range of Amanus, it was shut out from the rest of the world by the lofty Taurus, in conjunction with Cilicia, with which it was at times associated, Cilicia having been part of the dominions of the Seleucidæ, as well as having been sometimes joined to the Roman province of Syria, just as we find it so associated in the travels of S. Paul, "He went through Syria and Cilicia, confirming the churches" (Acts xv. 41); and again in Galatians i. 21, "Afterwards I came into the regions of Syria and Cilicia."

In the Hebrew "Aram" stands for Syria, the word "Syria" itself being derived from "Tsur," or Tyre, the first of the Syrian towns known to the Greeks.

The soil was rich and the produce abundant, the whole region overflowing, like Palestine, with corn, wine, and oil, and worthy of comparison with the Land of Promise itself as a land "flowing with milk and honey"—a distinct contrast with its present condition, desolated by centuries of Turkish misrule and the depredations of the Bedouin marauders. Its wines were exported to distant countries like India, Persia, and Æthiopia, and were appreciated by Rome itself. As regards its manufactures, the Tyrian purple was in demand in all parts of the world; raw silk from China found its way to the looms of Berytus and Tyre, and the linen goods of Byblus and the glass works of Sidon were famed throughout the world.

Syria was, in fact, an exceedingly wealthy district, and, as a province, one greatly coveted by office-seekers. Its governor was the master of four legions. When taken over as a Roman province a peculiar form of administration was assigned to it. There were a number of cities and of tracts of country in Syria which were so strongly attached to their ancient customs that the Romans judged it wise not to interfere with them,
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and accordingly allowed them the privilege of self-government, giving them the appearance without the reality of freedom, but requiring them to pay tribute direct to Rome. Such cities were Antioch, Seleucia, Sidon, Tyre, and others. The districts were governed by native princes, and were sometimes styled kingdoms, sometimes tetrarchies. Such were Commagene, Chalcis ad Belum, Arethusa, Abilene, Palmyra, and Damascus.

On the division of the dominions of Alexander the Great Mesopotamia and Syria fell to the share of Seleucus Nicator, who became the founder of the dynasty of the Seleucids, B.C. 321, which ruled Syria for nearly two hundred and fifty years. Seleucus founded the city of Antioch, with its port Seleucia, B.C. 300; and Antioch, as the capital of Syria, speedily became a splendid city, rivalling even Alexandria itself. Antioch has this great interest to us, that it was there that the holy name by which we are called derived its origin, "The disciples were called Christians first in Antioch" (Acts xi. 26). This city, in fact, became the headquarters of the Christian religion at an early date and the starting-point for the missionary journeys of S. Paul. When the persecution of the Jewish Christians broke out, after the martyrdom of S. Stephen, many of the brethren found a refuge in Phœnicia and Antioch (Acts xi. 19-27). It was here that the Gospel began to be preached systematically to the Greeks; here that S. Barnabas infused zeal into the new converts; hither Barnabas brought Saul from Tarsus; hither also Agabus and other prophets resorted from Jerusalem to foster the life of the growing Church of the Gentiles. It was from Antioch that Paul and Barnabas started for the first missionary journey, sailing to Cyprus from the port of Seleucia (Acts xiii. 1-4); to Antioch they returned at the conclusion of their journey, "And there they abode long time with the disciples" (Acts xiv. 26-28). Again, it was at Antioch that the first controversy arose in the Church as to the relation
between Jew and Gentile within the Christian fold, when Paul and Barnabas were sent as delegates to the apostles at Jerusalem. On their return, accompanied by Judas Barsabas and Silas as representatives of Hebrew Christianity at Jerusalem, they summoned an assembly of the Church at Antioch and delivered to them the document containing the decision of the apostles on the subject debated at the first Christian Council (Acts xv.). After this Paul and Barnabas “continued in Antioch, teaching and preaching the word of the Lord” (Acts xv. 35); and it was doubtless at this time that the painful incident occurred to which S. Paul alludes in Galatians ii. 11 ff. It has indeed been held by some commentators that this meeting between the two apostles took place at a later date, but it is more likely to have occurred soon after the Council at Jerusalem, when the matter under dispute was fresh in men’s minds. S. Peter appears at first to have acted loyally to the terms of the decree, but afterwards, through fear of man (as on the memorable occasion when he denied his Master), to have withdrawn his support, and to have refused communion with the uncircumcised brethren. Another difference of opinion, still more painful, arose shortly after between Paul and Barnabas (Acts xv. 36–40), illustrating, as Conybeare and Howson remark, the infirmity of human nature, and proving that they were indeed, as they had lately told the Lystrians, “men of like passions” with others. The dispute with S. Peter was upon a matter of principle of great importance to the welfare of the infant Church in the future. The quarrel with S. Barnabas was a more personal matter; at all events, on the part of Barnabas himself, whose family affections swayed his conduct on the occasion. In both disputes we recognise the unyielding conscientiousness of S. Paul, and his tenacious adherence to principle, which probably exerted all the more influence over him as he remembered the recent dispute with S. Peter when Barnabas’s weakness of character led him into “dissimulation” (Gal. ii. 13). And so the two
old friends, each a pillar of the Church, went their separate ways, taking their departure from Antioch. (The "Antioch" of 2 Timothy iii. 11 is that in Pisidia, for there were several cities of this name, sixteen of which were attributed to Seleucus as the founder.) Thus Antioch is of extreme interest and importance in the annals of the early Christian Church.

Besides this special interest, it was of importance in the world at large. Its position at the extremity of the great inland sea, which at this time had become practically a Roman lake, made it an emporium for the merchandise both of East and West; it served as a convenient medium of exchange between the countries bordering on the Mediterranean and the caravans from Mesopotamia, Persia, and the more distant Indies. It was well described as "the gate of the East." Its inhabitants were cosmopolitan. Greeks, Hebrews, Romans, and Orientals thronged its streets, making it the most populous city in the world after Rome and Alexandria. It was a great city from its foundation; but the later Seleucidæ added to its proportions, so that it became known in the time of Augustus as a tetropolis, consisting of four independent walled-in districts, the whole being enclosed by a common wall. Mommsen ("Provinces," vol. ii. p. 129) thus describes it: "No city in all the empire excelled Antioch in the splendour and magnificence of its public structures. The chief street, which to the length of thirty-six stadia (nearly four and a half miles), with a covered colonnade on both sides, and a broad carriage-way in the middle, traversed the city in a straight direction along the river, was imitated in many ancient towns, but had not its match even in imperial Rome. As the water ran into every good house in Antioch, so the people walked in those colonnades through the whole city at all seasons protected from rain as from the heat of the sun, and during the evening also in lighted streets, of which we have no record as to any other city of antiquity." Like Paris
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in our own day, Antioch was a city of pleasure, whither resorted those whose business it was to amuse, the performers on the flute and harp, and other musicians, the heroes of the amphitheatre, the gymnasium, and the thermæ. It was said to exceed all the great cities of the empire in dissoluteness of morals, and to have combined with its immorality the utmost credulity and superstition.

This state of things began early, and contributed greatly to the decline of the city. Nevertheless the country at large prospered exceedingly under the rule of the Seleucidæ. The kings of this line were as follows:—

| Seleucus Nicator | . . | B.C. 312 |
| Antiochus Soter | . . | 280 |
| Antiochus Theos | . . | 261 |
| Seleucus Callinicus | . . | 246 |
| Seleucus Ceraunus | . . | 226 |
| Antiochus Magnus | . . | 223 |
| Seleucus Philopator | . . | 187 |
| Antiochus Epiphanes | . . | 175 |
| Antiochus Eupator | . . | 164 |
| Demetrius Soter | . . | 162 |
| Alexander Balas | . . | 150 |
| Demetrius Nicator (1st reign) | . . | 146 |
| Antiochus Sidetes | . . | 137 |
| Demetrius Nicator (2nd reign) | . . | 128 |
| Antiochus Grypus | . . | 125 |
| Antiochus Cyzicenus | . . | 113 |
| Antiochus Eusebes and Philippus | . . | 95 |
| Tigranes | . . | 83 |
| Antiochus Asiaticus | . . | 69 |

The dominions of the Seleucid kings, originally extending east and west of Antioch into Mesopotamia and Asia Minor, became gradually disintegrated. The decline began with Antiochus Soter, who lost territory in Asia Minor: Antiochus
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Theos lost Parthia and Bactria, B.C. 254; and Antiochus the Great ceded his possessions in Asia Minor to Rome, B.C. 190. The infamous Antiochus Epiphanes, having roused the slumbering religious zeal of the Jews by his unparalleled cruelty and revolting impiety, was deprived of Palestine. This, however, will be considered further on, under Judæa. He was succeeded by his son, an infant, under whom further losses were made; and the disintegration of the Syrian Empire proceeded rapidly under the later Selucids, by whom futile attempts were made to arrest the decay. The country was now becoming impoverished by bribes to Rome for aid, which it never really gave; and constant warfare abroad and inordinate luxury at home completed the ruin of the country. Several kings of the name of Demetrius and Antiochus succeeded Antiochus Epiphanes, under whose rule the Syrian Empire gradually fell to pieces, a number of petty princes managing to form small independent governments all over the country, and several large cities on the coast and in the interior also asserting their freedom, a process which formed the basis for the free towns and the various tetrarchies and petty kingdoms which were allowed to exist under the Roman rule after the erection of Syria into a province. Meanwhile Tigranes had possessed himself of the northern portion of Syria and of the countries between the Caspian Sea and the Euphrates, including Armenia, Hyrcania, and the eastern portion of Cilicia known as Cilicia Pedias, or Campestris, forming altogether a not inconsiderable empire, with an ample revenue. He hoped to strengthen this position by an alliance with Mithridates, who was then foolishly engaged in an ambitious war against the Romans. But Mithridates was a broken reed, easily crushed by the proconsul Lucullus, for the Asiatics could never make a stand against the Roman legions. Finally, as it appeared that Lucullus was delaying the end of the war for the purpose of enriching himself by the plunder of a wealthy Oriental empire, Pompey was sent into Syria. Covered
with glory through his recent expedition against the Cilician pirates, who had infested the Mediterranean from Antioch to the Pillars of Hercules, he came to the East, drove Mithridates into suicide, and forced Tigranes to content himself with Armenia. By the treaty then concluded, Tigranes was required to pay an indemnity of six thousand talents and to give up all claim to Syria, which now received a formal constitution as a province, and was henceforth governed from Rome (B.C. 63). The governors were at first proprætors, or quæstors, afterwards proconsuls; and eventually, after the division of the provinces between the Emperor and the Senate, legati Augusti, or Caesaris proprætore. As Syria was a wealthy province, and one much desired by those qualified for the office, it was regarded as an important appointment, and was often held by prominent personages. This being so, and there being also a question of great interest connected with the name of Quirinius, upon which we have already commented (page 17), it may be well to record the names of the governors of Syria, from Scaurus, the first on the list, to Mucianus, who was in office in A.D. 69:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>B.C.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Æmilius Scaurus</td>
<td>Quæstor proprætore</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Marcius Philippus</td>
<td>Proprætor</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lentulus Marcellinus</td>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabinius</td>
<td>Proconsul</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crassus</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassius</td>
<td>Quæstor</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Calpurnius Bibulus</td>
<td>Proconsul</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sextus Julius Cæsar</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quintus Cæcilius Bassus</td>
<td>Prætor</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Cassius Longinus</td>
<td>Proconsul</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Decidius Saxa</td>
<td>Legatus</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Ventidius Bassus</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Sosius</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Munatius Plancus</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Calpurnius Bibulus</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governor</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q. Didius</td>
<td>Legatus</td>
<td>B.C. 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Valerius Messala</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varro</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Vipsanius Agrippa</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Tullius</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Vipsanius Agrippa</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Titius</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Sentius Saturninus</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Quinctilius Varus</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Sulpicius Quirinius</td>
<td>Legatus</td>
<td>A.D. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Cæcilius Melettus</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creticus Silanus</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Calpurnius Piso</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cn. Sentius Saturninus</td>
<td>Pro-legatus</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Pomponius Flaccus</td>
<td>Proprætor</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Vitellius</td>
<td>Legatus</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Petronius</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vibius Marsus</td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Cassius Longinus</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Ummidius Quadratus</td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domitius Corbulo and C. Itius</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincius</td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Cestius Gallus</td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Licinius Mucianus</td>
<td></td>
<td>A.D. 67 to 69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of these governors Quirinius is the most interesting to us in connection with the "taxing" mentioned by S. Luke. It will be observed that there is a hiatus of ten or twelve years between Varus (B.C. 6) and Quirinius (Cyrenius) (A.D. 6). For the suggestions made by Zumpt as to the legati during the interval, see page 29.

A passing word upon others of these governors may find a place here. The names of nearly all are recorded by Josephus, with some account of their deeds. The province suffered severely under their rule.
Scaurus, the first one appointed, received bribes from Aristobulus (Joseph., B. J. i. 6, 3). Gabinius also was corrupt; he accepted ten thousand talents from Ptolemy Auletes; and with the aid of Rabirius he carried on a wholesale system of plunder in Syria, for which he was accused before the Senate, and though defended by Cicero, was sent into exile. His extortions were surpassed by Crassus, who enriched himself exceedingly in Syria and the East, taking two thousand talents from the Temple at Jerusalem. Crassus then crossed into Mesopotamia, where his army was nearly exterminated by the Parthians, whose king, Orodes, filled the skull of Crassus with molten gold, saying, "Sate thyself now with that metal of which in life thou wert so greedy." Crassus was succeeded by Cassius, who had been one of the murderers of Julius Caesar.

Sextus Julius Caesar was murdered by Bassus, who made his own position in the province sufficiently secure to resist three proconsuls whom the Senate sent out in order to depose him.

The legates from Saxa to Bibulus were appointed by Antony.

Varus was the general who lost the Roman legions in Germany, this being the only serious disaster during the reign of Augustus.

Other governors of Syria will engage our attention at a later date.

The references to Syria in the New Testament are not very numerous; that one which has attracted the greatest attention, the taxing under Cyrenius (S. Luke ii. 2) is treated in a separate chapter.

The only other reference in the Gospels is in S. Matthew iv. 24, where it is stated that our Lord's "fame" (A.V.) or "the report of Him" (R.V.) "went forth into all Syria."

Three times we find "Syria and Cilicia" joined together in
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the history of S. Paul’s travels (Acts xv. 23, 41; Gal. i. 21),
the two adjoining provinces being, as we have shown else-
where, geographically one.

In three other places also the mention of Syria occurs in
connection with the travels of S. Paul, viz. in Acts xviii. 18; xx. 2; xxi. 3.

Syrophœnicia

We may conclude this notice of Syria with a brief account
of the word “Syrophœnician,” found only in S. Mark vii. 26.
The MSS. give us various readings.
Συραφοινίκισσα. B.D.F.G.
Συραφοινήσσα. U Lat.
Φοινισσα. D.
The two words Συρ. and Φοιν. are disjoined in several
uncial MSS.
The word “Syrophœnician” is usually understood in the
sense of a Phœnician belonging to Syria, just as a “Liby-
phœnician” was a Phœnician of Africa. But the latter word
did not mean merely a Phœnician who dwelt in Africa, but
one of a mixed race, partly African and partly Phœnician.
In like manner the Syrophœnicans would be a mixed race,
belonging to both the Syrian and the Phenician stock; and
the ethnic sense would predominate over the geographical.
It was not until the Emperor Hadrian that the geographical
sense would prevail. The province of Syria was then
divided into three—Syria Proper, Syro Phœnic, and Syria
Palestina, the latter including also Damascus and Palmyrene.
S. Matthew describes the woman as “Canaanitish” (R.V.)
or “of Canaan” (A.V.).

Palestine

We now turn our attention to the fortunes of Judea. We
begin with the outrageous persecution of the Jews by Antiochus
Epiphanes, when he endeavoured to uproot the worship of Jehovah and substitute in its place the Greek Pantheon. The painful story is given at length by Dean Stanley, in his third volume of the *Jewish Church*. After forbidding the observance of the Sabbath and of the rite of circumcision, and establishing altars to the Grecian divinities in every part of Palestine, Antiochus proceeded to the worst outrage of all, the deliberate profanation of the Temple. This "culminating horror" is thus described by Stanley (*Jewish Church*, iii. 297): "In December, b.c. 168, a small Grecian altar was planted on the huge platform of the altar of Zerubbabel in honour of the Olympian Jupiter. On the 25th the profanation was consummated by introducing a herd of swine and slaughtering them in the sacred precincts. One huge sow was chosen from the rest. Her blood was poured on the altar before the Temple and on the Holy of Holies within. A mess of broth was prepared from the flesh and sprinkled on the copies of the Law (Jos., *Antiq.* xii. 5, 4). This was 'the abomination of desolation'—the horror which made the whole place a desert. . . . Every Jew was constrained to conform to the new system. The children were no longer to receive the initiatory rite of circumcision. The swine's flesh was forced into the mouths of the reluctant worshippers, who were compelled to offer the unclean animal on altars erected at every door and in every street."

It was inevitable that revolt should follow such unprecedented outrages. It began at Modin with the aged priest Mattathias and his five famous sons, the most famous of whom, the third son Judas, became known under the surname of Maccabæus. He was the great hero of the Asmonæan race. Three decisive battles were fought by him at Samaria, Beth-horon, and Emmaus, b.c. 166, and a fourth at Beth-zur in the following year; and Judas Maccabæus, flushed with victory, took possession of the desecrated Temple, purged it from pollution, and kept the Feast of the Dedication with
great joy, a feast which became a permanent institution of the Jewish religion, and was observed by our Lord Himself. "And it was the feast of the dedication at Jerusalem: it was winter. And Jesus was walking in the temple in Solomon's porch" (S. John x. 22, 23). Judas held the Temple, but he was surrounded by foes. The Edomites had pressed northwards till they were but a few miles from Jerusalem; the Ammonites and Moabites were threatening Jerusalem from the east, and the Syrians maintained themselves in their fortress near the Temple. A great work remained to be done. To this Judas addressed himself, and in a further series of battles cleared Judæa of all enemies, though he himself was slain in battle B.C. 161. A matter of vital importance in his career, which indeed brought upon him much odium from the fanatical party, was the treaty which he made with Rome. With true political insight, foreseeing the ultimate predominance of the Roman power, he deemed it wise to send two ambassadors to the Senate, asking for an alliance. A treaty accordingly was arranged, which secured the Asmonæan dynasty on the throne of Judæa for a while, but which ultimately led to the absorption of Palestine into the dominions of Rome.

The princes of the Asmonæan family, forming a kind of royal pontificate, were as follows:—

Judas Maccabæus, son of Mattathias . . . b.c. 167–161
Jonathan " " . . . " 160–143
Simon " " . . . " 143–135
Alexander Jannæus " John Hyrcanus . . . " 105–79
Alexandra, widow of Alexander Jannæus . . . " 79–69
Hyrcanus II., son of Jannæus and Alexandra . . . " 79–30
Aristobulus II. " " . . . " 69–49
Antigonus " Aristobulus II., set aside for Antipater. Aristobulus III. grandson of Hyrcanus II., murdered by Herod, b.c. 35.
From the above list of the Asmonæan rulers it will be seen that the sceptre remained in the family of Mattathias for 120 years, beginning with three of his own sons. It is also noticeable that the Jews were under the rule of a woman for ten years; and after her death it was the civil strife between her two sons, Hyrcanus and Aristobulus, that brought about the downfall of the dynasty.

Pompey, who had driven the Cilician pirates from the Mediterranean, scattered the vast hosts of Mithridates, and reduced Syria to the form of a province, was at this time, B.C. 63, at Damascus, where he received the two claimants for the throne. The decision was given in favour of Hyrcanus, and was not unnaturally disputed by his brother Aristobulus, who retired to Jerusalem. But Pompey followed him, and after a three months' siege captured the sacred city, slew 12,000 of its defenders, and intruded into the very sanctuary, the Holy of Holies, which, to his surprise and to the surprise of the world, was found to be absolutely empty. Hyrcanus was appointed to the high-priesthood, while Aristobulus was taken to Rome with many Jewish captives to adorn the triumph of Pompey—the most magnificent triumph Rome had ever seen.

The fortunes of the Asmonæan family had fallen very low, and its place begins to be occupied by the Idumæan family of Antipater.

This Antipater had been present at the interview between Pompey and the rival Asmonæan princes, and his influence had helped to turn the scale in favour of the weaker claimant, Hyrcanus. Antipater thenceforth became the real ruler of Judea, for Hyrcanus was too weak to hold his own. The sceptre passed from the Asmonæans to the Idumæans. But this will be considered in the chapter on the Family of the Herods.
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Maranatha = Herod
The Provinces of Asia Minor—"Asia"

When the wars with Carthage and with Greece came to an end (B.C. 146), the Roman Senate had become established as the leading power in the civilised world. Egypt had placed itself under the protection of Rome, the victorious career of Antiochus Epiphanes in the East had been checked, and alliances had been formed with most of the states in Asia Minor.

It was, however, in B.C. 133 that the first Asiatic possession accrued, through the bequest of Attalus III., the last king of Pergamus. In personal character this king ranks as one of the worst in history: he had a passion for poisoning, and he probably felt a perverse delight in bequeathing his kingdom and his people to the tender mercies of Rome. The claims of Rome under the will were disputed by Aristonicus, the half-brother of Attalus; but he was speedily put on one side, and the kingdom of Pergamus became a Roman province under the name of "Asia," in B.C. 129. The territory lay between Bithynia on the north and Lycia on the south, and included Mysia, Lydia, Caria and the greater part of Phrygia, with the large and important cities on the coast, such as Ephesus, Smyrna, and Pergamus, as well as the Troad, and the isles of Lesbos, Chios, Samos, Patmos, and Rhodes. It was a rich, fertile, and prosperous possession. At first, as was natural, Pergamus was retained as the capital, but Augustus conferred this privilege on Ephesus, making it at the same time the supreme administrative centre of Asia, with the title πρώτη Ἀσίας.

Paul and Silas were anxious to spread the Gospel through this populous province, where there were great opportunities for missionary zeal; but for some reason not stated they were forbidden (Acts xvi. 6). However, on his third missionary journey, he spent more than two years in Ephesus (Acts xix.), where "a great door and effectual" had been opened (1 Cor.
xvi. 9), and where a church was founded, to which he addressed one of his epistles from Rome, as well as that to the Colossians in the same province.

Here also were the seven churches of Asia, to the members of which S. John addressed his letters (Rev. i. 11).

To this province also belonged those officials, the Asiarchs, who acted so friendly a part to S. Paul when his life was in danger during the riot at Ephesus (Acts xix. 31). An account of them will be found in chapter xi.

Bithynia and Pontus

We take these two together, as they formed one province, which, however, was known by the name of both its constituent regions, "Bithynia et Pontus." Each had its high priest, the Bithyniarch and the Pontarch, who exercised functions similar to those of the Asiarchs (chap. xi.). The united provinces extended along the shores of the Euxine Sea from Thrace to Armenia, and included Byzantium across the Bosphorus. It constituted a valuable possession to Rome, being not only populous and very fertile, but also inhabited by people peaceful in disposition and highly cultured. It contained a large Jewish population, to whom S. Peter addressed his two epistles (1 S. Peter i. 1).

Bithynia, like "Asia," fell to the Romans as a bequest. Nicomedes III., dying in b.c. 74, bequeathed his kingdom to the Senate, following the example of Attalus. At first it constituted a province by itself, but was afterwards united under one government with Pontus, when that district was taken from Mithridates, during the victorious career of Pompey, b.c. 65. It was from Zela, in Pontus, between the rivers Iris and Skylax, that Julius Cæsar despatched his famous report, so concisely worded, "Veni, vidi, vici," after his defeat of Pharnaces, b.c. 47. The eastern portion of Pontus remained independent until the time of Nero. Its chief town was
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Nicaea, near the Propontis, and afterwards famous as the meeting-place of the first General Council, in A.D. 325, when 318 bishops assembled to discuss the heresies of Arius. Another matter of deep interest to the Church consists in the fact that Pliny, when Governor of Bithynia, forwarded a report to the Emperor Trajan concerning the position of Christianity in his province. His letter contains a description of the mode of worship amongst the Christians and of their faithfulness under persecution.

Pontus and Bithynia were governed by proconsuls sent out by the Senate until the time of Hadrian; but he, having an affection for Bithynia, transferred it from the Senate to himself. His predecessor, Trajan, had appointed Pliny as governor, with special powers from himself.

On S. Paul's second journey, after passing through the central districts of Phrygia and Galatia, he and Silas were desirous of preaching in Bithynia, but being forbidden by the Spirit, they went to Troas and thence into Europe (Acts xvi. 7). The only other reference to these two provincial districts beyond that in Acts ii. 9 and i S. Peter i. 1 is to Aquila, as having been born in Pontus (Acts. xviii. 2).

Crete

In ancient times the people of Crete had a bad reputation. S. Paul, writing to Titus (Titus i. 12), quotes from Epimenides, "Cretans are always liars, evil beasts, idle gluttons." (Epimenides lived in the sixth century B.C., and was esteemed as a prophet.) "This testimony," says S. Paul, "is true." Similar testimony is borne by Livy and by Plutarch AEmilius, who wrote, "The Cretans are as eager for riches as the bees for honey," and Callimachus actually begins a line of one of his hymns with the very words quoted by S. Paul, Κρήτης ἀδικίας ἀγαθοταται. It was also true that their religion was very corrupt, full of debasing superstition and polluted by the orgiastic rites of
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Bacchus; in addition to which many of them were associated with the Cilicians as pirates. The whole Mediterranean swarmed with them, to the great loss of the Romans, whose corn vessels were frequently plundered and scuttled, and whose citizens were sometimes taken captive and tortured. Strong measures had become necessary, and Pompey was entrusted with the task of clearing the seas of these robbers. This he did most effectually, and during the process Crete, by the action of Metellus, was formed into a Roman province, in conjunction with Cyrene, B.C. 67. Under Augustus's division of the provinces it was assigned to the Senate.

Crete is mentioned three times in the New Testament: amongst the nationalities assembled at Jerusalem for Pentecost; in the account of S. Paul's voyage to Rome (Acts xxvii. 7, 12, 13, 21); and in Titus i. 5, 12, where Titus is appointed to superintend the Christian Church in Crete and to appoint elders in every city.

Cyprus

Cyprus was the native place of Barnabas (Acts iv. 36), and was one of the earliest places to embrace Christianity, receiving the new revelation at the hands of the brethren who had been scattered by persecution after the martyrdom of S. Stephen (Acts xi. 19, 20). It was the scene of S. Paul's preaching on his first missionary journey, accompanied by Barnabas and Mark. The missioners landed at Salamis on the east and passed through the island to Paphos, probably by the coast road, which would be shorter and more convenient than the higher road, which runs between the two lofty ranges of Troodos and Buffavento. At Paphos Sergius Paulus, whom S. Luke, with his usual precision, styles ἀνήφορος, or proconsul (for Cyprus was then a senatorial province), became a convert, and the false prophet Bar-jesus was smitten with blindness (Acts xiii. 4-13). On the proposal to make a second tour. Paul and Barnabas disagreed about Mark's previous desertion
at Perga, and the latter two went once more to Cyprus (Acts xv. 39). On S. Paul's third mission the ship in which he was sailing from Patara in Lycia to Tyre sighted Cyprus on the way (Acts xxi. 3); and finally, on the voyage to Rome, S. Paul's ship passed to the north of the isle, somewhat out of its direct course, in order to be under the lee of the shore and avail itself of the westerly current (Acts xxvii. 4). In Acts xxi. 16 we read of one Mnason of Cyprus.

Cyprus has always been a productive island, famous for its flowers and fruits, and in ancient times possessing rich copper mines. Troodos, its loftiest point, rises to the height of 6,400 feet. As far back as B.C. 1500, i.e. in the age of Moses, it belonged to Egypt; and since then it has been subject successively to Tyre, Persia, and Greece, and again to Egypt. On the death of Alexander the Great it fell to the share of Ptolemy. It became a Roman province B.C. 58 under circumstances discreditable to Rome. The infamous Clodius had been captured by pirates, and Ptolemy, king of Cyprus, brother to the king of Egypt, had refused to ransom him; in revenge for which Clodius, on his return to Rome, obtained the deposition of the king on a false charge of bad government. The island was reduced to the form of a Roman province, and Cato became governor—an exceptional governor too, for he honestly paid over to the treasury the 7,000 talents he had collected, instead of putting it into his own pocket as was then the custom. At first Cyprus was joined to Cilicia, but it became a separate province under Augustus, who, after retaining it for a while as an imperial province, transferred it to the Senate.

**Cilicia**

Cilicia, as we have already remarked, is geographically connected with Syria, the two districts being enclosed by the lofty range of Taurus and by the Euphrates and the desert. The "Syrian gates," the mountain pass between them, is less
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than 2,000 feet above the sea, while the "Cilician gate," leading into Cappadocia, rises to the height of 4,300 feet. Politically also the same tie existed, Cilicia having been included in the realms of the Seleucidae. Hence, in the Acts, we find "Syria and Cilicia," with S. Luke's usual careful attention to details, brought together several times in the same sentence (Acts xv. 23, 41; Gal. i. 21).

From Acts vi. 9 we gather that there was a synagogue of Cilicians in Jerusalem, implying a large Jewish population in Cilicia.

In its physical features the country was divided into two distinct portions. That on the east was known as Cilicia Pedias, or Campestris, and consisted of a fertile tract extending from the sea to the Taurus range. It was here that Tarsus was situated, the birthplace of S. Paul, in virtue of which he became "a citizen of no mean city"—a Roman citizen also through his father (Acts xxii. 39; xxii. 3, 28). He accordingly belonged to the province of Cilicia (Acts xxiii. 34), as the imperial legate Felix ascertained on inquiry. Here also we may note S. Luke's historical accuracy in applying to Felix the appropriate designation of ἕγεμον, as previously he had employed the precise word, ἀνθόπατος, in speaking of Sergius Paulus and Gallio.

The only other place in which Cilicia is mentioned is in Acts xxvii. 5, where S. Paul's vessel, on its way to Myra, a city of Lycia, "sailed across the sea which is off Cilicia and Pamphylia."

Cilicia Trachea, or Aspera, the western half of the province, was a difficult, mountainous country, always loosely held by those who professed to rule it. Its inhabitants had been sea-rovers for ages, and its coasts afforded anchorage to the innumerable pirate vessels which infested the Mediterranean from Syria to the Atlantic, and created a reign of terror on the seas, capturing the ships which supplied Rome with corn, and sometimes causing risk of famine. With the aid of the
ferocious Cretans, at that time in alliance with Mithridates, these robbers became so formidable that the Roman power itself was insufficient to cope with them, until Pompey was entrusted with the command of the fleet. He speedily swept the sea clear of these pirates, and rendered navigation safe.

Afterwards he made Cilicia a Roman province, and incorporated it into the great province of Syria. Cicero became proconsul of Cilicia B.C. 51, in conjunction with adjoining districts, and, like Cato in Cyprus, acted with an honesty and prudence very rare amongst provincial rulers of that day. He also maintained friendly relations with the native kings and with the Roman officials of the neighbouring districts, such as Deiotarus, king of Galatia, Tigranes, king of Cappadocia, and Ariobarzanes, king of Armenia. He had accepted the appointment unwillingly, for the whole of the east was disturbed by apprehension of incursions by the Parthians; in addition to which, Cicero, accustomed to distinction and renown in the Empire City, regarded his proconsulship, in such a remote corner of the world, amongst people who had but recently ceased to fly the black flag, rather as an uncomfortable exile than an honourable promotion.

**Cappadocia**

Cappadocia appears in the sacred narrative only in the list of nationalities present in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost, and amongst the Jews of the dispersion, to whom S. Peter addressed his epistles (Acts ii. 9; 1 S. Peter i. 1).

It was the most extensive of all the provinces of Asia Minor, but its boundaries were variable at different times. Roughly speaking, it lay between Pontus and Cilicia on the north and south, and between the Euphrates and Galatia on the east and west. It consisted of elevated tableland, fruitful in grain and suitable for the pasturage of cattle.

Archelaus had been appointed to the sovereignty by Antony,
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and reigned for many years. In his later years he was contemporary with his namesake, Archelaus, son of Herod. On his death, in A.D. 17, Tiberius formally constituted Cappadocia an imperial province, administered, like Judæa, by a procurator with authority direct from the emperor. It was regarded as a territory of small importance, and was at one time united with Galatia, at another time with Armenia.

Galatia

Galatia, in common with Ephesus and Colosse, had the high honour of receiving an epistle from the great Apostle S. Paul. On his second missionary journey S. Paul travelled through the central regions of Asia Minor, and was detained for some time amongst the Galatians by severe sickness. The Galatians, "the Gauls of the East," as they have been called, were a branch of that Celtic nationality which, more than two centuries before the time of Pompey, had invaded the north of Italy and of Greece. While they occupied Thrace they were invited by Nicomedes, king of Bithynia, to cross the Bosphorus and aid him in the civil war that was dividing his kingdom. Having thus gained a footing in those fertile regions, they pushed further east, and overran the whole peninsula of Asia Minor. They were a people always in motion—a camp rather than a nation—and became a source of dread to the populous Greek cities on the coasts. Acting sometimes as mercenaries, and sometimes as conquerors, they made their presence felt throughout Asia Minor, until by degrees the various surrounding nations drove them into the central regions, where at length they settled down under their own princes in a kind of tetrarchy. When Pompey was engaged in the war with Mithridates he received help from Deiotarus, one of the tetrarchs, whom he appointed King of Galatia. Deiotarus I. was succeeded by Deiotarus II. The next king, Amyntas, owed his appointment to Antony, and
was confirmed in the kingdom by Augustus. On the death of Amyntas, A.D. 26, Galatia became a province.

But even under Roman government the Galatians retained their language and nationality, and formed a kind of Celtic island in the centre of Asia Minor.

When S. Paul visited them they were still characterised by much of the wild and untutored spirit of their ancestors. Quick of apprehension, hasty in action, and variable in humour, yet capable of intense emotion and of true friendship, they became deeply attached to their master and teacher, whom they loved with such intensity that they would willingly have plucked out their eyes and given them to him, had it been possible, in place of his own eyes (Gal. iv. 15), the vision of which appears to have been impaired since the day when they were dazzled by the light from heaven above the brightness of the midday sun. But, like the seed in the parable that fell upon rocky ground, their zeal, so easily stirred, quickly passed away, and, leaving the doctrine of their master, they were led astray by Judaizing teachers from Jerusalem, their unstable conduct extorting from the apostle the cry, “I marvel that ye are so quickly removing from him that called you in the grace of Christ” (Gal. i. 6).

S. Paul paid two visits to the Galatians (Acts xvi. 6; xviii. 23), making converts on the first visit, and confirming them on the second. He gave directions also for a weekly collection to be made in their churches on behalf of the poor saints at Jerusalem (1 Cor. xvi. 1). And he still bore them in remembrance when nearing his end, for he sent Crescens on a mission to them (2 Tim. iv. 10).

Galatia was one of the districts to which S. Peter's epistles were addressed.

Phrygia

Phrygia may be coupled with Galatia, as mentioned in the same two places in the Acts (xvi. 6; xviii. 23). It is also found among the nations at Pentecost (Acts ii. 10).
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It never had any fixed boundaries, but was distributed in varying portions amongst the surrounding provinces, especially Asia and Galatia; hence the names Phrygia Asiana and Phrygia Galatica. It was not until A.D. 295 that there was a province of that name. It was then divided into Phrygia prima and secunda. Phrygia was an ethnological expression, not pointing to any political division, but indicating loosely the western portion of the central region between Asia and Galatia. Its chief towns were Laodicea, Colosse, Hierapolis, Apamea, and Synnada, but these were all well within the province of Asia.

Pamphylia and Lycia

These two districts can be taken together; they lay along the shore between Cilicia and “Asia.” Our interest in Pamphylia centres around Perga, the chief town, with its port, Attaleia; for it was here that S. Mark, with that infirmity of purpose that leads us to pray in the Collect for his day that we may be “not like children, carried away with every blast of vain doctrine,” abandoned the work and returned to Jerusalem. He was probably apprehensive of the difficulties likely to be encountered in the interior, for the Taurus range stands up so steeply a few miles from the shore that the track in one place was known as the κλίμαξ, or ladder. Pamphylia itself was an unattractive place, fertile indeed, but fever-laden, with a damp climate and a malarious soil. S. Paul himself may have contracted here the sickness which detained him in Galatia (Gal. iv. 13). At all events, he seems to have traversed the country rapidly, to have climbed the Taurus and mounted to the Pisidian tableland beyond, without pausing to preach in Pamphylia. The only places where we meet with Pamphylia are Acts ii. 10; xiii. 13; xv. 38; xxvii. 5.

At this time, under the Emperor Claudius, A.D. 43, Pamphylia and Lycia, with a part of Pisidia, were united as a
province, and in A.D. 74 an enlarged province of Pamphylia was formed.

The physical features of Lycia were entirely unlike those of its companion. It was almost entirely occupied by lofty mountain masses, commencing from the coast. Two of its cities, Patara and Myra, are mentioned in the Acts (xxi. 1; xxvii. 5).

On the death of Alexander Lycia fell to the share of Seleucus Nicator; it was wrested from Antiochus the Great by the Romans B.C. 188, but twenty years later was made free. It was pillaged by Cassius B.C. 43, and in A.D. 43 it became a province under Claudius governed by an imperial legate in conjunction with Pamphylia. Later it was made a separate province with Myra as its capital.

Macedonia

Macedonia became a Roman province in B.C. 146. It had been conquered by the Romans some years previously, Æmilius Paulus having gained a brilliant victory over Perseus at Pydna. The Macedonian monarchy was ended, and the conqueror divided the district into four regions, which he named Macedonia Prima, Secunda, etc. This did not last long, other territories were added, and the newly constituted province was ruled by a proconsul, whose capital was at Thessalonica. Roughly speaking, the province lay between the boundaries of Illyricum on the north and of Achaia on the south, and was separated from Moesia by the Hæmus or Balkan range.

Three towns in Macedonia are prominent in the narrative of S. Luke, Philippi, Thessalonica, and Berea, and it is singular that these three towns compare favourably with any others with which S. Paul was connected. Indeed, his missionary efforts were thoroughly appreciated in Macedonia, and the people seemed anxious to receive the Gospel; for
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when he was in a state of despondency in consequence of the check he had received in Asia and Bithynia, he was greatly encouraged by the vision of the "man of Macedonia" praying him to come over into Macedonia and help. Thus directed and invited, the apostolic band of preachers sailed from Troas across the Ägean Sea, and landed at Neapolis, the port of Philippi. This was the first town in Europe visited by S. Paul. It was the scene of several momentous events: the visit to the proseuche, the conversion of Lydia and of the jailor, and the riot stirred up by the masters of the girl possessed by a spirit of Python (Acts xvi.). When S. Paul left Philippi he appears to have appointed S. Luke to the charge of the infant Church there, as we gather from the use of the first and third persons in S. Luke's narrative (compare Acts xvi. io; xvii. 1). Here S. Luke remained for about six years, joining S. Paul's company again at Philippi (Acts xx. 5). The Church there had in the meantime prospered greatly under S. Luke's care, and when S. Paul wrote his Epistle to the Philippians, it alone amongst his epistles contained no blame, so great was the influence exerted by the brother whose praise was in the gospel throughout all the churches (2 Cor. viii. 18). S. Paul writes very gratefully of the kindness and generosity he had experienced at the hands of the Philippians (Phil. iv. 10–19).

On leaving Philippi S. Paul and his companions travelled along the Via Egnatia, across the neck of that singular three-pronged peninsula, known as Chalcidice, on the easternmost part of which is situated Mount Athos. The distance from Philippi to Thessalonica is just about a hundred miles, and Amphipolis and Apollonia are the two resting-places on the road.

At Thessalonica more adventures met the apostles, which we shall touch upon in a later chapter, and they were forced to flee by night (Acts xvii. 1–10). They came to Berea. Here they had a better reception from the "noble" men and "honourable" women. Yet after a while they had to leave
the town in haste (Acts xvii. 10–15). And thus they departed from the province of Macedonia into that of Achaia, and came to Athens.

Thus, as we have seen, the travels of S. Paul through Macedonia on his second missionary journey are related with circumstantial detail in Acts xvi. 10–xvii. 15. He passed through the same region on his third journey, some years later, but no incidents are recorded, and the route is not given (Acts xx. 1–5).

The Christians of Macedonia were far from wealthy, yet they made a most generous response to the appeal on behalf of the impoverished Church at Jerusalem; they contributed to the collection with a ready will and in a liberal spirit (2 Cor. ix. 2; xi. 9), and were an example to the Church at Corinth, whose members were better provided with worldly goods. On the whole the Gospel made such progress in this region that it has been said that Macedonia had become "a kind of Holy Land."

Achaia

Achaia was anciently the narrow strip of land in the north of the Peloponnesus, lying on the south of the Corinthian Gulf. But the Romans extended the name to the whole of Greece, from the boundary of the province of Macedonia to the island of Cythera. Its two chief towns were Corinth and Athens, the one a city of pleasure and profligacy, the other a kind of university.

The reduction of Greece followed almost immediately upon the conquest of Macedonia. From Macedon, after his victory over Perseus at Pydna, Æmilius Paulus marched into Greece in order to punish the supporters of Perseus. The whole country was pillaged, thousands of the unfortunate population were massacred or sold into slavery, and the Achaean league was crushed for the time. About twenty years later it raised its head once more under Æneas. Metellus, who had been
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engaged in the reduction of Macedonia, marched into Greece B.C. 147, and acted with great promptitude and moderation, having a genuine admiration of the genius of the Greek nations. But the next year Mummius became consul and took the command. He was a man of no education, and acted with extraordinary barbarity. Corinth was burnt to the ground, and such treasures of art as had not been destroyed were sent to Rome. The male population were put to the sword, and the women and children sold into slavery. Mummius returned to Rome enriched by plunder, and was awarded a triumph with the surname of "Achaicus." The destruction of Corinth happened in September, B.C. 146. Thus Greece became a province under the name of Achaia and was united to Macedonia. In B.C. 27, on the division of the provinces, Augustus made it a separate province, and gave it in charge of the Senate. Its governor accordingly had the title of proconsul, or in Greek, ἄνθυπατος; and Gallio, who was proconsul when S. Paul was at Corinth, is correctly described by S. Luke as ἄνθυπατος (Acts xviii. 12). In A.D. 15 Tiberius re-united Achaia with Macedonia, under an imperial legate, proprætor, or ἀντιστράτηγος or πρεσβευτής. Another change took place in A.D. 44 (the year that King Agrippa I. died). It again became a proconsular province under Claudius, and was in that condition when under the rule of Gallio. In A.D. 67 the mad Nero, at the Isthmian games, proclaimed Greece free; but in the time of Vespasian it once more became a senatorial province. "Macedonia and Achaia" are bracketed together in Acts xix. 21, Romans xv. 26, 2 Corinthians ix. 2, and 1 Thessalonians i. 7, 8.

When S. Paul was driven out from Berœa he came to Athens (Acts xvii. 13-15). In Athens, the cultivated and "over religious" (δεισιδαιμονεστέρους, xvii. 22) city, the Gospel made little way, and S. Paul made but few converts (xvii. 16-34). But when he came to Corinth things improved. In spite of opposition in the synagogue, and afterwards in the
city at large, he was able to hold his ground for more than eighteen months, and to found a church to which he afterwards addressed two epistles (xviii. 1–18).

Illricum

"From Jerusalem, and round about unto Illyricum, I have fully preached the gospel of Christ" (Rom. xv. 19).

This is the only passage in which mention is made of this province. Starting from Jerusalem as a centre (κύκλῳ), S. Paul had gradually extended his circumference towards the West until it had reached as far as the borders of the Roman province of Illyricum; for S. Paul, writing to the Romans, would obviously use the geographical term in its Roman sense. The expression does not, however, involve travel in Illyricum itself beyond the River Drinus, which formed its southern boundary, for the western portion of Macedonia, which lay along the Adriatic, was known as Greek Illyricum, and the military road, the Via Egnatia, stretched from Dyrrachium on the Adriatic to the Hellespont. Along this road S. Paul had journeyed from Philippi to Berœa; and some time during his third missionary journey he had proceeded further on the same road in the direction of Illyricum, whether Greek, or Roman and provincial Illyricum, preaching fully the Gospel of Christ as he went.

A neighbouring district—Dalmatia—which formed a portion of the province of Illyricum, is mentioned by S. Paul in 2 Timothy iv. 10—"Titus to Dalmatia." This indicates a further extension of the Gospel, for Dalmatia lay to the north of the Drinus, and well within the province of Illyricum. But, about the time when S. Paul wrote his second Epistle to Timothy, the two words Illyricum and Dalmatia were becoming interchangeable, and "Dalmatia" gradually superseded "Illyricum" as the name of the province.

"Illyricum" in the Greek is a curious word. The Greek
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term was 'Ἰλλυρία, or 'Ἰλλυρία, and the former would have been the correct word in Greek; but instead of using this word, S. Paul simply transliterates the Latin Illyricum into 'Ἰλλυρικόν, which perhaps seems natural in writing to Romans accustomed to the Latin language.

The occupation of Illyricum by the Romans was a gradual process. A province was formed in B.C. 167 with that name, consisting of the territories lying along the Adriatic Sea, between the province of Gallia Cisalpina on the north and the River Drinus on the south. Until the time of Augustus the boundary inland was indefinite, but it was then considerably extended, and included all the conquests of Rome towards the Danube. In A.D. 10 Pannonia was separated and formed into a distinct province. At first Illyricum was a senatorial province, but it was in a disturbed condition, requiring a considerable military force to keep order there; and accordingly it was taken over by the Emperor, and two legions were stationed there, the 7th and the 11th, as we learn from inscriptions.

Sicily

Sicily itself is not mentioned by name in the New Testament, but Syracuse, its chief city, is, and this may be our excuse for introducing it here.

S. Paul's ship touched at Syracuse, with S. Paul on board as a prisoner in charge of Julius, a centurion of Augustus's band. The vessel belonged to Alexandria, and was most likely one of the large number of corn vessels that sailed between that port and Italy with supplies of corn for Rome. Its sign was Διόσκουροι, the twin brothers, Castor and Pollux, sons of Jupiter and Leda, and patrons of sailors (Acts xxviii. 11). This vessel had wintered at Melita, and the centurion in charge of the prisoners had waited for it three months; so leisurely were voyages made in those days. It is not stated whether S. Paul landed during the three days the ship
remained at Syracuse. On leaving port the vessel "fetched a compass" (A.V.), or "made a circuit" (R.V.), i.e. beat about, until it arrived at Rhegium, a town on the extremity of the mainland of Italy, whose patron gods, like those of the ship, were the sons of Jove.

Sicily is notable as being the first Roman province (see p. 52). It affords also an excellent example of the extortionate conduct in which the Roman governors too often indulged. Caius Licinius Verres was the most notorious of these plunderers of provinces. He was a man of brutal instincts, vile in private life, licentious and cruel. At Rome, as one of the Marian faction, he had embezzled the funds entrusted to his care; and when sent to Cilicia he began a system of pillage, which he afterwards carried to excess in Sicily. In Cilicia he stole from cities, public buildings, sacred and secular, and from private persons, everything that was of value. And as prætor of Sicily, B.C. 73–71, he surpassed all other extortionate governors before or since. And this he carried out upon a systematic plan. Taking with him experts in painting and sculpture, he deliberately appropriated to himself every work of art which his advisers pronounced to be meritorious in design and execution, and sent six shiploads of treasure to his palace at Rome. This was beyond endurance, and the Sicilians determined to prosecute him. Cicero, who had himself held office in the island, was engaged for the purpose, and prepared six orations, the first of which had the effect of driving the accused into voluntary exile at Marseilles.

Spain

"Whosoever I go unto Spain." "I will go on by you unto Spain" (Rom. xv. 24, 28). In these two verses S. Paul expresses his intention to visit Rome at some future time not yet fixed, and to pass on thence to Spain.

The question is, Did he visit Spain, or not?
Conybeare and Howson decide that he did, and that he spent two years there, arriving in the year 66. There is, however, no certain evidence for this. Conybeare and Howson quote the well-known passage from Clement's *Epistle to the Corinthians*, where it is stated that S. Paul had penetrated "to the extremity of the West" before his martyrdom (ἐν τῷ τέρμα τῆς δύσεως); also from Muratori's fragment, about A.D. 170, where a reference is made to "the journey of Paul from Rome to Spain." The other quotations are either too late or too vague to decide the question with authority. The same writers reckon that S. Paul's imprisonment ended in the spring of A.D. 63, and that his martyrdom took place in the last year of Nero, thus leaving a space of five years between his two imprisonments at Rome. This, of course, allows abundance of time for the journey to Spain.

And even if we reduce the interval by a year or two, time enough will remain for the purpose.

In the epistles written from Rome during his first imprisonment (Eph., Phil., Col., and Philem.) S. Paul states his plans when set free. Thus he writes to Philemon: "Withal prepare me also a lodging." He was expecting release, and instead of carrying out the earlier intention expressed in Romans xv. 28, of passing from Rome to Spain, he now proposes to visit Asia Minor first. The same intention appears from what he writes to the Philippians (Phil. i. 25; ii. 24), whom he was expecting to see shortly.

We may conclude, then, that after his acquittal by Nero and release from custody, S. Paul fulfilled this promise and proceeded to Asia Minor, but by what route it is futile to conjecture.

His other movements at this period of his life may be gathered from the pastoral epistles, all three of which are acknowledged to be of late date, and to have been written within a few months of each other, the Second Epistle to Timothy being certainly the last of all, and written shortly before his martyrdom (2 Tim. iv. 6–8).
We may conclude, with a tolerable amount of certainty, that between the two imprisonments at Rome S. Paul went into Macedonia, and stayed some time in Ephesus and the neighbourhood (1 Tim. i. 3). He also preached the Gospel in Crete, and founded a Church there, which he left in charge of Titus (Titus i. 5). He apparently returned after this to Ephesus, and remained there for a considerable time (1 Tim. iv. 13; 2 Tim. i. 18). We hear of him also, probably at a later date, at Miletum and Corinth (2 Tim. iv. 20) and Troas (v. 13) and Nicopolis (Titus iii. 12). The order of these journeys it is impossible to determine.

In all these notices of plans proposed and of journeys accomplished no hint is given of the visit to Spain. We need not, however, hesitate to assume that his intention was carried into effect, and that, at some time or other during the interval between his two imprisonments he found his way, as S. Clement phrases it, "to the extremity of the West." The route that he followed, the date of his visit, and the incidents both of the journey and of his stay in the country are absolutely unknown.

We would fain believe that the phrase, "the extremity of the West," implied an extension of the voyage to the Cassiterides in our own island of Britain, which was really the ultima thule of the West to the Roman world; but this, though much to be desired, is extremely doubtful.

The greater part of Spain came into possession of the Romans during the Punic wars, about B.C. 205, and the whole country was eventually divided into three provinces, viz. Hispania Citerior and Ulterior, afterwards named Tarracocnensis and Lusitania. These were under the Emperor. The third province, Bætica, in the south, was assigned to the Senate.

**Libya**

In our rapid tour of the provinces we began with Palestine; and then, passing through Syria, Asia Minor, and Greece, we
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came to Sicily and Spain. And now, crossing the straits by
the Pillars of Hercules, we will complete the circuit of the
Mediterranean, that inland sea which the Romans began,
after the fall of Carthage, to claim as their own, calling it
"our sea," *mare nostrum*, as Julius Cæsar does in his writings.

At first the whole country beyond Egypt was known as
Libya, but later on the term was limited to Cyrenaica, which
was divided into Libya Inferior and Superior, the district to
the south beyond the province receiving the name of Libya
Interior. The only place in the New Testament in which the
word occurs is Acts ii. 10, amongst the nations present on the
day of Pentecost, "the parts of Libya about Cyrene."

Africa, as known to the Romans and occupied by them,
consisted merely of the comparatively narrow strip of land
lying between the Mediterranean Sea and the great Libyan
desert. The inhabitants were of a stock quite distinct from
the dark races of the interior and also from the Egyptians:
corresponding in type rather with the European nations, such
as the Phoenicians and Greeks, than with those of Africa.

The first part of the continent owned by the Romans came
as a consequence of the Punic wars, B.C. 146, the new province
being named "Africa"; but eventually, by extensions east and
west, the whole of northern Africa came under their control,
first as subject kingdoms, and then as provinces.

In the civil war between Pompey and Cæsar, B.C. 47, the
kings of the client-states, Numidia and Mauritania, took part
in the contest, Juba of Numidia supporting the adherents of
Pompey, and Bocchus of Mauritania supporting Cæsar. In
the end Juba was dethroned and Bocchus left in possession
with enlarged territory. In the next civil war, between Antony
and Octavius, Bocchus again stood for Cæsar, while Bogud in
the further west upheld the cause of Antony. On the fall of
Antony, Bocchus's dominions were further extended. At the
death of Bocchus, B.C. 33, Juba II., who had married the
daughter of Antony and Cleopatra, was, after an interval,
appointed his successor. Caligula, in A.D. 40, took over the whole territory as an imperial province. The Roman provinces in north Africa, beginning at the west, were Mauritania, Numidia, Africa, Cyrenaica, and Egypt. Of these the last two only are mentioned in the New Testament.

Cyrenaica

Cyrenaica, the province extending from Egypt to proconsular Africa, was named from its chief city, Cyrene, which was situated half-way between Alexandria and Carthage. The city had been colonised by Greeks, and held a large population of Jews, who possessed a synagogue of their own in Jerusalem (Acts vi. 9). The members of this and of other foreign synagogues in Jerusalem were very earnest in opposition to S. Stephen, and stirred up the elders and scribes to bring him before the Sanhedrin, a proceeding which led to his becoming the first martyr. When the brethren were scattered abroad upon the persecution that arose about Stephen, some of the Cyrenians came to Antioch and preached the Gospel to the Greeks, πρὸς τοὺς Ἠλληνας, their own language being Greek (Acts xi. 20). The Lucius of Cyrene, whose name occurs in Acts xiii. 1 amongst the prophets and teachers at Antioch, is said to have been the first bishop of Cyrene.

But the most conspicuous personage connected with this city is Simon the Cyrenian, the first cross-bearer, who was seized upon and forced to bear the cross of Jesus when He sank fainting beneath its weight (S. Matt. xxvii. 32; Mark xv. 21; Luke xxiii. 26).

The word used by S. Matthew is worth noting, ἱγγαρευσαν. It is derived from ἤγγαρος, a Persian courier, who had authority to press into the king’s service horses or men for the purpose of expediting the posts. S. Matthew uses the same word in the same sense in v. 41, “compel thee to go one mile.” S. Mark describes Simon as the father of Alexander and
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Rufus, the latter usually identified with the Rufus of Romans xvi. 13, of whose mother S. Paul speaks as "his mother and mine," an expression which may be taken in a general sense as indicative of S. Paul's reverence and affection for her, or may even be understood as a grateful remembrance of the motherly care bestowed upon him by Simon's wife during S. Paul's residence at Jerusalem.

Cyrenaica became a Roman province in B.C. 96, on the death of Ptolemæus Apion, the last king, who (like Attalus, king of Pergamus, and Nicomedes of Bithynia) bequeathed his kingdom to the Roman Senate and people, perhaps not without pressure from without. For some years the Cyrenians enjoyed a great amount of freedom, but this was gradually taken from them. At one time Cyrenaica was administered with Crete under one proconsul.

Egypt

The land of Egypt is wonderful, unique. Unique in its physical features, wonderful in the extraordinary antiquity of its history.

Its very soil has been snatched from the desert by its solitary river. The country exists only as the creation of that river. In fact, the Nile is Egypt. Were there no Nile, there were no Egypt—only a desert like that through which it flows. Like the so-called "canals" in the planet Mars, which are believed to consist of belts of verdure on both sides of a central stream, so the "sacred, beneficent, solitary Nile," as Dean Stanley calls it, "is the very life of the state and of the people." The cultivated land extends only to the limits of the inundation, and beyond these limits there stretches the trackless desert of sand. The bed-rock of the country consists alternately of granite, cretaceous sandstone, and limestone, with a layer of sand covering it, on the surface of which throughout the ages the bounteous river has deposited the alluvium, the black
mud which it has borne on its bosom from the mysterious and far-distant "mountains of the Moon," whence it derives its birth—a beneficent process which it renews, ever fresh, year after year.

No wonder that this beneficent river should have been revered, even worshipped and adored, by the people who owed it so great a debt of gratitude! Their name for the Delta, the broad, fertile region between the Rosetta and the Damietta branches of the Nile, expresses this sense of gratitude—they called it "the gift of the river."

The extraordinary fertility caused by the annual rise of the Nile enabled Egypt not only to feed its own dense population but also to become the granary of the neighbouring countries: for when famine prevailed in other lands the suffering peoples could look to Egypt to supply the deficiency; the proverbial saying expressed a never-failing truth, "There is corn in Egypt."

The history of the country reaches back into hoar antiquity. The Bible takes us up to the time of Abraham, when Egypt was a separate kingdom, under a settled government, and possessed of a civilisation ancient even then. But long before Abraham the "Pyramid kings" ruled the land, and left behind them buildings and inscriptions which have recently placed them in the category of historical personages. The coffin-lid, and even the embalmed body of Menkaura, the third Pyramid king, are now in the British Museum. The wonderful dryness of the climate in this rainless land, and the overwhelming desert sands, have preserved these ancient monuments so perfectly that, as Dean Stanley remarks, "we can form a clearer image of the Court of the Pharaohs in all external matters than we can of the Court of Augustus."

We cannot delay to touch on the history of Abraham, Jacob, or Joseph in Egypt, nor of the migration of the patriarchal family and the subsequent Exodus. Our plan will not permit us to speak of Jeroboam's flight into Egypt, or of
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the conquest of Palestine by Pharaoh Necho, or of its subsequent annexation to the Persian Empire. We must be content to commence the history of this ancient kingdom at the comparatively modern period of the Ptolemies.

Our knowledge of the history of the earlier ages used to depend upon Manetho, but recent excavations have laid bare monuments and inscriptions, which not only to a great extent corroborate his data, but afford additional and more precise information concerning the manners and customs of the ancient Egyptians and of the personal history of their kings. Manetho's work is not extant; it exists only in quotations and extracts made by Josephus, Eusebius, and other ecclesiastical writers.

Manetho was a priest of Heliopolis in the third century B.C., and his work, in three books, divides the line of kings into three groups, making thirty dynasties in all, and extending back many thousand years. On this work there have been founded two systems of chronology, the "Long" and the "Short." The latter was more in favour some years ago, as agreeing better with the dates assigned by Archbishop Ussher; but the monumental evidence recently discovered has shown clearly that the "Long Chronology" has far stronger claim to be correct.

On the death of Alexander the Great and the division of his empire amongst his generals Egypt came under the rule of the Ptolemies, B.C. 323. The first Ptolemy was the son of Lagus, from which circumstance the kings of this line are known as Lagidæ, as the rulers of Syria were named Seleucidæ. Between these two families of neighbouring kings there existed an active rivalry, the effects of which became marked in their subsequent history.

During the first three Ptolemies (Soter, Philadelphus, and Euergetes) Egypt experienced a century of prosperity. Phoenicia, Cæle-Syria, and Cyprus were wrested from the Seleucidæ, and art, literature, and commerce were successfully fostered. Alexandria became the chief trading port on the
Mediterranean, and in the same city were founded a famous museum and library. Distinguished men were welcomed to the Court, amongst whom were Euclid the mathematician and Apelles the artist. Philadelphus trod in his father's footsteps, and added to the empire Cyrene on the west and Lycia and Caria in Asia Minor. It was in his reign also that the Septuagint, the Greek version of the Hebrew Scriptures, was made, and that Manetho was encouraged to compile his History. Euergetes, by his conquests in Babylon and Persia, further extended the empire, and gained his title of "Benefactor" by bringing back the statues of Egyptian gods which Cambyses had carried away when he conquered Egypt, B.C. 525. Thus this period, from B.C. 323 to 223, was a period of unexampled prosperity.

Under the succeeding kings all was changed: province after province was lost to Egypt, whose kings gave themselves up to debauchery and assassination. It became customary for the Ptolemies to marry their sisters and other near relations, and to indulge in every conceivable vice and profligacy, amidst which the empire went to pieces, until it was finally reduced to its narrowest limits, viz. to Egypt proper, Upper and Lower, from Elephantine to Alexandria; wealthy still, through the bounty of the River, but disorganised, misgoverned, and open to invasion. It is not worth while to trace the record of these evil days. We may, however, mention as a point of interest that the far-famed Rosetta Stone, now in the British Museum, which afforded the key to the deciphering of the hieroglyphical character, was inscribed in the reign of Ptolemy V. (Epiphanes) on his coronation and marriage with Cleopatra, daughter of Antiochus Magnus of Syria.

The interference of the Romans in the affairs of Egypt began with Ptolemy IV., who helped them with supplies of grain during the second Punic war. After this the influence of Rome became more and more pronounced, until they treated the country as if it were already a Roman province.
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The names of the Ptolemies, or Lagidæ, are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ptolemy</th>
<th>I. Soter</th>
<th>B.C. 323</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II. Philadelphus</td>
<td>285</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Euergetes</td>
<td>247</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Philopator</td>
<td>222</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Epiphanes</td>
<td>205</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. Philometor</td>
<td>181</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. Euergetes II., or Physcon.</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII. Soter II., or Lathyrus</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX. Alexander I.</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII. (again)</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X. Alexander II.</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI. Dionysus, or Auletes</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII. (and Cleopatra)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII. (died B.C. 43)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cleopatra (died B.C. 30)

As the kingdom of Egypt, demoralised by luxury and profligacy, was drawing nearer and nearer to its downfall, there came to the front, as the most prominent personage in that part of the world, the famous, or rather the infamous, Cleopatra—a woman abandoned to profligacy, with no sense of shame to restrain her from its worst excesses. With her life the fate of Egypt was closely linked in its decline and fall.

Cleopatra was the daughter of the eleventh Ptolemy, surnamed Auletes. She was born B.C. 69, and had a sister and two brothers, all younger than herself. When her father died she was eighteen years of age, beautiful in form and feature, fascinating in manner and conversation, a very pearl of women.

"For her own person,
It beggar'd all description."

*Ant. and Cleop.,* Act ii. Sc. 2.

By her father's will the kingdom was bequeathed to Cleopatra and her elder brother jointly; and according to the provisions
of the will, which the incestuous custom of the country allowed, the brother and sister were to marry. The alliance did not last long, for the imperious Ptolemy XII. drove his sister from the country.

She took refuge in Syria. As soon as she was out of the way Ptolemy plotted to secure the throne for himself alone, at the hands of Julius Cæsar, by compassing the death of Pompey, who had taken refuge in Egypt after his defeat at Pharsalia, in Thessaly, B.C. 48. The crime was successfully accomplished; Pompey was assassinated in a boat, and three days afterwards the head of the murdered man was handed to Cæsar, who had pursued Pompey to the spot.

Cæsar then entered Alexandria. Here he encountered great risks, for he had but a few followers, and was immediately put to great straits to maintain his position against a formidable rising of the Alexandrian populace, at that time amongst the most insolent and dangerous in the world. Cæsar was besieged in the palace, and was so hard pressed that he could only escape with his life by swimming to a vessel at anchor in the harbour.

But his good fortune did not desert him. Presently the young king was accidentally drowned in the Nile. Reinforcements arrived; the insurrection was put down; and Cæsar, now enslaved by the beauty of Cleopatra, placed her and the younger brother, a child of eleven, on the throne. He assumed the title of Ptolemy XIII., and was the last of his line. But Cleopatra not long afterwards became sole ruler, having secured the removal of her brother by poison.

Julius Cæsar dallied with the youthful Egyptian queen for nine months, and she bore him a son, named Cæsarion. Meanwhile the disturbed condition of affairs in Pontus called him away. He marched through Syria, and routed the army of Pharnaces at Zela, reporting the victory to Rome in the famous message, “Veni, vidi, vici.”

Cleopatra was now firmly established on the throne of
Egypt, and so remained until the assassination of Cæsar, b.c. 44. This disconcerted her for a time, and she was in doubt as to her action in the future. But when Mark Antony made his progress in the East, and summoned Cleopatra to meet him at Tarsus, this scheming woman, now in her twenty-eighth year, began to angle for another lover, and so successfully that she enslaved Antony for the rest of his life. For her sake he sacrificed all—honour, ambition, the love of wife and child, and in the end life itself. In the midst of this entanglement he married Octavia, the half-sister of Octavianus, a noble-minded woman of the ancient Roman type, whom Antony, in his infatuation for Cleopatra, afterwards divorced, though she had children by him. This divorce was the main cause of his downfall. It was bitterly resented by Octavius Cæsar, between whom and Antony it became a fight to the death. At the Battle of Actium the guilty lovers suffered a disastrous defeat, and fled in haste to Alexandria (see p. 49).

Octavianus did not pursue Antony at once, being called away to Greece and Italy. It was nearly a year after, that he arrived at Alexandria. Antony was as infatuated as ever. Everything was going to ruin, but he could not leave her. She was now in her fortieth year, but apparently as charming as ever.

"Age cannot wither her, nor custom stale
Her infinite variety; other women
Cloy th' appetites they feed; but she makes hungry
Where most she satisfies."—Ant. and Cleop., Act ii. Sc. 2.

Cleopatra even tried her wiles on Octavianus, making proposals of peace, against which Octavianus was proof, for he had determined to reserve her for his triumph at Rome. All was lost, and the queen and her paramour resolved to die.

Antony fell upon his sword, inflicting a wound from which his life's blood slowly ebbed. He was carried into the palace, where Cleopatra had taken refuge with her treasures, and died
either on the way thither or in her presence. She herself
terminated her unworthy life by the poisonous bite of asps.
With her the line of the Lagidæ, or Ptolemies, became extinct.
Egypt fell into the hands of Octavianus, and was formally
constituted a Roman province, B.C. 30.

We now turn to the references to Egypt in the New Testa-
ment. These are numerous, but as they relate mainly to the
history of Joseph and of Moses, with whom our scheme does
not bring us into relation, they need not detain us long.

They are mainly threefold: (1) Those recording the flight
of the Holy Family into Egypt, (2) S. Stephen’s allusions
to Joseph and Moses in Acts vii., and (3) the evidences of
Moses’s faith in Hebrews xi.

We pass quickly over the second and third and pay more
attention to the first.

The references are as follows:—
2. Acts ii. 10, on the day of Pentecost, “in Egypt, and the
parts of Libya about Cyrene.”

Acts vii. 9–18. Joseph in Egypt. Also 19–40. Moses in
Egypt.

Acts xxi. 38. “Art thou not that Egyptian?”
3. Hebrews iii. 16, “all that came out of Egypt by Moses.”

Hebrews viii. 9, “in the day that I took them by the
hand to lead them forth out of the land of Egypt.”

Hebrews xi. 23–29. Moses as an example of faith.

Also S. Jude 5, “the Lord having saved a people out of the
land of Egypt.”

And finally, Revelation xi. 8, “the great city, which spiritually
is called Sodom and Egypt.”

It will be convenient to treat of Egypt as a Refuge and as
a Granary.

*Egypt as a Refuge.*—Egypt was usually, but not always,
under different government from Palestine, and was conse-
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quently able to afford protection to refugees under political complications and other difficulties. Thus the patriarchal family under Jacob, driven by famine and invited by Pharaoh, came to dwell there. Jeroboam, when designated king of Israel by the prophet Ahijah, stayed at the Court of Shishak until the death of Solomon; and Hadad also, another of Solomon’s adversaries, was entertained in like manner (1 Kings xi. 14–22; 26–40); and, after the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, there was a general exodus of “all the people, both small and great,” who fled into Egypt taking Jeremiah with them (2 Kings xxv. 26; Jer. xliii.).

The Flight into Egypt of the Holy Family is of greater interest to us. Warned by a dream, Joseph took the young Child and His mother by night and departed into Egypt, in order to escape the jealous fury of the bloodthirsty Herod, while the cries of Rachel, the typical mother, weeping with her representatives, were heard in the streets of Bethlehem, fulfilling, as S. Matthew points out, the prophecy of Jeremiah (xxxii. 15).

No incidents of the journey or of the stay are recorded by S. Matthew, but, amid the silence of the sacred writers, the imagination of the apocryphal evangelists has run riot, and stories of flaming trees, bending branches, springing wells, crops of stone, falling idols, adoring lions, wondrous cures, and converted robbers, have been placed on record, all duly authenticated by pointing to the actual spot where the marvel is said to have been manifested.

The stay in Egypt could not have been long, a few months at the most, perhaps not more than a journey there and back; for Herod, who had been stricken with mortal sickness before their departure, was soon dead. And at the bidding of another dream, the Holy Family returned to Palestine, fulfilling the words of Hosea, “Out of Egypt did I call My Son” (xi. r).
Egypt was also a Granary for Rome

As it was in Jacob's time so has it remained during all the ages since. Its soil, annually renewed, is exceptionally prolific, bringing forth one hundredfold. There was always "corn in Egypt," even when the crops in other countries failed. In Italy the land, of old teeming with fertility, had been mostly laid down in pasture during the later Republic, and the establishment of military colonies had tended further to the neglect of agriculture. As a consequence Italy was dependent upon the provinces for its supplies of food. And hence, in the days when the Cilician pirates swept the seas and intercepted the supplies, the pinch of hunger was sometimes felt by the swarming myriads at Rome. This was of not infrequent occurrence, until, in B.C. 67, Pompey was invested with full powers to press into the service of the Republic all such vessels and naval stores as he required. In three months the work was accomplished, and the seas were cleared of pirates. From that time the navigation of the Mediterranean became safe. Henceforth the fleets of corn vessels from Egypt, Carthage, and Sicily were able to pursue an uninterrupted course. The Castor and Pollux, or Dioscuri, the ship in which S. Paul sailed from Melita to Puteoli (Acts xxviii. 11-13), was probably one of these corn vessels, on its way from Alexandria to Puteoli, the usual port, a voyage of about twelve days.

The extraordinary fertility of Egypt rendered it a valuable possession to its owners. It will be remembered that Joseph, by the storage of corn during the seven years of plenty, and its sale during the seven following years, had bought up the whole land for Pharaoh, though subsequently restoring a portion (Gen. xlvi. 14-26). Under the Ptolemies the whole land belonged to the kings, and from it they derived a yearly revenue of 12,500 talents. When Egypt became a Roman province, Augustus claimed the whole country for
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himself, and it became known as the “patrimonium Cæsaris,” a rich and valuable inheritance.

A province of such exceptional nature seemed to demand exceptional treatment. Its governor was styled Praefectus Augustalis, and ranked above all other rulers of provinces; he was always of equestrian rank, and wielded enormous authority—in fact, he took the place of the Egyptian king, with powers derived direct from the Emperor himself.

The first praefects were Cornelius Gallus, Ælius Gallus, and Petronius, and their rule extended from B.C. 30–20.

Cornelius Gallus was a well-known poet of the Augustan age, of whose genuine writings only a few fragments remain. He abused his powers as Praefect, and having been convicted of misgovernment, he took his own life.

Ælius Gallus was another failure; he attempted to reduce the Sabæans of Arabia Felix, but was unsuccessful.

Petronius is known principally by the supplies of corn he sent to Herod during a severe famine in Palestine (Joseph., Antiq. xv. 9, 2).

We may conclude this notice of Egypt by a reference to the Egyptian alluded to by the chiliarch in Acts xxi. 38, “Art thou not then the Egyptian, which before these days stirred up to sedition, and led out into the wilderness the four thousand men of the Assassins?” This impostor is mentioned by Josephus (Antiq. xx. 8, 6). He professed to be a prophet, and led 30,000 credulous people to the Mount of Olives, declaring that the walls of Jerusalem should fall down before them, and afford an entrance. But he was attacked by the procurator, Felix, who dispersed the rebels with great slaughter, the Egyptian deceiver escaping with his life. The German commentators have pointed out the discrepancies in these two accounts, with the view of discrediting S. Luke, but S. Luke’s account is given on independent authority, and if there be any reason to discredit either, let the blame rather fall on Josephus.
CHAPTER IV

ANTIPAS AND THE HERODIAN FAMILY

Notes on the Genealogy

The genealogy of the family of Herod, running into intricate details, can be easily made out from Josephus (Antiq. xvii. 1, 3; xviii. 5, 4; B. J. i. 28, 4, and other places). We have recorded the most prominent members only, including all whose names are found in the New Testament. The intermarriages (frequently of uncle and niece) were frightful, and the complications of family relationship exceedingly involved.

The family tree had its root in Antipas, the Governor of Idumæa and father of Antipater, who heads our list.

Herod "the Great" had ten wives, none of whom are named in Scripture. They were as follows (Joseph., Antiq. xvii. 1, 3):—

1. Doris, the mother of Antipater, who was executed by his father five days before his own death, the order being given on his death-bed (Joseph., Antiq., xvii. 7, 1).

2. Mariamne, the heiress of both branches of the Asmoæan family. She was the mother of Aristobulus and grandmother of Agrippa I. and Herodias. She also had Salampsio, Cypros, and Alexander, the husband of Glaphyra, who afterwards married Archelaus.

3, 4. Nieces, names unknown.

5. Mariamne, daughter of Simon the high priest and mother of Herod Philip, first husband of Herodias.

GENEALOGY OF THE FAMILY OF HEROD

Antipater = Cypros
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7. Cleopatra of Jerusalem, mother of Philip, the Tetrarch of Iturea.
8. Phaedra.
10. Elpis.

The Herodian Family

For more than two centuries and a half the fortunes of Judæa were in the hands of the members of two distinguished families—the Asmonæans and the family of Herod. Judas Maccabæus, third son of the priest Mattathias, came into power B.C. 167, and the sceptre remained with the Asmonæan dynasty until the time of Antigonus, a period of about 120 years. It was then, by the favour of the Romans, transferred to Antipater, whose descendants held it till near the end of the first century A.D.

A short account of the Asmonæan dynasty has been given (pp. 76–79); it remains for us to record at greater length the fortunes of the Idumæan family of Herod, whose names meet us frequently in the Gospels and the Acts.

The Transfer of Power

The earlier Maccabees were patriots fired with zeal for their country and their God; but the time came when the flame burnt low, and dissension divided the family. Aristobulus, the younger brother, disputed the crown with Hyrcanus; and their respective claims were submitted to Pompey, who was at that time in Syria. Pompey appointed a meeting at Damascus: and the ambassadors of the two claimants pleaded their respective causes before him.

Aristobulus was undoubtedly the abler man of the two: but he was the younger, and Hyrcanus had the great advantage of the advocacy of the crafty Antipater. This turned the scales in favour of the weaker claimant, and Hyrcanus was confirmed in the priesthood, but without the royal diadem.
Henceforth the ball was in the hands of Antipater; and he played a winning game. The weakness of Hyrcanus was Antipater’s opportunity: the semblance of power was with Hyrcanus, its reality with Antipater. Antipater did not fail to improve his opportunities; and having aided Julius Cæsar in his campaign in Egypt, he was rewarded by the appointment of Procurator of Judæa, B.C. 47. The Idumæan was now in the ascendant, and he founded a family which held the reins of power till the end of the next century.

**The Herodian Family**

"These Idumæans were a remarkable family. By favour of the Romans they make a great figure in history as kings, princes, and tetrarchs.

The men were, as a rule, cruel in disposition, and energetic but unscrupulous in action. They were great builders and founders of cities. There was a passion for the founding of cities at that time. Herod, miscalled "the Great," built Sebaste on the site of Samaria, and Cæsarea on the sea-shore; his son Philip built Cæsarea Philippi and Bethsaida Julias; and Antipas built Tiberias and another Julias.

The women were, many of them, as e.g. Bernice and Drusilla, noted for their sensuality; or arrogant, ambitious, and self-willed, like Herodias, the more modern counterpart of Jezebel.

Antipater now appointed Phasael, his elder son, as Governor of Jerusalem, and Herod, the younger, Governor of Galilee.

Herod was but fifteen years old at the time, but he speedily showed a resolution beyond his years. He dispersed the banditti who had infested the country; he ingratiated himself with the rapacious Cassius, now Proconsul of Syria; he put down the revolt of Malichus and the Jewish faction, who had poisoned his father; he put Malichus himself to death; he defeated Antigonus, the last of the Asmonæan dynasty; and in other ways he proved his genius and ability.
By the appointment of Mark Antony, Herod next became Tetrarch of Judæa, to which soon after Cœle Syria was added. His good fortune, however, deserted him for a while when the Parthians, in alliance with the Asmonæan Antigonus, invaded Judæa. Antigonus was seated on the throne of Jerusalem; and he and the Parthians ravaged the country, besieged Hycranus and Herod's brother Phasael, and eventually mutilated the ears of Hycranus and drove Phasael to suicide.

But these events, instead of hindering the advancement of Herod, facilitated it. He had fled to Rome, with the intention of advocating the claim of Aristobulus to the throne of Jerusalem. Aristobulus was the brother of his wife Mariamne, and was the heir of both branches of the Maccabees, being grandson of Hycranus by his mother, Alexandra, and grandson of Aristobulus by his father, Alexander. The claims of Aristobulus were passed over, and Herod himself, favoured both by Augustus and Antony, was appointed King of Judæa by the Senate, B.C. 40 (Josephus, Antiq. xiv. 14, 4, 5). On his return to Palestine he defeated Antigonus, who was afterwards beaten to death by the Roman lictors. After the Battle of Actium, Herod, who had supported Mark Antony during the civil war, went to Rhodes to curry favour with the victorious Octavius, and by his craft and address not only obtained forgiveness, but actually persuaded Octavius to confirm him in the kingdom, B.C. 31.

Thus far Herod had conducted himself with prudence and dignity. But now a change took place. Like our own Henry VIII., he had succeeded to power at an early age, and had proved himself worthy of the position, amidst the acclamation of his subjects. But on his return from Rhodes his character exhibited signs of deterioration. He had married Mariamne, the heiress of both branches of the Asmonæan family; but when he left Palestine for the interview with Octavius, moved by an insane jealousy, he directed his uncle
Joseph to put her to death in case he lost his own life. Mariamne, learning his perfidy, reproached him bitterly; and Herod, infuriated, shortly afterwards ordered her execution. But he soon repented his brutal passion, and was seized with remorse, which issued in bodily sickness and mental derangement. From that day he was a changed man. The worst points in his character were developed, and he fell under the domination of an evil spirit of ferocity, like one possessed by the devil. He had already, in various ways and on different pretexts, compassed the death of Malichus, of Antigonus, of Aristobulus the brother of his wife Mariamne, of Hyrcanus her grandfather. His reign, after the death of Mariamne, reads like a carnival of bloodshed. "His whole career," writes Dean Farrar, "was red with the blood of murder. He massacred priests and nobles; decimated the Sanhedrin. His sons Alexander, Aristobulus, and Antipater, his uncle Joseph, Alexander the father of his wife, his mother-in-law Alexandra, his kinsman Cartobanus, his friends Dositheus and Gadias, were but a few of the multitudes who fell victims to his sanguinary suspicions and guilty terrors. His brother Pheroras and his son Archelaus barely and narrowly escaped execution by his orders. Neither the blooming youth of the Prince Aristobulus nor the white hairs of the King Hyrcanus, had protected them from his fawning and treacherous fury. Deaths by strangulation, deaths by burning, deaths by being cleft asunder, deaths by secret assassination, confessions forced by unutterable torture, acts of insolent and inhuman lust, mark the annals of a reign which was so cruel that, in the energetic language of the Jewish ambassadors to the Emperor Augustus, 'the survivors during his lifetime were even more miserable than the sufferers.' And, as in the case of Henry III., every dark and brutal instinct of his character seemed to acquire fresh intensity as his life drew towards its close. Haunted by the spectres of his murdered wife and murdered sons, agitated by the conflicting furies of remorse
Roman Law in the New Testament

and blood, the pitiless monster, as Josephus calls him, was seized in his last days by a black and bitter ferocity, which broke out against all with whom he came in contact."

With such a blood-stained record as this, that atrocity which we are disposed to reckon amongst the worst of his crimes—the massacre of the innocents at Bethlehem—would seem to contemporary historians too insignificant to be worthy of a passing notice. Josephus makes no allusion to it in his books.

The narrative in S. Matthew (ii. 16–18) agrees entirely with what we should expect from the character of Herod. Furious with jealousy all through his life—jealous of his wives, of his subjects, of his kingdom—this feeling was intensified as he drew near his end. His ambition had been to found a kingdom, even an empire, in the East, which he would make independent even of the Romans, by whose means he had obtained the kingdom. In these ambitious views he had received the support of the Herodians. Was this dream to be dispelled by the new-born "King of the Jews"? He had swept out of his way, with ruthless ferocity, the surviving members of the Asmonæan dynasty; he had removed the Sanhedrin; he had decimated the nobles; he had slain wife, and son, and friend; would he hesitate to take the lives of a few infants in an obscure village? Amongst so many crimes this seemed the least. According to Macrobius, his friend and patron, Augustus deemed the act worthy only of notice by a pun. When he heard of it he is reported to have remarked, "I had rather be Herod's swine than his son"—"Malo esse Herodis ἡτίς quam vītòs." The Greek Church has canonised the slaughtered infants as 14,000 martyrs, but the number really slain can hardly have exceeded fifteen or twenty.

Yet, with all his crimes, he was a magnificent monarch, always in high favour with Augustus at Rome, for he ruled Palestine with vigour, and made his kingdom an effective barrier against barbarian invasion, whether from the Parthians or the Nabatæan Arabians.
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He endeavoured to conciliate Jew and Gentile alike, without real sympathy for either. Sprung from an Idumæan father and an Arabian mother, his tastes were mainly Greek: and in all his buildings he largely employed artists and architects from Greece.

With his mind ever fixed on dreams of empire, he fortified his kingdom from Damascus to Alexandria, and founded cities in different districts, which formed a chain of military posts from end to end of his dominions. Amongst these cities the most famous were Sebastæ and Cæsarea, both named after the Emperor. He also rebuilt and enlarged the Castle of Antonia, overlooking the Temple at Jerusalem, and raised citadels at Gaba in Galilee and at Heshbon, the ancient capital of Og, the king of Bashan, as well as the strong fortress of Machærus, protecting the frontier towards Moab, and controlling the great Arabian desert.

While thus making preparation for further schemes of ambition, he was at the same time gratifying his princely passion for building, and satisfying his Hellenistic tastes.

He made great efforts to conciliate the Jews by public works in Jerusalem itself: a new palace on Mount Zion, new synagogues in Bezetha, and a magnificent bridge connecting the Temple with the city. But the greatest architectural achievement of all was the rebuilding of the Temple of Solomon, on a scale of magnificence surpassing the splendid edifice of Solomon himself. At another time, when a long drought had created famine and pestilence, he is said to have fed 50,000 persons from his own stores.

But he failed to secure the affections of his people, for they saw that the same hand which restored the Temple raised theatres and amphitheatres, in which the barbarous Roman sports of wild beasts and gladiators were exhibited; and it was remarked that if he raised from its ruins the Temple of Jehovah at Jerusalem, so also did he rebuild the temple of the hated Samaritan on Mount Gerizim.
In spite of all his efforts to ingratiate himself with Jew and Gentile, he died universally detested, leaving behind him a memory which has been execrated by all succeeding generations.

Archelaus

There is comparatively little on record concerning Archelaus; and what there is does not redound to his credit. He seems to have been fired with ambition to emulate his father in his vigorous government and his ruthless cruelty. He succeeded only too well in the latter, but failed signally in the former.

Herod had made several wills in his later days. In one of these he had left the kingdom to Antipater, in another to Antipas; but, finally, Archelaus was constituted his successor. The will, however, could not be executed until it had been ratified by Augustus. Meanwhile Archelaus acted as his father's heir, and buried him with royal pomp. In public he affected sorrow for his father's death, while in private he indulged in banqueting and rejoicing with his friends, even on the very night when Herod breathed his last.

He started at once upon that career of cruelty which finally brought about his ruin, and which falls in exactly with the short notice of him in S. Matthew ii. 22, the only mention of him in the New Testament. "When Joseph heard that Archelaus was reigning over Judæa in the room of his father Herod, he was afraid to go thither; and being warned of God in a dream, he withdrew into the parts of Galilee, and came and dwelt in a city called Nazareth." Thus Archelaus, even before his accession to power, had so evil a reputation that Joseph thought it prudent to make his home in Galilee under the milder rule of Antipas, rather than to risk a repetition under Archelaus of the jealous cruelty of Herod towards the infant "King of the Jews."

When the aged king's corpse had been laid in its splendid tomb at the Herodium, arrayed in purple and fine linen, and
bearing all the insignia of royalty, the Zealots who had been concerned with Matthias in tearing down the golden eagle from the gates of the Temple (see p. 6) convened a seditious meeting, and demanded the punishment of the executioners of Matthias and his followers. The Passover was now due, and the Jews were gathering in thousands from the country districts. Archelaus determined to act with vigour, and his troops slew 3,000 of the Jews, and guarded the gates of the holy city. The pilgrims were ordered back to their homes, and the solemnities of the Passover were interrupted.

Then Archelaus proceeded to Rome, followed by the chief members of his family—by his brothers Antipas and Philip, his mother Malthace, his aunt Salome. Relying upon a former will of Herod's made in favour of Antipas, the whole family urged the claims of the milder Antipas against the precipitate monster Archelaus. A second deputation, consisting of fifty Jews from Palestine, who were met and welcomed by 8,000 Jews of Rome, also appeared before Augustus, to advocate the setting aside of the will entirely and the deposition of the whole race of Herod. The deputation recounted the cruelty and oppression to which they had been subjected, and prayed that Judæa should be treated as a dependency of the province of Syria rather than remain under the heavy yoke of the Idumæans.

This incident seems to have suggested to our Lord the parable of the pounds (S. Luke xix. 11–27), or rather He chose to incorporate into that parable some of the events that actually occurred on this occasion. Archelaus had gone from Jericho to Rome to solicit a kingdom, leaving certain of his adherents in charge of affairs at home. "But his citizens hated him, and sent an ambassage after him, saying, We will not that this man reign over us."

The decision of Augustus was awaited with anxiety by both deputations: and when it was given it was found in the main to confirm the directions of the testator. Archelaus, in spite
of the formidable opposition to his appointment, received the
government of Judæa, Idumæa, and Samaria, with the title of
Ethnarch, the dignity of sovereignty being denied him, though
promised in the future on evidence of good conduct. Antipas
was appointed Tetrarch of Galilee and Pææa; and Philip
received Auranitis, Trachonitis, Paneas, and Batanea. Also
the government of several towns was awarded to Salome, with
a revenue of sixty talents.

Archelaus returned to Palestine, all heedless of the warnings
he had received, and continued his reign of cruelty and
oppression, becoming daily more and more unpopular. He
also outraged Jewish sentiment by marrying Glaphyra, the
widow of his brother Alexander. This he did to please him-
self; there was no excuse for his act under the levirate law,
for Glaphyra had children by Alexander: she was also the
wife of Juba the Mauritanian, who was still living. This and
other tyrannical and oppressive acts effectually alienated the
minds of his subjects, who after nine years of his rule found
the yoke intolerable. Another deputation proceeded to Rome,
A.D. 6, and lodged serious complaints against him. Augustus
summoned the accused before him and dealt with him
summarily. He was banished to Vienne, in Gaul: his property
was confiscated and sold by Quirinius (Cyrenius), the Governor
of Syria, and his ethnarchy was absorbed into the province of
Syria, and henceforth governed by procurators appointed
directly by the Emperor.

Antipas

Herod Antipas was the son of Herod "the Great" by
Malthace, the Samaritan, and was whole brother to Archelaus.
The various branches of the family of Herod are detailed with
much care by Josephus (Antiq. xvii. 1; xviii. 5, 4).

Antipas, though not a man of great power, was more shrewd
than his brother Archelaus, whose excesses caused his deposi-
tion and banishment after nine years' misgovernment. Antipas,
on the contrary, managed to secure his position for no less than forty-three years, from his accession, B.C. 4, to his deposition in A.D. 39. He is the "Herod" of the Gospels in every place except in S. Matthew ii. At one time his father intended him to be his successor, but shortly before his death he put Archelaus in his place, and left to Antipas Galilee and Perea, with a revenue of 200 talents.

His character was weak and wavering, and he was under the influence of his two wives, both of them women of great determination. This is related in the history of Herodias (p. 125).

Like other members of the family, he had a mania for building, which he prudently directed to the practical purpose of ingratiating himself with the reigning emperor by naming the new cities Tiberias and Julias.

Tiberias, on the western shore of the Sea of Galilee, was commenced in A.D. 22, a few years before the Lord's ministry began, and was the greatest achievement of his long reign. It was, however, built on the site of an old burying ground, and was in consequence regarded by the Jews as unclean, so that it was with great difficulty that any were induced to settle there. It is believed that our Lord never set His foot within its walls. The new city contained a strong fortress and a splendid palace, known as the Golden House: and as a means of attracting a Hellenistic population a large amphitheatre was added.

Machærus was the stronghold in the south, on the borders of Arabia, a means of protection against the assaults of the Nabatæans, always a formidable foe to the Roman power. It was exceedingly strong by nature, being situated on lofty eminences 3,800 feet above the Dead Sea, with sheer precipices towards the valley. It had been built by the Maccabæan prince, Alexander Janæus, the father of Hyrcanus and Aristobulus, the two claimants to the throne in the time of Pompey: but had been dismantled by Gabinius during the
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Jewish war. Herod the Great restored and enlarged it, and Antipas added to the works. And thus, with its lofty walls and bastions, and its vast keep towering over all, it constituted a fortress practically impregnable. It was here that S. John the Baptist was imprisoned, and it was in one of the dungeons of the keep that the speculator (S. Mark vi. 27) sent by Herod, beheaded the bold prophet who had dared the wrath of the tetrarch and his still more terrible spouse.

Other buildings of Antipas were the fortifications of Sephoris, near Mount Tabor, in Galilee, and of Betharamphtha, which he renamed Julias, in honour of the Emperor's wife (Antiq. xviii. 2, 1). It was during his reign that the sect known as Herodians came into prominence. They were a political party, looking to the Herodian family as the best protection against absorption by Rome, as opposed to the Zealots, who, by fair means or foul, always resisted the heathen domination. The Herodians were in the main inclined to adopt Roman customs, to frequent the foreign games in the amphitheatre, to wear the Roman costume, and to advocate the payment of the tribute to the emperor without question. On two occasions in the Gospels (S. Mark iii. 6; S. Matt. xxii. 16) we find the Herodians and the Pharisees uniting to oppose our Lord, seeking to “destroy” Him, and to “entangle Him in His talk.” The two parties differed from each other on all points, yet were ready to unite for the purpose of crushing a common foe. Well might the Lord warn His disciples against the “leaven of the Pharisees and of Herod” (S. Mark viii. 15).

From the various passages in which Herod's name occurs in the Gospels, we gain some insight into his character. These passages relate chiefly to the death of S. John the Baptist, viz. S. Matthew xiv. 1-12; Mark vi. 14-29; Luke iii. 19, 20. But his name occurs in other connections, such as Mark viii. 15, “the leaven of Herod”; Luke iii. 1, where he is mentioned as “tetrarch of Galilee,” amongst other
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contemporary governors; Luke viii. 3, “Joanna the wife of Chuzu Herod’s steward”; ix. 7–9, “desired to see Him”; xiii. 31, 32, “tell that fox”; xxiii. 6–12, 15, the examination of Christ before Herod. He appears also twice in the Acts: iv. 27, “Herod and Pontius Pilate”; xiii. 1, “Manae, the foster-brother of Herod the tetrarch.” S. Luke refers to him more frequently than the other evangelists, speaking of him always as “the tetrarch,” which was his correct designation, whereas SS. Matthew and Mark, using the popular language of the day, style him, less technically, “king.”

These passages, in a few strokes, depict the portrait of Antipas, and throw light upon his character in its good and bad points. His was a complex character, exhibiting some of the less favourable features of his father’s character, e.g. his sensuality, in his association with Herodias; his weakness in submitting to her dictation; his duplicity, justifying the designation, “that fox,” applied to him by our Lord; his superstition in supposing Jesus to be John the Baptist risen from the dead; his rashness in making promises hard to perform; and his cruelty in the murder of John. Yet he had the seeds of good within him; he listened with respect to John’s exhortations, and in some measure altered his conduct in consequence: he was “sorry” when he heard the nature of the reward claimed by Salome; and he showed some capacity for government as evidenced by the fact of his maintaining his position as tetrarch for more than forty years. Had he been allied with a better woman, he might have left a more honourable reputation behind.

Herodias

Herodias’s temptation throughout life was ambition—“vaulting ambition, which o’erleaps its selle, and falls on the other.”

Her father, Aristobulus, was the son of Herod “the Great,” by Mariamne, the Asmonæan princess, the heiress of the two Maccabæan lines. Aristobulus gave his daughter in marriage,
while yet a child, to her uncle Philip, son of the other Mariamne. The disparity in age was considerable, and there was no love on her side. In her pride she despised her husband's family, as belonging to the Boethusian line of priests from Alexandria. She was never happy with her husband, and the only issue of the marriage was the girl Salome (S. Mark vi. 22).

When Herod's last will was read, Herodias was furious. She had hoped for some recognition of her husband, as in previous wills; but nothing was bequeathed to him. Archelaus, Antipas, the other Philip, even Salome, the sister of Herod, were awarded provinces and cities, but her Philip was passed over altogether. Herodias's pride and ambition could not endure a private station—she must be the wife of a prince. Little wonder that she yielded to the solicitation of Antipas! she was as much the tempter as tempted; being the stronger character of the two, she doubtless took the lead. She and her paramour repudiated their respective partners, and made a matrimonial alliance. She could now gratify her ambition: she could shine in a court, occupy the Golden House at Tiberias, and the palace-fortress at Machærus, and make progresses through her husband's dominions. It was true that Antipas was tetrarch only, but his desire to become king was well known, and his courtiers usually addressed him by this title (S. Matt. xiv. 9; S. Mark vi. 14, 22-27).

The complications, however, of this alliance were enormous, and the consequences disastrous. Herodias had a living husband, Antipas a living wife. Philip could be put aside without much trouble, for he was weak and indolent, devoid of ambition and without influence. But it was quite another matter for Antipas to repudiate his wife. She was the daughter of the powerful king of the Nabatean Arabs, and was herself a woman of high spirit, like her rival. It was out of the question that these two women could meet in peace. Herodias determined that the daughter of Aretas should be displaced.
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Two results followed immediately—war with Aretas and the death of John the Baptist.

The two lovers had arranged to meet at the Golden House, on the shores of the Sea of Tiberias, and this plan coming to the knowledge of the Arabian princess, she took immediate steps to redress her wrongs. She took refuge at Machærus, a strong fortress on the frontier of her father's dominions, and summoned him to her aid. A misunderstanding about boundaries had already arisen between the two princes, and now a far more grievous cause of offence had been given. The insult to his daughter was unpardonable, and Aretas declared war. He was a formidable opponent. Herod the Great had endeavoured to reduce him to subjection, but had found it more politic to conciliate him by this very matrimonial alliance. The power of Rome itself had been insufficient to quell these Nabataeans and to capture their stronghold Petra amidst the burning sands of Arabia. And now Aretas avenges his daughter's dishonour by the defeat and slaughter of Antipas's whole army. This disgrace roused the guilty lovers at the Golden House, and they moved their court to Machærus.

And now the voice of John the Baptist is heard. He denounces the incestuous adulterers. Like a second Elijah, whom indeed he represented, he sternly reproves this Ahab and Jezebel—"It is not lawful for thee to have thy brother's wife." What Antipas might have done had he been a free agent it is impossible to say: but he was under the domination of the imperious and unscrupulous Herodias. She would have made short work of this daring prophet. There were, however, obstacles to this high-handed deed: the angry Aretas with his victorious army was at his gates, and behind him lay the outraged consciences of the Jewish people. For the present, therefore, he kept John in prison. From that prison at Machærus, John sent two of his disciples to inquire of Jesus, "Art thou He that should come, or look we for
another?” (S. Matt. xi. 2). Herodias's vengeance was not long delayed. Her opportunity came when the tetrarch was keeping his birthday. The youthful Salome, beautiful, sensual, and imperious, like her mother, casting aside for the time the dignified bearing of a princess, disgraced herself and her mother by executing a lascivious dance in the presence of the half-drunken nobles, chiliarchs, and chiefs of the military forces then at Machærus. Instigated by her mother, she demanded as the reward for this indecent condescension "the head of John the Baptist on a charger" (Matt. xiv. 1 ff.; Mark vi. 17 ff.).

Thus Herodias ruled her husband and gratified her vengeance.

But she had only partially satisfied her ambition. She had deserted a private station that she might preside over a court; but she was, so far, merely the wife of a tetrarch. She must become a queen. And now her jealousy was excited by the good fortune of her brother Agrippa, upon whom Caligula had conferred the tetrarchy of Philip, with the title of King. Agrippa was now in Palestine, making a royal progress through his newly acquired dominions. Instead of rejoicing in her brother's prosperity she was consumed by insatiable envy, and could have no peace until her husband was on a level with her brother. Much against the tetrarch's better judgment, he was over-persuaded to undertake a journey to Rome to obtain the royal dignity from the all-powerful Cæsar. But this last stroke of ambitious policy proved the ruin of them both. Agrippa treacherously sent a messenger to Caligula, to accuse Herod of disloyalty and the accumulation of arms in league with the Parthians. And thus, instead of returning to Palestine with royal state as they both had hoped, he was deprived of his tetrarchy and banished to Lyons in Gaul, Caligula at the same time conferring upon Agrippa the vacant tetrarchy and the revenue belonging to Antipas.
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Caligula proposed to exclude Herodias from this sentence, on the ground that she was the sister of Agrippa, but she proudly replied, “It is not just that I, who have been partner in his prosperity, should forsake him in his misfortunes,” and she went into exile with the man she had ruined (Jos. Antiq. xviii., 6, 7), A.D. 39.

The Two Philips

The two Philips were sons of Herod, the one by Mariamne of the Boethusian family, the other by Cleopatra of Jerusalem. They were consequently half-brothers to each other, and both of them uncles to Herodias and to Agrippa I.

Philip, the husband of Herodias, was the son of Mariamne, the daughter of the Boethusian high-priest Simon. On the division of the dominions of his father, this Philip was quite passed over, and remained a private person all his life. Three of his brothers, as well as their aunt Salome, received tetrarchies or cities, but Philip received nothing. This gave great offence to the ambitious Herodias: and, although she had a daughter by Philip, she determined to divorce him—an unprecedented act on a woman’s part—and to ally herself with Antipas. This caused great scandal, bringing upon the incestuous pair the sharp reproof of John the Baptist, “It is not lawful for thee to have thy brother’s wife” (Matt. xiv. 3; Mark vi. 17; Luke iii. 19). Perhaps Philip was not altogether sorry to be quit of her: he was double her age, at the marriage, and her imperious manner must have caused constant friction.

The other Philip, the tetrarch, is mentioned only once in the New Testament, viz. in S. Luke iii. 1, amongst the names of the historical personages, at the time when S. John the Baptist emerged from the wilderness, and began the preaching of the baptism of repentance.

He was the son of Cleopatra of Jerusalem, and is known
chiefly as the Tetrarch of Iturea and Trachonitis. He was educated at Rome with his half-brothers Antipas and Archelaus. He married Salome, the dancing-girl of S. Matthew xiv. 6, who was the daughter of Herodias and of the other Philip. The marriage was childless, and Salome became the wife of Aristobulus, king of Chalcis, the brother of Agrippa (Joseph., Antiq. xviii. 6, 4).

By his father's last will he became Tetrarch of Iturea and Trachonitis, and of the region of Gaulonitis and Auranitis, the modern Hauran, and ancientsly forming the territory of Og, the king of Bashan, whom Moses vanquished at the Battle of Edrei. It was a district of high table-land on the east of Jordan, extending from the base of Mount Hermon to the River Hieromax, which flows into the Jordan, south of the Sea of Galilee. It was inhabited in the time of Augustus by half-savage tribes, many of whom were cave-dwellers, who made their livelihood principally by the plunder of travellers and of caravans on the march. They were in league with Zenodorus, of whom mention is made under Lysanias (p. 132), and it was not until the Emperor assigned the whole district, including Abilene, which Zenodorus had misgoverned, to Herod the Great, that this organised system of brigandage was put down (B.C. 20).

It was a difficult district to govern, but Philip proved himself equal to the task: and for thirty-seven years kept order amongst these freebooters, and gave his people a peaceful and prosperous time. He devoted himself to the interests of his tetrarchy, and kept aloof from the intrigues in which the other members of the family were involved. He left no children, and his dominions were added to the Roman province of Syria. He died at Bethsaida Julias, A.D. 34. He was the best of Herod's sons.

He is chiefly remembered as the builder, or rather the beautifier of the ancient town of Laish, or Dan (Judges xviii.), subsequently known as Baal-gad and Pania, and at present
as Banias. He greatly enlarged the town and renamed it Caesarea in honour of the Emperor. In S. Matthew xvi. 13 and Mark viii. 27 the city is mentioned in connection with the Transfiguration and other events in our Lord’s life. Philip also complimented the Emperor by raising Bethsaida in Gaulonitis to the rank of a city, and naming it Julias after the daughter of Augustus and the wife of Tiberius, an infamous woman, who deserved no such honour.

Lysanias

Lysanias does not, apparently, belong to the family of Herod, but we introduce him here, as being mentioned by S. Luke (iii. 1) in association with other rulers of Palestine at the same period. The introduction of his name creates a difficulty, of which advantage has been taken, in order to cast doubts upon S. Luke’s historical accuracy. There is, however, no reason why any reference should be made to him, unless the writer was perfectly certain of his facts: and probably the allusion is made on account of a friendship existing between Lysanias’s family and the Asmonæans, as related by Josephus (Antiq. xiv. 7, 4).

The name of this Lysanias of S. Luke iii. 1 does not occur elsewhere, either in the New Testament, or in the writings of contemporary historians: but the same remark is applicable to Chuza, Herod’s steward (Luke viii. 3), and to Manaen, his foster-brother (Acts xiii. 1), as well as to many persons named in the writings of Josephus. We do not doubt Josephus on this account, neither are we entitled to doubt S. Luke, whose accuracy has been upheld on all occasions when it has been challenged. S. Luke, equally with Josephus, had an intimate acquaintance with the personages of his time, and of the events in which they took part. Members of this family are mentioned by Josephus. Thus, in B.C. 34 there was a Lysanias, who succeeded his father Ptolemy, the son of
Menneus, in the government of Chalcis, which at that time included Abilene (Joseph., B. J. i. 13, 1). This Lysanias was put to death by Antony, on a false charge of complicity with the Parthians: and this was done to please Cleopatra of Egypt, who coveted Lysanias's dominions (Antiq. xv. 4, 1). This was sixty years before S. Luke's Lysanias, who was no doubt a successor.

The "house of Lysanias" also is mentioned by Josephus (Antiq. xv. 10, 1), as being in charge of a man named Zeno-
dorus, who farmed the revenues of Chalcis and Abilene, after they had been given to Cleopatra. Josephus has much to say about this man, which we need not repeat here. Thus the name of Lysanias is three times coupled by Josephus with the district in which Abilene was situated.

Abila itself was a small town about half-way between Chalcis and Damascus, in the wild, mountainous region at the base of Hermon and Anti-Libanus. Abilene was the district attached to the town. It was an unsettled neighbourhood teeming with robbers, with whom the Zeno-
dorus mentioned above was con-
federate, with the object of increasing his revenues. The country gave much trouble to the Roman Government, and was subjected to constant change of rule, and alteration in area. Augustus conferred the district upon a descendant of the first Lysanias, and in B.C. 22 added it with Chalcis to the dominions of Herod the Great; Caligula gave it to Herod Agrippa I., after his brother Herod, King of Chalcis, had held it for a while; and after another interval Claudius transferred it to Agrippa II. Amidst all these changes in area and in government, Abilene might well have belonged to Lysanias in A.D. 27.

In A.D. 79, Abila was captured by Placidus, one of Vespasian's generals, and was thenceforth annexed to Syria.
Agrippa 3.

With Agrippa we pass to the second generation from Herod, for he was the grandson of Herod by the Asmoncean princess Mariamne. His father, Aristobulus, his uncle Alexander, and his grandmother Mariamne, had all been executed by Herod's orders; and Agrippa's own career during his youth was chequered by misfortune and enlivened by adventure. He had bitter experience of debt and difficulty, and even of actual distress. In the hands of money-lenders, arrested for debt, accused of peculation, a pensioner on the bounty of his relatives, driven to despair and to the contemplation of suicide, and eventually cast into a dungeon and loaded with chains;—such was his life during his youth, until, with the accession of Caligula, brighter days came, and he passed from a prison to a throne.

On the execution of his father, he was sent to Rome, where he was brought up with Drusus, son of the Emperor Tiberius, and was under the patronage of Antonia, a friend of his mother, Bernice. His adventures and youthful escapades are related at great length by Josephus (Antiq. xviii. 6). His conduct on many occasions was far from honourable, and he was at times in danger of death. At one time his uncle Antipas rescued him from actual poverty at the intercession of Herodias his sister, and appointed him governor of Tiberias. This appointment he threw up by an act of folly, and once more came to destitution. At Rome he attached himself to Caius Caligula, and recklessly expressed a wish that Tiberius might die and Caligula take his place. This was overheard and reported, with the result that he was arrested in the public circus and cast into prison, where he remained for six months. At the accession of his friend Caligula, he was set free, his iron chain was exchanged for a golden one of equal weight; and, the tetrarchy of Philip being then vacant, he was promoted to the post with the title of King (A.D. 37). All this
is recorded, with many details, by Josephus in the passage referred to above.

And now the scene was changed: the cloud and darkness of the past disappeared as though by magic, and the future was illumined by a golden glow. No longer in debt, in dependence, in prison, disgraced and despised, he was a king! And when he arrived in Palestine, he made a royal progress through his dominions, to the great annoyance of his sister Herodias, whose pensioner he had lately been. This freak of fortune roused her jealous anger: she exclaimed that she could not bear to live any longer, while Agrippa who, in extreme poverty, had begged of her husband the very necessaries of life, and had absconded from his creditors, had returned from Rome in royal state. Antipas must also wear a crown; and she drove him to that journey which issued in his deposition and banishment (Joseph., Antiq. xviii. 7).

Agrippa basely accused his former patron, the husband of his own sister, of disloyalty to Rome, and was mean enough to accept with alacrity the tetrarchy of Antipas, which Caligula now conferred upon him, in addition to the tetrarchy of Philip, of which he was already in possession.

This was in A.D. 39. Two years later Agrippa happened to be in Rome when Caligula was assassinated, and was instrumental in securing the succession to the feeble and hesitating Claudius, who seemed incapable of extricating himself from the maze of difficulties in which he was involved at his accession. For the services thus rendered, he was rewarded by the addition to his dominions of Judæa and Samaria, and of the district of "Abila of Lysanias." Thus Agrippa ruled over the whole of the dominions of his grandfather Herod (Joseph., Antiq. xix.). He was now a great king indeed, and he returned to Palestine with augmented dignity.

Josephus describes him as a man of generous disposition, and of a humane and compassionate temper: and especially
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careful in the observance of the Law of Moses. This latter characteristic would have brought him great popularity amongst his Jewish subjects, had he not somewhat discounted it by building a theatre at Berytus, and an amphitheatre, in which he exhibited shows after the Roman fashion, with gladiatorial contests, and on one occasion a battle in the arena with 700 men on each side (Joseph., Antiq. xix. 7, 5).

He had been all his life fond of display. In his wild youth in Rome, he had impoverished himself several times by his wasteful expenditure; when Caligula first raised him to the throne, he had infused gall into the jealous Herodias by the royal state he kept; and now that his kingdom equalled in extent the realms of Herod the Great, he began to play the part of a great king, and invited to his palace at Tiberias several of the neighbouring sovereigns, amongst whom were the kings of Commagene, Emesa, and Armenia, as well as Polemo, king of Pontus, and his own brother, Herod, king of Chalcis. These he entertained royally at the Golden House.

With the same idea of magnificent display he came to Caesarea Stratonis, by the sea, on the occasion of a festival held in his honour, at which there was an immense concourse of all the principal dignitaries in his dominions.

It is here that S. Luke's narrative in the Acts comes in. Agrippa had laid himself out to conciliate the Jews; and, with that object, had beheaded S. James and cast S. Peter into prison (Acts xii. 1–19). After S. Peter's deliverance by the angel, Agrippa went down from Jerusalem to Caesarea, to attend the festival. We have two narratives of the events which followed—those of S. Luke and of Josephus (Acts xii. 20–24; Antiq. xix. 8, 2). Agrippa appeared at the festival in a robe made wholly of silver, which, illumined by the light of early morning, shone so resplendently in the sun as to excite a feeling of awe in the minds of the spectators, some of whom cried out that he was a god, and began to offer prayers to
him. He accepted their adoration without rebuke, after the example of the "divine" emperors; and was immediately seized with violent internal pains, which five days afterwards carried him off. He died A.D. 44, after a reign of seven years, in the fifty-fourth year of his age.

Agrippa 33

When his father died at Caesarea, as related by S. Luke (Acts xii. 20–23), the young Agrippa was residing at Rome. He was but seventeen years of age, and was considered by the advisers of Claudius too young and inexperienced to occupy a throne, especially at a time when Palestine was infested by brigands. Accordingly Judæa fell again under the governorship of procurators, and Cuspius Fadus was appointed to the office (Antiq. xix. 9). In fact, from the deposition of Archelaus, A.D. 6, to the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, a long line of these officials had succeeded one another without intermission, except during the three years that Agrippa I. had ruled over all Palestine.

The young Agrippa was detained for six years at the Court of Claudius, until about the year A.D. 50, when he was appointed as king of Chalcis, on the death of his uncle. In A.D. 52, Claudius further promoted him to the tetrarchies of Iturea, Trachonitis, and Abilene, formerly held by Philip and Lysanias, and also conferred upon him the coveted title of king. To these territories further small accessions were made both by Nero and Vespasian; but Agrippa never attained to the full extent of his father's dominions, and Judæa continued to be ruled by procurators appointed direct by the emperor.

Our interest in Agrippa consists solely in the part which he took in the trial of S. Paul at Caesarea. The apostle had been arrested in Jerusalem by the chiliarch, Claudius Lysias, during a riot in the Temple court, and had been secretly con-
veyed to Cæsarea. Here he was in custody for two years under Felix; and then, in A.D. 60, he was brought before Festus, Felix’s successor as procurator of Judæa (Acts xxiv. 27). The new governor, hesitating to decide questions relating to the Jewish religion, without the assistance of the priests, suggested that the venue should be changed from Cæsarea to Jerusalem. To this, however, S. Paul objected; and, feeling that he would not obtain justice in Palestine, he exercised his right, as a Roman citizen, of appealing to Cæsar. Festus rightly judged that the case was at an end, as far as he was concerned, and replied, "Thou hast appealed unto Cæsar: unto Cæsar shalt thou go" (Acts xxv. 6-12). The cause was now removed from Jerusalem and from Cæsarea, and must be tried at Rome. The procurator was freed from further responsibility, the accused must be brought before the Court of Final Appeal; the emperor himself must be the judge.

Nothing remained now but to keep the prisoner in safe custody until he could be sent to Rome. But a reasonable charge must be preferred against him (Acts xxv. 27), and Festus was ignorant of the Jewish Law. Agrippa, however, had come to Cæsarea on a visit to Festus; and Agrippa was, presumably, an “expert” in Jewish law (Acts xxvi. 3), for, on his appointment as king of Chalcis, he had not only received the crown of his uncle, but had also been invested with the special privileges which the late king enjoyed—the custody of the sacred vestments of the high priests, the superintendence of the Temple and its treasury, and the appointment of the high priests (Antiq. xx. i, 3).

Festus had already suggested that the cause should be tried at Jerusalem, but the accused had indignantly rejected the suggestion (Acts xxv. 9-11): now Festus seeks the assistance of Agrippa in formulating the charge to be sent to Rome. The proceedings in the presence of Agrippa were irregular; the formal appeal had been made, and had been allowed;
any further inquiry, if considered necessary, should have been informal and private. But Agrippa was anxious to hear the case, and he delighted in display; accordingly the hearing was made formal and public, and Agrippa and Bernice entered the court with "great pomp" (Acts xxv. 23).

The court seems to have been formally constituted, and was attended by the civil and military officials, the chiliarchs and the principal men of the city. Festus orders the prisoner to be brought into the audience-chamber; and then, addressing himself to the king, lays the case briefly before him, and concludes by stating that he is searching for some definite accusation to forward to the emperor, "for," said he, "it seemeth to me unreasonable, in sending a prisoner, not withal to signify the charges against him" (Acts xxv. 27).

Agrippa asks the prisoner to speak for himself. Then S. Paul for the fifth time stands upon his defence (Acts xxii. 1–21; xxiii. 1–6; xxiv. 10–21; xxv. 7–12; xxvi. 1–29). We may assume that he need not have pleaded at all, as his case was finished so far as Festus was concerned, when he gave notice of appeal; but he would lose no opportunity of advancing the cause of Christ, and was anxious to press the Gospel both upon the heathen governor and the Jewish king. And indeed both were impressed by his impassioned oratory (Acts xxvi. 24, 28). The conduct of Festus will be considered later on (chap. xvi.): we will now deal only with Agrippa. He replies to S. Paul's impassioned appeal—

'Εν ὀλίγῳ μὲ πείθεις Χριστιανὸν γενέσθαι.

The meaning of these words has been long debated, and cannot with absolute certainty be decided.

The A.V. renders them, "Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian." It is obvious that some word must be understood after ὀλίγῳ: for the phrase is elliptical; the question is, What shall we understand? and the following have been suggested:—
“in a few words.”
“in a small measure—almost” (A.V.).
“in a short time—soon” (Conybeare and Howson).
“with slight argument” (R.V.)
“with little trouble” (Alford).

In verse 29 S. Paul takes up this word of Agrippa’s, and uses it in the same sense, ἔδειξαίμην ἀν τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ ἐν ὀλίγῳ καὶ ἐν μεγάλῳ κ.τ.λ.

Evidently, in both verses the ἐν ὀλίγῳ must have the same meaning. Hence in verse 29 we may read:—

“in few words or in many.”
“almost and altogether” (A.V.).
“soon or late” (Conybeare and Howson).
“easily or with difficulty” (Alford).

The following renderings have been given:—
“Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian” (A.V.).
“With but little persuasion thou wouldest fain make me a Christian” (R.V.).
“Thou wilt soon persuade me to be a Christian” (Conybeare and Howson).

Dean Alford adopts a different reading—

Ἐν ὀλίγῳ με πείθῃ Χριστιανὸν ποιήσαι

—and translates, “Lightly (with small trouble) art thou persuading thyself that thou canst make me a Christian.” And in the next verse, “I could wish to God, that whether with ease or with difficulty (on my part), not only thou, but all who hear me, might become such as I am, except only these bonds.”

Taking into consideration the character of Agrippa, his worldliness, his sensuality, his love of display, his desire to keep in touch with the higher powers, we can hardly take his words as indicating a leaning towards Christianity. At that time the word “Christian” had not been adopted by the brethren themselves, and was used only by outsiders; viz.
by the heathen at Antioch, and in the world at large (Acts xi. 26; 1 S. Peter iv. 16). It would therefore be used by Agrippa with a feeling of contempt. We should not, consequently, follow the A.V. in supposing Agrippa to be waver- ing between Judaism and Christianity, but rather that he speaks contumuously, and suggests that such arguments as S. Paul had used were not of sufficient weight to convince him. He would be much of the same opinion as Festus (v. 24), and have but little sympathy with enthusiasm, or (as he would have regarded it) with fanaticism, or even derangement of mind.

However, the arguments of the accused produced some impression upon both the judges, for they agreed, "This man might have been set at liberty, if he had not appealed unto Caesar." They were not at all convinced that there was any truth in Christianity, but they felt that their prisoner had cleared himself of all offence against the Jewish religion and the Roman government.

This appearance of S. Paul before Agrippa took place in A.D. 60.

After this we read no more of Agrippa in the New Testament, but he appears in the long history given by Josephus of the last Jewish war against the Romans. Agrippa endeavoured to dissuade his countrymen from entering on the war, and Josephus gives a long report, no doubt composed by himself, of an eloquent speech delivered on this occasion (B. J. ii. 16). The king’s advice was rejected by the Jews, and he cast in his lot with his patrons the Romans, against his own countrymen; and in the course of the war was wounded by a stone from a sling, at the siege of Gamala, in Lower Gaulonitis (B. J. iv. 1, 3).

After the fall of Jerusalem he retired, with his sister Bernice, to Rome; and there he fixed his residence in the main, though still retaining his kingdom in Palestine: and there he died, "the humble and contented vassal of Rome," at the age of
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seventy, and at the close of the century, the last of the Idumæan dynasty. It was a wonder that a family, which made so many intermarriages, generation after generation, some of them incestuous, should have lasted so long.

A short account of Bernice will be found further on, in the chapter on Marriage.

Drusilla

Drusilla was ten years younger than her sister Bernice (Joseph., Antiq. xix. 9, 1). Very little is known about her. We read of her in Acts xxiv. 24 as being a Jewess, and the wife of Felix. She may have been present on the occasion when S. Paul “reasoned of righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come.”

All that is known of her is related by Josephus (Antiq. xx. 7, 1, 2).

She had been betrothed to Epiphanes, the son of Antiochus, king of Commagene; but, on his refusal to embrace the Jewish religion as he had promised, she was given in marriage to Azizus, king of Emesa. The marriage was soon afterwards dissolved, for Felix, when he became procurator of Judæa, fell in love with her, she being, like her sister, a very beautiful woman, and persuaded her to leave her husband and marry him. A son was born of this union, who was named Agrippa, and who perished in the famous eruption of Vesuvius in the days of Titus.
CHAPTER V

TIBERIUS AND TRIBUTE

Tiberius

The history of Tiberius need not detain us long, for his reign was uneventful, though it extended over twenty-three years.

In character he was a master of dissimulation. Augustus claimed to have "played his part well," but he acted always for the public good. Tiberius kept his own selfish ends in view, and never ceased to wear the actor's mask till the death of his mother Livia released him from all restraint. All through his life he was moody and reserved, suspicious of everyone, and disposed to the gratification of secret vices—a disposition, in his earlier life, carefully concealed; but to which, in his declining years, he gave full vent.

Yet, in his youth he had given abundant proof of a capacity for better things. He was a man of parts, as Lord Macaulay would have said. He was a competent general, and an efficient and successful, if not popular, provincial governor. "Nature" writes Niebuhr "had done very much for him: he had great judgment, wit and industry; indestructible health; a very happily and beautifully organised body; a tall majestic figure; a fine head: his statue and that of Augustus are the finest amongst those of the emperors. He also spoke extraordinarily well."

For many years, in spite of all these points in his favour, there was no probability of his ever becoming emperor, for there were several between him and the throne. Augustus had adopted Caius and Lucius Cæsar, the sons of Agrippa
and Julia his daughter—he had also adopted her husband Marcellus, and Drusus the son of Livia. These four stood between Tiberius and supreme power; in addition to which Augustus built hopes upon having children by Livia. These hopes, however, were not realised: and the four adopted sons all died young, thus clearing the way to the throne for Tiberius. Tiberius's mother, Livia, now plotted for her son's advancement, and arranged that he should marry Julia, which he was very unwilling to do, as her profligacy was notorious.

The emperor's command was laid upon him, and he was forced to divorce his wife Vipsania Agrippina, and marry the emperor's daughter. A very short time was sufficient to disgust him with his new wife; and he was glad to go anywhere to be rid of her. First to the north of Europe, and afterwards to the island of Rhodes, did Tiberius withdraw, much to the annoyance of his stepfather, Augustus; and he did not return thence until Caius and Lucius Cæsar were dead, and Julia was banished to Pandataria.

At length Augustus adopted him as his successor, and appointed him to service in Pannonia and Illyria.

On the death of Augustus, A.D. 14, Tiberius, by the help of his mother, stepped into his place, pretending all the while that he was acting for the public good, by the express desire of the senate, whose acts in reality he was able to control, by virtue of his tribunician authority. He began well, for it was necessary to bid for popularity against his nephew Germanicus; but on Germanicus's death, five years later, Tiberius felt himself safe on the throne: and from that day, the darker traits of his character, which he had hitherto concealed with some success, began to manifest themselves. First his gloomy and jealous disposition induced him to increase the number and severity of the prosecutions for high-treason, crimen læse majestatis; by means of which any persons of rank and importance, whom he considered to be dangerous to himself, could be removed out of the way.
Next, on the death of his mother, Livia, who had been a terror to himself as well as to his stepfather, he cast aside all restraint, and gave up altogether any pretense to the possession of virtue. This was in A.D. 29.

And finally, having appointed Aelius Sejanus to the high office of praefectus praetorio, and feeling himself perfectly safe, he left the management of public affairs to this praefect, retired to Capreae, and spent the rest of his life in infamous lusts, only rousing himself once to depose Sejanus, and put Macro in his place.

And so he died, A.D. 37; his death being doubtless hastened by poison or by strangulation, or perhaps by both.

It was of this infamous man that the Lord Jesus, loyal to the constituted authorities, said “Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar’s.”

And it was while Tiberius was at his worst in the isle of Capreae that the climax of the Saviour’s sufferings was reached in His Cross and Passion, in His precious Death and Burial: to which Tacitus makes allusion in the well-known passage in his Annals (xv. 44.) “Ergo abolendo rumori” (viz. the report that Nero himself had set fire to Rome) “Nero subdidit reos, et quesitissimis pœnis affectis quos per flagitia invisos vulgus Christianos appellabat. Auctor nominis ejus Christus Tiberio imperitante, per procuratorem Pontium Pilatum supplicio affectus erat.”

The Tribute Money

On the Tuesday before the Crucifixion a determined attempt was made by the enemies of the Lord Jesus Christ to discredit Him amongst the people who were thronging the Temple courts, and at the same time to embroil Him with the ruling powers both Jewish and Roman. They hoped also to extract from His own lips words which could be used in evidence against Him at the approaching Trial, should they succeed in apprehending Him on a sufficiently definite charge.
Accordingly the various representative parties and sects came forward, one after the other, propounding questions which they conceived to be impossible of answer without Self-incrimination.

With these questions we are not concerned, except with the second:—

"Is it lawful to give tribute unto Caesar, or not?"


The question was asked by the Pharisees and Herodians (Matt. and Mark); or by spies sent out by the chief priests and scribes (Luke).

The union of Pharisees and Herodians on this occasion was significant: it showed the bitter animosity which both parties felt against the Lord. It was an unholy alliance of parties, at other times in opposition, but now for the moment in collusion, the question of the payment of tribute being the bone of contention. The Pharisees, as the patriotic party, zealous for the Law of Moses, deemed the payment unlawful. The Herodians, as political opportunists, conceded the point, as a matter of expediency.

The Herodians were a political party, rather than religious; and, as far as can be ascertained, consisted of two distinct classes.

First, those who were supporters of the Herodian family as the most convenient safeguard against absolute subjection to Roman rule. The ambition of the first Herod to found an independent oriental empire like that of David and Solomon, would be remembered, and they would hope that Antipas, or some other more enterprising member of the family, would revive the project.

The larger number, however, were mere time-servers, who perceived that the Roman power was irresistible, and made up their minds to submit to the inevitable. Hence they would pay the Roman taxes without question, and comply with
Roman customs in daily life, even to the extent, in some cases, of wearing the Roman costume, instead of the distinctive garment prescribed by the Law (Num. xv. 38, 39). When there was a show in one of the amphitheatres in Caesarea, Jerusalem or Jericho, you would expect to see them there; and they would also be hangers on at the petty court of Antipas, in the Golden House at Tiberias, regardless of the current report that the town was built upon the site of a disused cemetery, and was consequently to be shunned by a faithful Israelite as unclean. They doubtless regarded themselves as the liberal party, the party of progress, in contradistinction to those who stood in the old paths.

These two parties, the Pharisees and Herodians, in opposition upon almost every point, were specially antagonistic in regard to the payment of tribute. There was no escape, they fondly hoped, from the question they had agreed to ask. "He must," they concluded, "give a categorical reply: either yes or no." Surely He would be impaled upon the horns of this dilemma. If He decided in favour of payment, He would offend the multitude, lose His popularity, and fall into the hands of the Sanhedrin as a breaker of the Law of Moses. On the other hand, if He declared that such payment was not lawful, He would be in still worse case, for He would come into collision with the Roman power: and could be delated by the "spies" (the liers in wait, ἐγκάθετοι: S. Luke xx. 20) before Pilate, on the charge of laesa majestas, or high-treason. They hoped to "entangle," "ensnare" (παγιδεύω, Matt.) "catch" (αγρεύω, Mark) Him either way; and take hold of His words, so as to deliver Him up to the rule and to the authority of the governor. The two words used by S. Matthew and S. Mark suggest the craft of the hunter, who sets his traps and watches for the prey to fall into them. Παγιδεύω, S. Matthew's word, is to ensnare or entrap; ἀγρεύω, S. Mark's word, is to take in hunting.
Tribute

In the New Testament three words are used for taxation: (we exclude the didrachma for the present, as being a Jewish impost). These three words are φόρος, κῆνσος, and τέλος, of which the first two indicate direct taxation, the third indirect. The first two only are used, as we should expect, in the narrative of the tribute money.

I. Φόρος was that which is brought, φέρεται.

It is the word employed by S. Luke (xx. 22) "Εξεστιν ἡμῖν Καίσαρι φόρον δοῦναι ἢ οὐ; "Is it lawful for us to give tribute unto Caesare, or not?" It appears again in the accusation brought against our Lord before Pilate (xxiii. 2) κωλύοντα Καίσαρι φόρους διδόναι, "forbidding to give tribute to Caesar." And we find it in conjunction with τέλος in Rom. xiii. 7, where Christians are bidden to be in subjection to the higher powers, and to render to all their dues, both tribute and custom, i.e. direct and indirect taxation.

II. Κῆνσος, Census, a Latin word; from censeo, to count, reckon; hence to tax, assess. The Census was a registering and rating of Roman citizens originally, and of provincials afterwards, for the purpose of the valuation of property. The word was used also for the sum so assessed.

This is the word employed by S. Matthew and S. Mark in the narrative of the tribute money "Εξεστι δοῦναι κῆνσον Καίσαρι; It is, however, to be noted that ἐπικεφάλαιον occurs in S. Mark’s narrative in D (Codex Bezae, in the University Library at Cambridge). Ἐπικεφάλαιον does not meet us in the New Testament; but κεφάλαιον is used in the sense of a sum of money in Acts xxii. 28, by Claudius Lysias, as the means of obtaining his citizenship: also in Heb. viii. 1 with the meaning of a "summary." In S. Matt. xvii. 25, κῆνσος is used: "The kings of the earth, from whom do they receive toll or tribute?" τέλη ἡ κῆνσον;
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The ἀπογραφή of S. Luke ii. 2 and Acts v. 37, was a registration or enrolment, a record of the names and description of the people, usually with a view to taxation, but not necessarily so (see page 37). The "census" was a poll tax, tributum capitis, levied on every Jew, and regarded with peculiar hatred, as a mark of subjection to a foreign power.

With the κῆνος there was also a property-tax, which was resisted for the same reason, as tending towards slavery. It caused the revolt of Judas of Galilee; but Joazar, the high-priest, persuaded the people to submit (Jos., Antiq. xviii. 1, 1).

There was also in Jerusalem a special house-duty, from which Agrippa freed the Jews, in the reign of Claudius (Antiq. xix. 6, 3).

Thus Judæa was heavily weighted by taxation.

From these two sources, the φόρος and the κῆνος, the Romans derived the greater part of their revenue in the provinces: estimated to amount to about 6 per cent.

III. Τέλος.

In addition to direct taxation, there was the indirect: the toll, or customs, known as vectigalia; the τέλη of S. Matt. xvii. 25, the τέλος of Rom. xiii. 7.

The word itself is of exceedingly wide meaning, but is used in the above places, and with the cognate words noticed below, in the sense of dues paid at harbours or piers (as customs), or at the gates of cities, (as octroi), or in the towns, (as excise) on articles of home production.

The τέλος was collected by the τελώναι, a word compounded of τέλος and ὄνεομαι, to buy. These officials correspond with our own tax-gatherers and custom-house officers.

They sat at the τελώνιον, the custom-house, toll-house, or collector's office. Here sat S. Matthew at Capernaum (Matt. ix. 9: Mark ii. 14: Luke v. 27), at some spot near the pier at which the trading vessels on the lake touched. Here also he would be able to intercept the caravans from Damascus, on
Tiberius and Tribute

their way to Jerusalem, Cæsarea or Joppa, and demand payment of the *portorium*, the customs-duty, or pedlars’ tax.

Above the *τέλωναί*, as superior officials, were the *ἀρχιτελώναί*, to whom Zacchæus belonged (S. Luke xix. 2). Of these we shall speak presently.

In addition to the taxes above-named, there was the διδραχμα of S. Matt. xvii. 24–27, consisting of a half shekel for each person, payable towards the services in the Temple at Jerusalem (Ex. xxx. 11–16). After the destruction of the Temple, Vespasian transferred the amounts thus obtained to the Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus (Joseph., B. J. vii. 6, 6). There are some interesting points connected with this tax, of which we refrain to speak, as it was a purely Jewish tax, and was not collected by the Romans until the time of Vespasian.

These taxes, with the exception of the διδραχμα, were paid into the treasury at Rome. In the case of the senatorial provinces, the contribution was styled *stipendium*, and was paid into the *ararium*, in the Temple of Saturnus. In the imperial provinces, it was called *tributum*, and was paid into the *fiscus*, or emperor’s treasury. In the later times of the Empire this distinction was lost. The *fiscus* must be distinguished from the private property of the emperor.

Syria, to which Palestine belonged, was an imperial province, governed by a *legatus Cæsaris*; and Palestine itself was governed by a *procurator*, appointed by the emperor. Consequently the *tributum* from Palestine was collected by the emperor’s representatives, and paid into his *fiscus*.

The payment of tribute to Rome from Judæa began B.C. 63, when Pompey settled the dispute between Hyrcanus and Aristobulus (see page 114), and made Judæa tributary to the republic, exacting from the people a sum amounting to no less than 10,000 talents (Jos., *Antig*. xiv. 4, 4 and 5). But the amount payable varied from time to time, the burden being alleviated by Julius Cæsar, but becoming very heavy under
Herod, whose expenditure upon building operations was enormous.

The Roman citizens themselves, at this time, paid no direct taxation, but the provincials were heavily taxed for their benefit. This naturally caused discontent in every province; but nowhere so much as in Judæa, where the domination of a heathen government was resented as an outrage upon their allegiance to Jehovah.

Hence revolts were frequent, such as that of Judas of Galilee, "in the days of the enrolment" (Acts v. 37): and resistance was systematic, producing such loosely organised bodies as the Zealots and Sicarii.

But the taxation continued, and was carried out in that thorough manner which ever characterised the operations of Rome. The regular tribute was put up to auction by the censors, and knocked down to the highest bidder, who might be an individual or an association.

If the contractor were an individual, he would be in the position of the servant in the parable, who had promised to collect the sum of 10,000 talents; in other words he was farming the revenues of a province (S. Matt. xviii. 23 ff.). Such a man would be one of the equestrian order, and would conduct the business in his own way. He would undertake to pay the stipulated sum into the aerarium or fiscus, as the case might be, and recoup himself for the expenses of collection and for profit to himself, by cruel extortion from the provincials: for which purpose he would appoint agents and collectors in the various districts.

But the business required large capital, and would be beyond the power of all but the most wealthy: it was consequently often undertaken by an association of capitalists, something like our own limited liability companies, though the liability was unlimited. Such a company was called a societas, and would be conducted on commercial principles, with a chief office at Rome, under a magister, or managing
director, and with agents, or sub-magistri, in the provinces. These last were known as ἀρχιτελῶναι, of whom Zacchæus was one. Their duty would be to superintend the collection in the particular province for which they acted, and to appoint the local agents, or officials. These were the publicani, who collected for the publicum or treasury, and were called portitores, or receivers of custom: in the New Testament they are called τελῶναι. To this class S. Matthew belonged, his office or stall being situated at Capernaum.

The τελῶναι nearly always belonged to the locality in which they officiated, or at least were inhabitants of the province in which their district was situated. Acting under instructions from the ἀρχιτελῶναι, they were bound to be extortionate: there was no help for them; they would lose their place if they were not. Hence they were universally execrated as exactores. Their rapacity was proverbial, and their general character suspected: to speak of them as "extortioners, unjust, adulterers" (S. Luke xviii. 11) was quite usual: and when advice was given to them, the most appropriate would be, "Extort no more than that which is appointed you" (S. Luke iii. 13). They were popularly classed with "sinners." "Why eateth your Master with publicans and sinners?" (S. Matt. ix. 10, 11). The Pharisees were scandalised at a prophet keeping such company: and our Lord's contemporaries described Him as "a gluttonous man, and a winebibber, a friend of publicans and sinners" (S. Matt. xi. 19). Our Saviour Himself coupled them with "heathen" and with "harlots" (S. Matt. v. 46, 47, R.V.: xviii. 17: xxi. 31, 32). The Jews hated them as unpatriotic, collecting dues for a foreign and heathen power; and precluded them from sitting on the bench as judges, and from giving evidence as witnesses. They despaired of the salvation of such criminals, repentance being so exceedingly difficult for them.

"It has not been our lot," writes Dr. Kitto, "to be
acquainted with any country, the inhabitants of which are so alive to their obligations to the State, as to receive with pleasure, and regard with respect the collectors of the revenue, under whatever name they may come, whether tax gatherers, rate collectors, excisemen, custom-house officers, or toll-men. The popular dislike to this class of public servants has always existed everywhere; and in an eminent degree it has always existed, and does exist in the East.”

We none of us really like to pay taxes, though such burdens, in England, are equitably distributed, under the sanction of laws generally known and understood, and the amount to be collected is calculated for each person with due regard to the valuation of property. This was not the case in the Roman provinces. There was no regular and organised system of taxation. The plan was to squeeze the tax-payers as closely as they would permit, so as to secure as large a margin of profit as possible for the farmer of the taxes, whether an individual or a company. This pressed with unequal weight upon different classes, the timid paying all that was demanded, the more resolute resisting excessive demands. Payment was often enforced by drastic measures, by violence and compulsion, and even on occasion by the employment of the provincial military forces. The collectors would detain and open letters on suspicion. Altogether the burden was so unequal, so unjust, and so excessive, that the whole system met with universal detestation, and the provincials would sometimes combine together, and forward their complaints to Rome. Tacitus speaks of the “immodestia publicanorum,” and elsewhere we read that these officials were πάντες ἀρπαγές. They were so universally hated and avoided that none but the worst class of people would undertake an office so obnoxious.

It seems strange that our Lord should have selected one of His apostles from such a class, and that He should have honoured another with His special approbation. But, inas-
much as He came to seek and to save that which was lost, He was content to be the friend of publicans and sinners.

Such were the taxes which the Jewish people were required to pay to the Roman government: and the question pronounced to our Lord by the combined party of Pharisees and Herodians was, "Is it lawful for us to give tribute unto Cæsar, or not?" The ἡμῖν, "for us," is emphatic in S. Luke's account. The persons sent to ask this question were ἐγκαθέτων, "spies," suborned men, liers in wait; people placed in ambush, with the object of taking hold of His speech, "so as to deliver Him up to the rule and to the authority of the governor." These "spies" were sent "by the scribes and the chief priests." And the intention was to make the reply more difficult. "On the supposition that the tax might, under exceptional circumstances, be paid by the ordinary Jew, is it lawful for us, who belong to the priestly caste, and of whom consequently more strict obedience to the Law is required, to pay tribute to a heathen power, when the Law declares that God's people are a holy people 'peculiar unto Himself, above all the nations that are upon the earth' (Deut. xiv. 2), and therefore above the Romans?" The object is to extract from our Lord some reply to their question, which shall put the Jews in antagonism to the Romans, and enable them to accuse Him of disloyalty, even of the crimen lase majestatis, at that time frequently made the subject of accusation, and punished with the extreme penalty of the law. Other nations, Greeks, Egyptians, Persians, may submit to these exactions, for they can change their gods with their change of residence; but we are the servants of the Most High God, the only God throughout the world. "Shall we give, or shall we not give?"

This was a trap, they thought, into which He would surely fall.

But the reply of Jesus was unexpected:—

"Bring me a penny."
They obtained the coin, doubtless, from one of the money-changers sitting at their tables in the court close by (S. Mark xi. 15): for if they were carrying such coins in their girdles, they had already answered their own question in the affirmative. Besides which no strict Jew ought to be in possession of money which was defiled with heathen symbols and inscriptions. But the money-changers were at hand. They had indeed been driven forth from the court the day before; but, with the impunity which an established custom encourages, they had doubtless already resumed their places. At all events they were not far away, and the requisite coin was produced.

Money-Changers

This money-changing was a regular business. It was a great convenience to those who came from foreign countries—it was indeed a necessity.

The priests were bound to require that the offerings for the Temple should be made in Jewish money. Especially was this the case with the half-shekel which every Jew had to pay annually, as a ransom for his soul: it must be a "shekel of the sanctuary." It was the same in amount for all, whatever their condition in life: the rich must not give more, nor the poor less, than half a shekel (Ex. xxx. 11–16). The amounts thus collected were dedicated to the service of the sanctuary: and it was the custom for the priests to begin the collection twenty days before the Passover.

At the time of the Passover the Israelites flocked to Jerusalem from all parts of the world, in enormous numbers, sometimes, it is said, amounting to three millions of souls. The Jews of the Dispersion (1 S. Peter i. 1) were everywhere. They came from all points of the compass: every town where any mercantile business was carried on, sent forth its representatives to the Holy City at Passover time: and they came
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in their thousands, bringing with them Roman denarii, Greek drachmæ, Persian darics—coins of every land under the sun, some of them made of base metal, mere slabs or counters of brass or copper, perhaps without any sign or impression whatever, but more usually bearing some heathen device or inscription. It was necessary to exchange these multifarious coins for Jewish shekels, for this heathen money must not be cast into the Treasury, or Γαζοφυλάκιον (S. Mark xii. 41, 43; S. Luke xxi. 1; S. John viii. 20).

This exchange was the business of the money-changers.

Three words are used in the New Testament for those who transacted this business: — τραπεζίτης, κολλυβωτής, κερματωτής. These were the same persons, the difference consisting in the point of view from which they were considered, the first being rather a banker, or money-lender, the others being money-changers.

I. The τραπεζίτης was a banker, broker or money-lender, who was prepared to deal with his customers either as a lender or a borrower. In the latter case he would receive money on deposit, as our bankers do, and pay a small rate of interest; in the other case he would lend money out on interest or usury, charging, as might be expected, a higher rate for the accommodation. We meet with him in the Parable of the Talents, “Thou oughtest therefore to have put my money to the bankers (exchangers, A.V.), and at my coming I should have received back mine own with interest" (usury, A.V.). S. Matt. xxv. 27.

These men were, of course, usurers, the nature of their business compelling them to be so. The word has a prejudicial signification; but, strictly speaking, only indicates one who lends on interest, without any insinuation that the interest is exorbitant; for in equity, there is no reason why a man should not charge a premium for the use of his money, just as he would for the use of his house or his land. That, in the one case the accommodation is called “interest” or
“usury,” in the other case “rent,” makes no difference in the principle.

“Usury,” in English, is generally understood of excessive or exorbitant interest, which is naturally regarded as a species of robbery, especially when coupled with the fraudulent pretence of charging only 5 per cent., when the actual charge is 5 per cent. per month, or in reality 60 per cent. An instance of this kind of business is given by Josephus (Antiq. xviii. 6, 3). King Agrippa borrowed of the Alabarch, (the governor of the Jews) at Alexandria, the sum of 20,000 Attic drachmæ, for which loan he was to pay 2,500 drachmæ, i.e. one eighth, or 12½ per cent. The usual rate of interest was one per cent. per month. It was in order to prevent such extortion, and at the same time to inculcate the duty of brotherly kindness to their fellow-Israelites, that the Jewish law of usury was laid down by Moses. If a Jew lent to his brother Jew, he was not to charge interest, “thou shalt not be to him as an usurer, neither shalt thou lay upon him usury” (Ex. xxii. 25). This is inculcated more plainly still in Levit. xxv. 35–37. This prohibition, however, did not extend to transactions with Gentiles, “Unto a stranger thou mayest lend upon usury” (Deut. xxiii. 20).

The Jews have ever been money-lenders, even usurers in the worst sense of the word: and it was a temptation, which they found irresistible, to transgress the law by lending to their own kith and kin: on which account Nehemiah, after the return from the Captivity, severely reproved those unfeeling Jews, who had not only exacted usury from their brethren, but had pressed their demands to the extent of foreclosing the mortgages, and reducing the debtors to slavery (Neh. v. 1–13). Nehemiah compelled them to make restitution.

These τραπεζίται, (in Latin mensarii, from mensa, a table, sometimes mensularii, from mensula, a little table) sat at their tables in the temple-court for the transaction of business. The word τράπεζα, from which their name is derived, is used with
a wide signification in the New Testament:—for a table for
meals (S. Matt. xv. 27; Mark vii. 28; Heb. ix. 2): for the
Lord’s Table (1 Cor. x. 21): for service in general (Acts vi. 2).
Our Lord, when He cleansed the Temple, overthrew the
“tables” of the money-changers (S. Matt. xxi. 12): and else-
where, in the Parable of the Pounds, He uses the word for
the bank itself, “Wherefore gavest thou not my money into the
bank?” ἐπὶ πὴν τράπεζαν (S. Luke xix. 23).

The fee charged for the use of the money was known as τόκος,
from τίκτω, to produce; σῶν τόκω (S. Matt. xxv. 27; S. Luke
xix. 23). “Usury” is, of course, derived from utor, to use;
and is the price paid for the use of the money.

The two parties stood to each other in the relation of debtor
and creditor, χρεωφειλέτης and δανειστής, as in our Lord’s
conversation with Simon (S. Luke vii. 41). See also for
these two terms S. Luke vi. 34, 35, and S. Matt. v. 42 (active
to “lend”; middle to “borrow”): also S. Luke xvi. 5,
“debtor.”

It is interesting to note that in one of the Agrapha, or
traditional sayings of our Lord, He gives this advice to money-
changers, Γίνεσθε δόκιμοι τραπέζιται, “Become approved
bankers.”

II. The κολλυβιστής (S. Matt. xxi. 12; Mark xi. 15; John
ii. 15) was the same person, regarded as a money-changer,
argentarius, numularius, sitting at his counter for the purpose
of exchanging coins, as mentioned above. It is the term used
by SS. Matt. and Mark in the narrative of the cleansing of the
Temple, τὰς τραπέζας τῶν κολλυβιστῶν.

For this accommodation the κολλυβιστής would charge as
his fee, a κόλλυβος, or kolbon, originally a coin with an ox
engraved on it (κολλώμενος βοῦς), a small coin or obolos,
weighing the sixth of a drachm.

III. Κερματιστής is the word used by S. John (ii. 14) in the
account of the cleansing of the Temple, in addition to κολλυ-
βιστής in v. 15. The word is derived from the κέρμα, or small
change, money clipped small, from κείρω, to clip or cut. S. John employs this word also, ἐξεχθεῖ τὸ κέρμα (v. 15).

These capitalists would sit at their tables or counters in the shade of the colonnades, formed by the quadruple rows of Corinthian columns, surrounding the Court of the Gentiles, ever ready to do business with all comers. It was indeed a great convenience, especially at Passover time; but it was the cause of great confusion and much unseemly noise, often amounting to a scandal. The bargaining and wrangling, characteristic of all Oriental barter, with the chinking of coins, and the noise of the general traffic, would operate as a serious disturbance to the devotional exercises of the Levites and the private prayers of the people, and would amount to actual desecration of God’s house of prayer, rendering absolutely necessary the intervention of the Son of God, on the previous day.

The Denarius

Jesus had said “Show me the tribute-money.” Ἐπεδείξετε μοι τὸ νόμισμα τοῦ κήρου (S. Matt. xxii. 19). Νόμισμα, from νομίζω, to settle, establish, to be usual or customary, was that which was sanctioned by law or custom; hence money established by law, whose value νενόμισται, has been settled by law. The word was adopted into Latin, as nomisma, numisma or nummisma, with the meaning of a piece of money, a coin.

“They brought unto Him a penny,” i.e. a δηνάριον.

This was the recognised Tribute-money.

Numerous other coins were in circulation in Palestine in the time of our Lord, and were a legal tender in matters of commerce and of business generally: there were coins of Herod the Great, or of Antipas, or the coins, still extant, of the Maccabæan period. These had no heathenish or foreign effigy on the obverse, but only the usual devices of the Asmonæan dynasty.
There were also the coins struck by the Roman emperors specially for Palestine, in deference to Jewish scruples, which bore no image of the emperor until the time of Vespasian. None of these would have been objectionable to the Pharisaic or National party, and would therefore have been carried on the persons of those present in their purses or girdles (ὑπόνη, zone, belt, girdle, purse: S. Matt. x. 9, Mark vi. 8).

The coins of the Herods were of copper only: e.g. a coin of Herod's third year, B.C. 37, has on the reverse or back ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΗΡΩΑΩΤ with ΛΓ, which means "the money of King Herod in his third year."

Archelaus stamped his money with ΗΡΩΑΩΤ, and a bunch of grapes with a leaf, on the obverse, or front; and on the reverse ΕΘΝΑΡΧΩΤ, a helmet with a tuft of feathers: i.e. "the money of Herod the Ethnarch." Archelaus was the only ruler of the Herodian race who was styled "ethnarch." This word occurs in the New Testament only in 2 Cor. xi. 32, "in Damascus the governor under Aretas the king."

Herod Antipas was ruling in Galilee at the time when our Lord was discussing the question of the payment of tribute to Caesar: indeed he was at the moment actually in Jerusalem, having come up for the Passover. The coins issued from his mint bore no objectionable symbols. On the obverse was a palm-branch with the inscription ΛΑΓ in the middle, and round the edge the legend ΗΡΩΑΩΤ ΤΕΤΑΡΑΧΩΤ: i.e. the year corresponding to A.D. 33, "the money of Herod the tetrarch." On the reverse, in the centre ΤΙΒΕΡΙΑΔ surrounded by a wreath.

On the other hand there were coins circulating in Palestine amongst the Greek population, and even amongst the less strict Jews, such as the Herodians, which bore symbols and legends offensive to the Separatist party, such as those of Herod Philip, or of the procurators, or of the emperors Augustus and Tiberius.

Herod Philip (B.C. 4 to A.D. 34), though the best of the
Herod, was so anxious to keep on good terms with his patron the emperor, that he stamped his "image and superscription" on his coins, in contravention of the Law of Moses. He was alone in doing this. His coins bear the head of Tiberius, bare, with a branch of laurel, and the words ΤΙΒΕΡΙΟϹ ΚΕΒΑΣΤΟϹ ΚΑΙϹΑΡ (Tiberius Sebastus Caesar): and on the reverse ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟϹ ΤΕΤ, i.e. Philip the tetrarch, with a temple, and ΛΑΖ: i.e. "year 37" which corresponded with A.D. 33 and 34.

The Roman procurators also exercised the privilege of the Mint; and coins are extant of Coponius, Annius Rufus and Pontius Pilate. Those of Pilate are thus stamped: obverse, ΤΙΒΕΡΙΟϹ ΚΑΙϹΑΡΟϹ ΛΙϹ (Money of Tiberius Caesar, year 16: A.D. 29), reverse ΙΟΤΛΙΑ ΚΑΙϹΑΡΟϹ: Money of Julia Caesar.

Such were some of the numerous pieces of money current in Judaea at this time.

When our Lord said "Show me the tribute-money" ῥὸνυμὸμα τοῦ κήνου, it was a Roman coin of the empire that He demanded, because that was the tribute-money which was the badge of Jewish bondage to Rome.

And it would appear, from the answer to the question "Whose is this image and superscription?" that the particular denarius produced and placed in His hand, was not a coin of the old consular times before the Republic was superseded by the Empire, for those coins were impressed with such symbols as the head of Rome and a helmet; or the Dioscuri, Castor and Pollux; or the head of Jupiter; and on the reverse, chariots drawn by two or by four horses, bigae or quadrigae.

The Denarius was a silver coin of the Romans, and was so named because originally it was equivalent to ten asses, though in later times after the weight of the as was reduced, it was equivalent to sixteen asses.

It weighed 60 grains under the Republic, and was reduced to 52 ½ under the Empire. When allowance is made for alloy, the 60 grains would become about 58 of pure silver. Now
as the English shilling contains 80·7 grains of pure silver, the actual worth of the denarius of the Commonwealth would amount to about $8\frac{1}{2}d$, which in our Lord's time under the Empire, would have fallen to about $7\frac{1}{2}d$. This would be a little less than the value of the Greek drachma, although the two coins were regarded as practically equal in value. S. Luke xv. 8, 9 the Parable of the lost piece of silver is the only place in which the δραχμή occurs in the New Testament.

Thus the denarius, as a silver coin, would have been a little larger and heavier than a sixpence, but smaller and lighter than a shilling. The translation, "a penny," is most misleading: "a shilling" would have been closer to fact; or even the American "dime": but as the coin was Roman, it would have been better to have kept to the fact, and have called it "a denarius." It is surprising that our Revisers should have retained a designation so far from the truth.

In purchasing-power the denarius was very much more valuable still. Calculations have been made, based upon the value of chariots and horses in the days of Solomon (2 Chron. i. 17), and upon the price of vineyards in the time of Isaiah (Is. vii. 23), or the price of a slave in the time of the patriarchs or of Moses (Gen. xxxvii. 28; Ex. xxi. 32). But those days are too remote from the Christian era to afford any sound basis of comparison. Our Lord, however, in His Parable of the labourers in the vineyard (S. Matt. xx. 1–16) gives us a surer means of comparison. The householder in the parable hires labourers at a denarius a day. The denarius, therefore, was worth the day's wages of a labourer, an amount which would vary considerably in different ages and in different countries, but might, for purposes of calculation, be put approximately at about five shillings; for the day's hire in the parable is assumed to be a liberal payment. Elsewhere we learn that in Cicero's time the daily wage was rather less than a denarius, while the soldiers were paid more liberally, each of them receiving a denarius a day.
This particular denarius was one of Tiberius’s. Holding it in His hand, the Lord demanded of His questioners “Whose is this image and superscription?” Τίνος ἡ εἰκὼν αὐτῆ καὶ ἡ ἐπιγραφή;

The word εἰκὼν is used in Rom. viii. 29 and 1 Cor. xi. 7 for the image of God, and ἐπιγραφή is used in S. Mark xv. 26 and S. Luke xxiii. 38 for the Title on the Cross.

In our Lord’s question the εἰκὼν and ἐπιγραφή correspond with the “effigy” and the “legend” in numismatics.

The various parts of coins and medals are denominated by numismatists as follows:—

1. the obverse, or front, ordinarily stamped with the head or figure of the sovereign or ruler by whom the coin has been minted; or in the case of a medal, the effigy of the person to whose honour it has been dedicated: or else some emblematical representation of the State in which the coin circulates, or of its ruler.

2. the reverse, or back, containing further descriptions or details appropriate to the occasion, or the person.

3. the inscription, which occupies the middle of the field.

4. the legend, which runs round the edge of the coin or medal.

5. the exergue or basis, the small space beneath the base line of the effigies or figures stamped or engraved on the coin or medal, and announcing the date or the value of the coin, or some brief notice of secondary importance.

The denarius of Tiberius bore on its obverse the head of Tiberius, to the right, laureated, with the legend TICAESAR DIVI AVG F AVGVSTVS—i.e. Tiberius Caesar Divi Augusti filius Augustus—“Tiberius Caesar Augustus, son of the divine Augustus.”

Sometimes the legend ran TICAESAR AVGVSTIF IMPERATOR, i.e. “Tiberius Caesar, Emperor, son of Augustus.”

In his youth Tiberius had been a man of commanding presence, and of beautiful features. Niebuhr thus describes him
in a passage we have already quoted: "Nature had done very much for him: he had great judgment, wit and industry; indestructible health; a very happily and beautifully organised body; a tall majestic figure; a fine head: his statue and that of Augustus are the finest amongst those of the emperors." But that was in the past. Since he felt himself securely seated on the throne, Tiberius had committed the government to the hands of his prætorian prefect Sejanus, and was at this time living in retirement in the isle of Capreæ, where he was wallowing in sensuality. His once handsome profile had degenerated, and his later coins show the change that had passed over it.

The reverse shows the figure of a woman looking to the right, and holding in her right hand a sceptre and in her left a flower or branch. This was Livia, the widow of Augustus, and the mother of the emperor by Tiberius Claudius Nero. She was a terrible woman, and ruled both husband and son with a rod of iron. The legend on the reverse reads PONTIF. MAXIM. i.e. Pontifex Maximus, an office which had been appropriated by Augustus on the death of Lepidus, and had been transferred to Tiberius. This assumption by the emperors of priestly powers, and of the title Divus, divine or deified, is worthy of notice, for the fact that such titles should appear on the coins would naturally make them abhorrent to every sincere worshipper of Jehovah, as well as to every patriotic Jew. Patriotism and religion were inseparable in the mind of a Jew, whose theory of government, as taught by Moses, was that of a theocracy: and to this form of government they had been accustomed until comparatively recent days under the Asmonæan dynasty. It must have been a horror to a Jew to find himself brought under the rule of a sovereign, who, at least officially, claimed to be divine. A new imperial religion had been organised for the Roman empire, the essence of which consisted in the worship of the divine majesty of Rome, incarnate in human form in the person of the emperor. The title "divus" was already on
the coinage, and by degrees this new cultus obtained a firm footing throughout the provinces, where temples were erected in honour of the emperor, and sacrifices offered upon altars.

The priesthood attached to these temples gradually acquired a reputation and prestige superior to the priesthood of the gods themselves, and the reigning emperor was recognised as the chief priest, the *pontifex maximus* of the whole.

The Roman *denarii* were stamped with other devices besides those already mentioned, such as *Salus generis humani*, or *pater, victor*, or some reference to Augustus, as distinguished for "*clementiae, moderationis, providentiae, perpetuae paci*" and the like. All of which would have tended to make the whole system abominable to the patriot, and intolerable by all, had it not been for the concession wisely made by the imperial government, of a special coinage for Palestine, bearing the name of the emperor without his effigy and the heathenish and blasphemous symbols.

No wonder that the Pharisees esteemed the payment of the tribute-money unlawful, and cried in concert with the Zealots, that resistance was a duty incumbent on every patriotic, every religious Jew. "The Romans were foreigners, Gentiles: they had no right in Palestine: they were heathen; and every good man ought to be against them. They spoke another language, used other customs, served other gods. They ought not to bear rule in the Holy Land, and in the City of the Great King. It was not lawful to pay tribute to Cæsar."

The only places in which the denarius is mentioned are:—


S. Matt. xx. 2, 9, 10, 18. The labourers in the vineyard, "a penny a day."


S. Mark vi. 37; S. John vi. 7. Feeding the 5,000, "200 pennyworth of bread."
S. Mark xiv. 5; S. John xii. 5. "300 pence," the value of the box of ointment.

S. Luke vii. 41. The parable of the two debtors: "500 pence, and 50."

S. Luke x. 35. "Two pence" paid to the innkeeper by the Good Samaritan.

Rev. vi. 6. The price of barley and wheat, at the opening of the third seal: "a measure of wheat for a penny, and three measures of barley for a penny."

The other coins mentioned in the New Testament are:—

The Lepton, λεπτόν, derived from λεπτός, thin, fine, small. It was the smallest coin of all, and was worth about $\frac{3}{4}$ of a farthing.

Lepton, (minutum), is the word used for the widow's mites in S. Mark xii. 42. "And there came a certain poor widow, and she threw in two lepta which make a quadrans." See also S. Luke xxii. 2. These lepta were cast into the γαλασφυλίκιων, or treasury, which consisted of thirteen chests called shopheroth, or trumpets, so called from their shape, each bearing an inscription, marking the object of the contribution. These "trumpets" were fixed up in the Court of the Women: and the smallest offering permitted was two lepta or "perutaḥs"—even this poor widow might not give only one. The coins of Alexander Jannæus (the Asmonæan ruler b.c. 105–78) were a favourite offering to the treasury in the Temple Court, the devices thereon being national in character; viz. on the obverse "Jonathan, the High Priest, and the Sanhedrin," within a wreath of olive; on the reverse two cornucopiæ and a poppy. The Jews, so mean in the time of Malachi, had afterwards given so liberally, that when the Temple was taken by Pompey, the treasury contained in money nearly half a million (2,000 talents) and other treasures to the value of 8,000 talents; all of which Pompey had left untouched, but Crassus had sacrilegiously carried away (Joseph., Antiq. xiv. 4, 4, and 7).
The *lepton* appears but once more, viz. in S. Luke xii. 59. "Thou shalt by no means come out thence till thou have paid the very last *lepton*.

The *Quadrant*, *quadrans*, κοδράντης, was, as its name indicates, the fourth part of an *as*, or *assarium*. It weighed 33 grains, and was worth two *lepta*, or in English money about three-quarters of a farthing. It was regarded as of very small value, but was the customary price for a bath at Rome.

S. Matthew, in v. 26, uses *quadrant* in the passage just quoted from S. Luke, "till thou have paid the last *quadrant". The only other place in which it appears, is S. Mark xii. 42, quoted above, "two *lepta* which make a *quadrant*.*

The *As*, *assarium*, ἀσσαρίου, was originally a pound weight of uncoined copper, afterwards gradually reduced in weight. As a coin it was made of brass, and weighed about 140 grains, its value being a little more than three farthings. It was about the tenth part of a *denarius* or *drachma*. It was the original Roman coin, and the unit of Roman numeration, both of weight and currency, its place in this respect being afterwards taken by the *sestertius*.

Horace uses the *as* as the expression of what was worthless. The "ace" in cards is derived from this coin, it being an unit, and having but one spot.

It is found in S. Matt. x. 29, and Luke xii. 6; "two sparrows sold for an *as*": "five sparrows sold for two *asses*." In the Vulgate the latter passage is rendered, "nonne quinque passeres veneunt *dipondio*?" the *dipondius* being of the value of two *assaria*.

The *as* and the *quadrans* are both translated "farthing" in the New Testament:—

The *sestertius*, which was the Roman unit in matters of account, does not appear at all in the New Testament. Its value was two and a half *asses*, or one quarter of a *denarius*.

The *denarius* and its equivalent the drachma have already been considered.
The *didrachma* of S. Matthew xvii. 24 was the equivalent of the half-shekel of Ex. xxx. 13, and the *stater* found in the fish’s mouth was worth a shekel or two didrachma. But this was a Jewish offering and does not fall within our scheme.

We are now able to make a table of the coined money of the New Testament.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 lepta</td>
<td>1 quadrant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 quadrants</td>
<td>= 1 as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 asses</td>
<td>= 1 denarius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 drachmæ</td>
<td>= 1 didrachmon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 didrachma</td>
<td>= 1 stater, shekel,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tetradrachma = 2s. 6d.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These are the coins. The mina and the talent were reckoned by weight only, and there is such an extraordinary diversity in the estimation of the value (there being several different kinds of talents) that it will be useless to assign the equivalent in English money. However:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100 drachmæ</td>
<td>= 1 mina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 minæ</td>
<td>= 1 talent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The *Mina* was a weight equivalent to 100 drachmæ, and also a sum of money amounting to the same value. We have previously estimated the denarius of the empire as about $7\frac{1}{2}$ of English silver, and the Greek drachma at a little more. Taking the drachma at 8d., a mina would be worth 800 pence, or about £3 6s. 6d. But there were different values attached to the mina in the various systems of weight adopted in the states of Greece. The Attic mina weighed nearly 16 oz., and was worth about £4. The Æginetan mina was heavier, and its value was about £5 14s. 7d. The Roman mina was less than either.


It is interesting to compare the incidents in this parable, with the actual history of Herod the Great and Archelaus,
as related by Josephus (*Antiq.* xiv. 14; xvii. 9, 4; and 11, 1). The narrative is too long for quotation, but it contains practically all the main incidents introduced into the parable. It relates how the various members of the family of Herod had gone to Rome to sue for a government and the title of king: how they plotted one against the other, and sought to damage each other's cause by bringing accusations of disloyalty to Rome: how, especially, a deputation of 50 ambassadors, who were supported by 8,000 of the resident Jews in Rome, had been sent from Palestine to protest against Archelaus being set over them as king, inasmuch as he had already assumed the title and exercised authority as king, that he had impoverished Judæa and slain many of the nobles (*Antiq.* xvii. 11). Further, Josephus informs us that Archelaus had appointed his brother Philip to take charge during his absence, had placed certain castles under the care of various adherents; and that, on his return, he rewarded those who had been faithful to him.

The whole account is of extreme interest, as an illustration of the manner in which our Lord utilises historical events in His parables.

The Talent, from ταλάντω, to bear or sustain, because originally the talent was the scale itself in which the metal was weighed. Afterwards it was used for the weight, and also for the amount of cash equal in value to the weight of the metal. If, in estimating the mina, we come upon great discrepancies, we find these discrepancies increased in an attempt to find the value of the talent.

Taking the drachma at 8d., and the mina at 800 pence, the talent would be worth 800 x 60 pence, or £200. In some of the states of Greece, the value was about £198: in others £225: in others £243 15s. 0d. This last was the value of the Attic talent, which contained 60 minæ. The Jewish talent was higher, amounting to about £342 in silver, or about £5,475 in gold. Its weight was double
that of the Attic talent: the Ἀγινηταν came half-way between these two.

The number of minœ to a talent also varied considerably. Amongst bankers the talent consisted of 60 minœ, of 12 oz. each: that used in commerce consisted of 80 minœ, of 16 oz. each: while the great or Alexandrine talent consisted of 100 minœ of 20 oz. each.

Amidst such diversity it seems hopeless to arrive at any certain conclusion, our only guide being that, in the New Testament, the Jewish, rather than the Greek or Roman estimate should be followed.

If, in the parable of the unforgiving servant (S. Matt. xviii. 24), we endeavour to arrive at the value of 10,000 talents, we should find that, at £342, it would amount to more than three millions sterling; if in gold to over fifty-four millions. Keeping to the silver, we see that the great servant or steward in the parable was in the position of one of the “publicans” of Rome, farming the revenues of a considerable province, larger and wealthier than Palestine.

The only other place in which the talent appears is S. Matt. xxv. 14 ff., where the word occurs many times. In this parable of the talents, the servants are entrusted with various amounts, five, two and one, unlike the corresponding parable of the pounds, in which each servant receives the same amount.

It is from the parable of the talents that the word has gained its secondary signification of endowments, capacities, and abilities, for the improvement of which each must give account at the last.

We meet with the word ταλανταίος in Rev. xvi. 21: “Great hail, every stone about the weight of a talent, cometh down out of heaven.”

In addition to the coins and weights of which we have already spoken, we find the word ἄργυρα in the plural, as “pieces of silver,” where coined money is intended:—

S. Matt. xxvi. 15, τριάκοντα ἄργυρα, “they weighed unto
him thirty pieces of silver.” These were no doubt shekels, the price Judas obtained for betraying the innocent blood.

S. Matt. xxvii. 3, 5, 6, 9, the casting down the 30 pieces in the Temple; and the purchase of the potter’s field.

S. Matt. xxviii. 12, 15, ἀργύρια ἱκανά, “they gave large money unto the soldiers,” probably shekels, to bribe them to report that the disciples had stolen the body of Jesus.

Acts xix. 19, καὶ συνεψήφισαν τὰς τιμὰς αὐτῶν καὶ εὗρον ἀργυρίου μυριάδας πέντε, “and they counted the price of them, and found it fifty thousand pieces of silver.” These coins would have been drachmae or denarii, not shekels, and the total amount in weight of silver would have exceeded £1,700, and in purchasing power, in the present day, would have been considerably larger.

Then we have ἀργυρίων in the singular, for “money” in general:—

S. Luke xix. 23, in the parable of the pounds: τὸ ἀργυρίον μοῦ, “thou oughtest to have put my money to the bankers.” In this case it was a mina, of the value of 100 denarii.

S. Mark xiv. 11, and S. Luke xxii. 5, ἀργυρίων δοῦναι: this was the 30 shekels paid to Judas, regarded as a sum of money.

Acts vii. 16, τιμῆς ἀργυρίου “the tomb that Abraham bought for a price in silver of the sons of Hamor in Shechem.”

Next we have the mention of metals used for money without relation to a price:—

S. Matt. x. 9, χρυσὸν, ἀργυρον, χαλκὸν εἰς τὰς ζώνας ὑμῶν. “Get you no gold, nor silver, nor brass in your purses.”


Acts viii. 20, S. Peter says to Simon Magus “Thy silver perish with thee.”

Acts iii. 6, Peter says to the lame man “Silver and gold have I none.”
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S. Mark xii. 41, "beheld how the multitude cast money (χαλκὸν, brass) into the treasury."

Again, we find silver and gold mentioned in general terms:—

Acts xx. 33, "I have coveted no man's silver, or gold, or apparel."

S. James v. 3, "Your gold and your silver are rusted."

1 S. Pet. i. 18, "Ye were redeemed, not with corruptible things, with silver or gold."

2 Tim. iii. 20, "vessels of gold and silver."

Rev. ix. 20, "idols of gold, and silver, and brass."

Lastly, we have price alluded to, without mention of the amount:—

Acts iv. 37, Barnabas "having a field, sold it, and brought the money, (τὸ χρήμα, the price), and laid it at the apostles' feet."

Acts xxiv. 26, Felix "hoped withal that money (χρηματα) would be given him of Paul." See also κεφάλαιον, capital, Acts xxii. 28, "with a great sum."

We have now touched upon the principal matters of interest connected with the payment of tribute to the Romans.

We have seen that, on the morning of the Tuesday before the Crucifixion, a coalition of parties holding opposite views on the subject, had asked the question, "Is it lawful to give tribute unto Cæsar, or not?"

The Pharisees, as religious devotees, looked back with a glow of pride to the days of Moses their lawgiver, and David the great king, and fervently prayed that those glorious days should return: they were discontented with the Roman rule, were galled by the Roman yoke, and had decided that the tribute ought not to be paid.

The Herodians, as political time-servers, held the opposite view. It was useless to kick against the pricks, submission was a necessity. There might even be advantages in submission; some of the Roman customs might be better than their own. Hence they would follow the Roman fashions and pay the Roman taxes.
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Whatever answer the Lord might give, they felt sure that He
would be brought into collision either with the High Priest or
the Procurator.

The Lord replied, "Bring me a penny."

The coin was obtained from one of the money-changers
hard by.

The Lord inquires, "Whose is this image and superscrip-
tion?"

They say unto Him, "Caesar's."

This settled the question, for their own rule was, "He whose
coin is current is king."

But it is necessary to observe the actual words used in the
question and reply.

They are the same in all three evangelists, "Εἴπετο δοῦναί,
"Is it lawful to give?", with the addition in S. Mark, "Shall
we give, or shall we not give?" as if it were a voluntary offer-
ing, and the decision remained with themselves. Δῶμεν, ἢ μὴ
δῶμεν;

Our Lord in His reply uses a word with a stronger meaning.
In each Gospel the word is Ληφόδοτε, "Render, restore, give
back."

Δίδωμι, is to give, bestow, present. Ληφοδοῦμι, is to render
that on which there is a claim, to render in full, to give back,
restore, refund, to pay a debt, discharge an obligation.

The penny of the tribute-money was stamped with the
effigy and legend and devices of Caesar: it belongs to him.
Pay back, then, what was originally his.

Yes: "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's"—
even to such a Caesar as this vile Tiberius.

It is the same principle as that enunciated by S. Paul thirty
years later, when the still more infamous Nero was the Caesar,
"Let every soul be in subjection to the higher powers: for
there is no power but of God; and the powers that be are
ordained of God" (Rom. xiii. 1). And he continues in
verse 7, "Render to all their dues," using the same word as
the Lord did, 'Ἀπόδοτε; "tribute to whom tribute is due" (φόρος, the same word as in S. Luke), "custom to whom custom" (τέλος, indirect taxation). Thus S. Paul enjoins upon the Christians in Rome, at the very head-quarters of the masters of the world, the payment both of φόρος and τέλος, of direct and indirect taxation.

And finally the Lord reads those insincere and treacherous interrogators a grand lesson on Duty;

"and unto God the things that are God's."

As that denarius belongs to Cæsar, for it has been coined in his mint, and been impressed with his stamp, so do you belong to God, whose image and superscription you bear. In the beginning God created man in His own image. You, therefore, who have been made in the likeness of God, into whom He Himself has breathed the breath of life; you are not your own, you belong to Him. See that you render unto God the things that are His.

And so He sends them away discomfited, "When they heard it, they marvelled, and left Him, and went their way."

For a second time that day, the victory lay with the Lord.
CHAPTER VI

Pilate and Majestas

The trial of the Lord Jesus Christ

The proclamation of the Gospel by our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ aroused the enmity and active opposition of the priestly party, whom S. John uniformly designates "the Jews." They were led by the chief priests and the Pharisees, and were sometimes supported by the people at large. Several attempts were made upon His life. At Nazareth they sought to cast Him headlong from the brow of the hill on which the city was built (S. Luke iv. 29). At the feast of Tabernacles, while He was teaching in the Temple, the chief priests and Pharisees sent officers to apprehend Him, and even the people took up stones to cast at Him: and at the feast of Dedication, He was assaulted in the same manner (S. John vii. 28, viii. 59, x. 31, 39). His life was always in danger; hence exclaimed Didymus, when Jesus proposed to leave the place beyond Jordan where He had taken refuge, in order to raise Lazarus, "Let us also go, that we may die with Him" (S. John x. 40, xi. 7, 8, 16).

And now the end was at hand. The Jews were determined to wait no longer. This heretical Teacher must be removed at once. But there must be no public tumult. A council was summoned on the Wednesday before the Passover to devise means to achieve their object. This was a full meeting of the Sanhedrin, held in the palace of the High Priest. The difficulty, out of which they could not see their way, was how to light upon their Victim in the absence of the multitude—
the common people, who now were listening to Him gladly, and might intervene on His behalf. It would not be safe to attempt the arrest in the Temple, or in any public place, or on the feast-day. Such an attempt would probably be resisted by the people, and lead to some kind of tumult requiring the interference of the Roman garrison, which was altogether inexpedient. The difficulty seemed insuperable, and the Council was about to abandon the proposal for the arrest of Jesus, until after the Passover, when, to their great joy, the announcement was made that one of His disciples desired an audience. He was immediately admitted. The bargain was struck, the blood-money was handed to the traitor, and the arrangements for the betrayal were devised and completed.

The Arrest

The proceedings preliminary to a trial are the Arrest, which may be either with or without Warrant, according to the nature of the case, and the Commitment of the accused.

The object of the arrest is the detention of the accused person in order that he may be forthcoming at the proper time to answer for an alleged or suspected crime. If the offence be committed in the presence of a magistrate, the offender may be arrested without the authority of a warrant. Under other circumstances a warrant must be obtained, in due form of law, authorising the apprehension of the accused person.

In the case of our Blessed Lord, the authority for His apprehension came from the Sanhedrin. It was full and complete. A council had assembled two days before, in which there sat as members, chief priests, scribes and elders, and Pharisees. This Council had decided upon the arrest of Jesus with the view of committing Him for trial. And it had ample power for such a purpose: for, although Judæa was subject to the Roman power, to any extent that power might claim, yet the
Romans, wise in their generation, like our own government in India, allowed the full exercise of judicial functions to subject nations, provided that no conflict arose with the Roman law itself. And the Sanhedrin, conscious of acting within their powers, and certain of the support of the procurator himself, had applied to Pilate for the assistance of a band of soldiers, to enable the arrest to be carried out without fail. There was, consequently, ample *Warrant for the Arrest*, according to the forms of Jewish law, as laid down in the Law of Moses and in the Talmud, though we do not hear of any formal written document.

The Sanhedrin were glad to have the assistance of Judas, to enable them to seize Jesus, in the absence of the multitude. And Judas, well acquainted with his Master’s movements, led the officials by night to the Garden of Gethsemane, at the foot of the Mount of Olives, across the brook Kedron.

He came at the head of a large body of men, described by the first two Evangelists as “a great multitude with swords and staves.” Some commentators hold that this “multitude” was composed entirely of the Temple guard and the chief priests’ servants, and was consequently wholly a Jewish band. But the facts of history and the words used by the Evangelists point clearly to a *combination of Jewish and Roman officials*, the Sanhedrin having sent their own officers to carry the arrest into effect, and the procurator having granted a military corps as a precaution, to preserve order, and to take action only in the event of resistance being offered, or any attempt at rescue being made. S. John makes this clear. The force consisted of a “band of soldiers, and officers from the chief priests and Pharisees,” the distinction between the two bodies of men appearing more clearly in the original ὁ οὖν ἦν ὦδας λαβὼν τὴν στρατιάν, (this was the Roman military detachment,) καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἄρχερεων καὶ Φαρισαίων ὑπηρέτας, ἔρχεται (S. John xviii. 3). This latter was the Jewish civil force.

I. There was, then, first the *Band of Soldiers, στρατιά,*. 
under the command of a χιλίαρχος (S. John xviii. 3, 12). The σπείρα, or cohort, in a Roman legion consisted of six centuries of 100 men each, or three maniples of 200 each; 600 in all. Its commander was a legionary tribune, or χιλίαρχος. And in the Latin version the words are translated cohors and tribunus.

Polybius uses σπείρα as equivalent to maniple, instead of cohort, i.e. as composed of 200 instead of 600 men; but in the New Testament the word seems always to denote a cohort, as it evidently does here, it being under the command of a chiliarch or tribune. It is not necessary to suppose that the whole force was present, but there were certainly more than 100, or else a centurion would have been sufficient as the commanding officer.

From Josephus (B. J. v. 5, 8) we learn that a Roman legion, i.e. about 6,000 men, was always stationed in the Tower of Antonia, a strong fortress overlooking the Temple, and communicating with it directly by a flight of steps. Within the walls was ample space for this garrison, whose presence in the City was necessary at all times for the purpose of preserving order, and especially at the Passover and other festivals. Pilate, under whose command these troops were, would have been quite willing to aid the Jewish authorities by allowing an armed detachment to accompany the prefect of the Temple when he went with his assistants to the Mount of Olives to execute the warrant for the arrest. This band, in addition to others, was doubtless the same that mocked Jesus, by arraying Him in a scarlet robe. S. Matt. (xxvii. 27) speaks of "the whole band," δλη την σπειραν.

This Roman cohort, then, came with the rest of the "multitude," into the Garden of Gethsemane, armed with δοξα (S. John xviii. 3), in the usual manner, with arms, offensive and defensive, of which the μαχαιρα is specified (Matt. xxvi. 47, 55; Mark xiv. 43, 48), i.e. the formidable weapon worn by the Roman legionaries.
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II. There was, secondly, the body known as the Jewish Temple police, designated by S. John apparitors, ἵππερεταί, a word of wide meaning, but in this place indicating the officials who executed the orders of the Sanhedrin. S. Luke, speaking more definitely, calls their leaders στρατηγοί τοῦ ἱεροῦ (xxii. 4, 52). They were the same officers who had been sent by the chief priests and Pharisees to apprehend Jesus during the feast of Tabernacles in the previous year, but who came back to their masters without Him, saying, “Never man so spake.” S. John again employs the word ἵππερεταί (vii 32, 45). They were the same also who were sent by the Sanhedrin for the apostles who had been imprisoned but had been set free by an angel. Here S. Luke uses the word ἵππερεταί for the officers, and στρατηγὸς τοῦ ἱεροῦ for their commander (Acts v. 22–26). The same phrase occurs also in Acts iv. 1.

This body of men, forming the Temple guard, belonged to the civil service of the Jews, and would have hesitated to act alone in the endeavour to effect such an arrest as that of Jesus, for there was danger of an “uproar” among the people. And Pilate would have made no difficulty in affording military aid to the Sanhedrin, especially at Passover time, when the religious fanaticism of the Zealots was easily aroused: and there may be an implied reference to this military force in our Lord’s question “Thinkest thou that I cannot beseech my Father, and He shall even now send me more than twelve legions of angels?” (S. Matt. xxvi. 53).

This civil force was not regularly armed: but they carried staves, or rods, in their hands: and, being now engaged in night work, they were provided with lanterns and torches. It was at the time of the Paschal full moon, and the light would be brilliant; but if a search were necessary in the recesses of the garden or the interior of a house, artificial light would be required. The lanterns and torches are mentioned only by S. John. The Temple-watch customarily went their rounds by night with torches, φάνω, from φαίνω, to shine. The word
indicates any light carried in the hand, and made of some inflammable material, such as resinous wood, or twisted flax. Military torches are made of twisted rope smeared with some combustible substance.

The λαμπάδες were wicks supplied with oil, contained in lamps or lanterns, such as those used by the ten Virgins in the parable, or those which were burning in the upper chamber at Troas where S. Paul was preaching (Acts xx. 8).

The Latin version renders "lanterns and torches" by laternis et facibus: the latter from fax, a bundle of sticks for burning, a torch, flambeau or link.

Such was the force led by Judas for the apprehension of Jesus. It was a formidable force, both in numbers and in influence, for it represented the civil, ecclesiastical and military authorities of Judæa, both Roman and Jewish. But it could not withstand the divine majesty of the Son of God. When Jesus came forward, and offered Himself to His captors, they were seized with a sudden dread. The Temple guard once before had not dared to apprehend the Great Prophet, and had returned without their prisoner: only three days before, He had purged the Temple courts of the buyers and sellers. And the Jewish officers, knowing His claim to be the Messiah, aware of the wondrous miraculous power He could exhibit at will, were overcome with awe; and with the revulsion of feeling which often sways the Oriental mind, "they went backward, and fell to the ground," a second time unable to perform the duty for which they had been sent. Meanwhile in the confusion, the Prisoner might have escaped. But the Roman soldiers had no such fears. All religions were the same to them, equally true or equally false; and they accordingly stepped forward, laid hold on Jesus, and bound Him securely. Having done this, and the servants of the Sanhedrin having recovered from their panic, the soldiers gave Jesus in charge to the Jewish officers, who had been sent to execute the warrant of arrest.
Attempt at Rescue

It was the natural and spontaneous impulse of all the disciples to fight for their Master's cause, that He should not fall into the hands of His enemies. They knew that trouble was at hand, for at the last Supper just before rising from the table to go to the Mount of Olives, the Lord had warned them. "But now, he that hath a purse, let him take it, and likewise a wallet: and he that hath no sword, let him sell his cloke and buy one." The disciples, taking these injunctions all too literally, but falling into the spirit of our Lord's declaration, had replied "Lord, behold, here are two swords" (S. Luke xxii. 35-38).

It was not lawful to bear arms on the Feast day; but the disciples appear to have concealed these two swords, and to have taken them with them when they left the Paschal upper-room. On the betrayal by Judas, when the chief priests' officers approached in order to lay hold upon their Master, they cried out "Lord, shall we smite with the sword?" It was a futile thing to propose, for of what avail would two swords be against "a great multitude"? Peter, however, waits for no reply. With the impetuosity ever his characteristic, he no sooner conceives an idea than he translates it into action. Drawing his sword, he leaps forward towards the advancing band, and delivers a blow which cuts off the right ear of Malchus, one of the servants of the high priest. It was an ill-judged act, useless in itself, and likely to bring into danger all the disciples, when it was the Master alone for whom the armed force had come. The names of Peter and Malchus are given only by S. John.

Jesus rebukes the impetuous disciple. "Put up the sword into the sheath."

μαχαιρα is used for "sword" throughout the narrative in all four Gospels, gladius being its rendering in the Latin version.
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The word for "sheath" is, in S. Matthew, τόπος, place, locus: in S. John, Ἱγκη, sheath, vagina.

Our Lord further replies to S. Peter's rash act, "All they that take the sword shall perish with the sword. Or thinkest thou that I cannot beseech my Father, and He shall even now send me more than twelve legions of angels?" Had there been any occasion for resistance, the "great multitude" would have found themselves outnumbered by the "twelve legions," i.e. by 72,000 members of the angelic host. Peter, like Elisha's servant, needed to have his eyes opened that he might see the invisible array. "They that be with us are more than they that be with them" (2 Kings vi. 16). But then, how should the Father's will be accomplished? Jesus had just prayed, in the garden, that the "Cup" might pass: but He was now ready to drink it to the dregs that man might be rescued from death eternal. He then remedies Peter's blunder by restoring the servant's ear.

Jesus is now led away captive alone, the disciples being allowed to escape, in accordance with His request "If therefore ye seek me, let these go their way." And they all forsook Him and fled.

Commitment

The Accused, having been securely apprehended, and being now in safe custody, is led away by His captors, and conveyed to the palace of the high-priest, where Annas was awaiting events. This was in accordance with justice and common sense. The accused must needs be brought at once before the magistrate, or safe lodged until that opportunity arrives, in order that a preliminary examination may be made, for the purpose of ascertaining the nature of the charge brought against him, and the grounds of the accusation. If, on examination, it be obvious that no offence has been committed, the accused man must be discharged: if there seem to be sufficient grounds for detention, he must be committed for
trial. This preliminary examination need not take place in open court; the magistrate could conduct it in private.

In this way the Lord was taken before Annas first, and, after a brief investigation, or *praetorium* of the case, was at once committed for trial, and sent to Caiaphas and the whole Sanhedrin for the purpose.

Into this trial we do not propose to enter; it does not come within the scope of this work. We will therefore pass on to the Trial before Pilate. There are, however, some remarks which must necessarily be made before we enter on that subject.

**The Illegality of the Jewish Trial**

In a monograph on this subject by A. T. Innes, "The Trial of Jesus Christ," the author refers to the Rules of Trial on a Criminal Charge, in the Mishna, De Synedriis, and shows that the Trial of our Lord before the Jewish authorities was altogether illegal, and the whole proceedings, from the point of view of Jewish law, invalid.

The examination of witnesses by night was illegal. Capital trials could be commenced only in the day-time, and must also be concluded by day-time. If the accused were to be acquitted, the sentence might be pronounced on the day of the trial; but if there was to be a sentence of condemnation, there must be a postponement to a second day. Hence capital trials could not be held on the day before a Sabbath or a Feast Day.

The seeking for witnesses by the judges themselves was a scandalous indecorum; the discrepancies in the evidence of the witnesses who were produced were glaring; the evidence of others was not relevant to the case: no witnesses for the defence were brought forward: and finally the judicial use of the confession of the accused was illegal, for "Our law condemns no one to death, on his own confession."

Mr. Innes sums up the case thus: "A process, begun,
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continued, and apparently finished in the course of one night, commencing with witnesses against the accused who were sought for by the judges, but whose evidence was not sustained, even by them; continuing by interrogations which Hebrew law does not sanction; and ending with a demand for confession which its doctors expressly forbid: all followed, twenty-four hours too soon, by a sentence which described a claim to be the Fulfiller of the hopes of Israel as blasphemy—Such a process had neither the form nor the fairness of a judicial trial."

Thus the Lord Jesus Christ was illegally condemned to death.

Had the Sanhedrin the Right to pass Sentence of Death?

We have seen, according to this declaration by Mr. Innes, that the proceedings up to this point were illegal from the standpoint of the Jewish law. We shall now see that they were equally illegal from the Roman point of view.

We affirm, in answer to the above question, that the Sanhedrin had no right to pass sentence of death. Such a sentence was ultra vires, for the Romans had deprived them of all such power. The jus gladii, the jus vitae aut necis had been taken away at the time when Judæa was reduced to the condition of a Roman province.

In justification of this assertion we plead their own admission (S. John xviii. 31):

"It is not lawful for us to put any man to death."

So they declared plainly, and without reservation, before Pilate.

This ought to be conclusive. There ought not to be any further argument upon the question. The very authorities who were desirous to retain that right, themselves formally admitted that they did not possess it.

This has been traversed by the assertion that power for the
trial of all causes that arose amongst themselves, civil as well as ecclesiastical, resided in the Sanhedrin, even to the pronouncing of a sentence of death; and that such a sentence was within their competency, and merely required the official assent of the procurator. It is further replied, in answer to the admission of the Jews that it was not lawful for them to put any man to death, that this disability applied only to the Sabbath Day, or to the Feast day, and especially to so high a festival as the Passover. This is the view taken by S. Augustine, S. Chrysostom, and S. Cyril of Alexandria. Others hold that they had no power to put to death by crucifixion, which was the death they desired; or that they could not execute for treason, which was an offence against the emperor, and could be judged only by his representative.

To this the rejoinder would be obvious, that if they were so unfortunate as to have a criminal lying under sentence of death at such a season, they needed only to detain him in safe custody, till the conclusion of the Feast, and then carry out the sentence. Had the Jews been in legal possession of the power of life and death, they would never have imperilled it by an application to the Roman governor for his co-operation.

In regard to this matter many questions arise as to points of detail:—

How far did the power of the Sanhedrin extend in ecclesiastical causes?

Could they try other causes than ecclesiastical?
What penalties were they at liberty to impose?
Could they pronounce sentence of death for any cause at all?
If so, could they execute the sentence themselves?
And if they could, was it necessary to obtain the sanction of the Roman governor?

Or must the execution of the sentence be the duty of the Roman governor?

Had the procurator the right to inquire into the case?
Or even to hold a fresh trial?
There is no necessity to attempt a reply to these questions, or to any others like them; for the whole matter depended upon circumstances, which circumstances varied in the different provinces, and sometimes in the same province at different times.

The Romans, like the modern British, were wise in their generation, and ever ready to yield to the logic of facts. The whole power, _de facto_, throughout the provinces, was in their hands. They held a strong rein, which they could slacken or tighten at will. And in such cases as that under consideration, from the pleadings to the judgment, all was in their hands: they could intervene, whenever they chose, at any stage of the proceedings. The whole power was with them.

But they would not draw the rein too tight; and if the provincials showed a disposition to act reasonably, great latitude would be allowed.

They would even allow some nations to retain their own king, to govern by their own laws, to have full authority in all cases, including the carrying out of capital sentences, the only restriction being that the local custom must not infringe the universal law of Rome.

The relation between the Roman governors of provinces and their subjects was not regulated by any hard and fast line. The Romans were discreet, and avoided any unnecessary exasperation of the provincials. Thus to some countries they would allow full liberty; and such a king as Herod would possess almost supreme power, though the king himself would be fully conscious of the limitation of his authority, and would take care not to transgress.

In fact the amount of tension in the bond depended, to a great extent, upon the disposition of the people themselves towards the central authority. If they kept quiet, paid the tribute, and remained loyal, they might do almost as they pleased. The check-string was always in the hand of the governor, whenever he chose to pull it; and behind him was the majesty of the Roman people, represented by the emperor.
In the case of Judæa, there was, as a rule, so much friction, especially in regard to matters ecclesiastical, that the bonds were frequently drawn very tight, though even this depended greatly on the personal character of the procurator for the time being. Considerable power was left in the hands of the Sanhedrin, to which Pilate appealed when he exclaimed, "Take Him yourselves, and judge Him according to your law." But the power of life and death was reserved to the procurator.

Under a mild ruler like Gallio, this power would be exercised with due restraint, and the first procurators of Judæa respected the susceptibilities of the Jewish people: but Pilate was exceptionally severe, not hesitating to massacre, when he deemed it needful, and eventually losing his post on this account.

The evidence that the Jews had lost the power of life and death is very strong:—

(1) Ever since the deposition of Archelaus, in A.D. 6, when Judæa was added to the province of Syria, this power had been lost. Judæa was governed by procurators, under the direct rule of the Emperor, and nominally subject to the imperial legate of Syria. Josephus (B. J. ii. 8, 1) states, "And now Archelaus's part of Judæa was reduced into a province, and Coponius, one of the equestrian order among the Romans, was sent as a procurator, having the power of life and death put into his hands by Caesar."

(2) The Jews, as we have already seen, admitted that it was not lawful for them to put any man to death.

(3) Pilate claimed the full exercise of the right of capital punishment. He said to Jesus, "Knowest Thou not that I have power to crucify Thee, and have power to release Thee?" Evidently all proceedings in the Jewish courts were invalid as against the authority of the procurator.

(4) Annas, the father-in-law of Caiaphas, was deposed by the procurator Valerius Gratus, A.D. 14, for carrying out capital sentences.
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(5) The Talmud states that the power of capital punishment was taken away forty years before the fall of Jerusalem.

(6) Josephus (Antiq. xx. 9, 1) gives an instance of the deposition of a high-priest on account of his having executed capital sentences. It happened on the death of Festus, the procurator who sent S. Paul to Rome on appeal. His successor, Albinus, had not yet arrived in Judæa, and the high-priest of the time, Ananus, or Annas, the son of the famous high-priest Annas, regarded the interval as a favourable opportunity for asserting the rights of the Sanhedrin. Accordingly he summoned a meeting, and "brought before them the brother of Jesus, who was called Christ, whose name was James, and some others; and, when he had framed an accusation against them as breakers of the law, he delivered them to be stoned." For this offence this Annas was deposed by King Agrippa, after a short rule of three months, and was reminded that it was not lawful to assemble a sanhedrin without the consent of the procurator.

These illustrations render it a matter of certainty that the Jews were but citing the actually existing letter of the law upon the case in question, when they said before Pilate,

"It is not lawful for us to put any man to death."

It is true that cases arose from time to time when the penalty of death was inflicted. This was so with Zachariah, son of Barachiah, whom they slew between the sanctuary and the altar (S. Matt. xxiii. 35), and with S. Stephen. But these were not executions after judicial sentence: they were not even judicial acts done ultra vires: they were merely murders committed by a furious mob in a moment of sudden anger, for which the procurator, had he been disposed, might have exacted severe punishment.

In the declaration before Pilate Ὑμῖν ὅτι ἔχετε ἀποκτεῖναι οὐδένα, the first word is emphatic, "It is not lawful for us," as though they would urge, "We cannot do this which we
powers than most of these officials: he was procurator cum potestate, possessed of supreme power in all causes within his district, except in the case of Roman citizens, who had the right of appeal. He was no mere procurator fiscalis, with powers limited to financial matters, but the procurator Caesaris, the representative of the emperor: in civil and criminal causes a magistrate and a judge: in military affairs the commander of the imperial forces within his jurisdiction.

For this important official the word employed in the New Testament is universally ἕγεμων; and an idea of the high estimation in which the office was held, may be gained from the fact that S. Luke applies the same title to the emperor himself as well as to Pilate Εὐν έτει δὲ πεντεκαίδεκάῳ τῆς ἕγεμονίας Τιβέριου Καίσαρος, ἕγεμονεύοντος Ποντίου Πιλάτου τῆς Ἰουδαίας (S. Luke iii. 1). In Josephus the word is ἐπίτροπος.

The Procurators of Judæa

Pontius Pilate was the fifth procurator. Some writers reckon him the sixth, by counting Sabinus as the first. But Sabinus was a kind of assistant commissioner to Varus and Cyrenius, the imperial legates of Syria. Josephus styles him "Caesar's steward (or procurator) for Syrian affairs." On the death of Herod the Great he took charge of his property until Archelaus was definitely appointed ethnarch.

We esteem Coponius as the first procurator of Judæa and Samaria; his successors were Marcus Ambivius, Annius Rufus, Valerius Gratus, and then Pontius Pilate, as stated by Josephus, in Antiq. xviii. 2, 2, where all these five are brought together. Cyrenius, whose name is so well known as the governor who conducted the "taxing" of the Jews in the year of our Lord's birth (Chapter II.), was sent into Palestine by Augustus, on the deposition of Archelaus, to effect the settlement of Judæa, and its transformation into a sub-province dependent upon
the adjoining province of Syria. Hitherto under Herod and his sons Archelaus and Antipas, Palestine had enjoyed practical independence; but now Samaria and Judaea were attached to the province of Syria, and Coponius was appointed the first governor, under the title of procurator. This new official was invested with exceptional powers, and, subject to the overlordship of Syria, exercised supreme authority within his district. Josephus phrases it thus: "Coponius also, a man of the equestrian order, was sent together with Cyrenius, to have the supreme power over the Jews" (Antig. xviii. 1, 1). The census was taken by Cyrenius, a poll tax was levied, and the whole fiscal system of Rome was imposed upon the Jews. There was no longer any pretence that they were ruled by princes and kings of their own; they were now governed direct from Rome, under a procurator appointed personally by the emperor.

The first four procurators appear to have been tolerably conciliatory, and careful especially not to shock the susceptibilities of the Jews in religious matters. Tiberius himself made a point of this in the directions given to his deputies. Hence the first four procurators refrained from bringing into Jerusalem any offensive emblems; and when the troops were marched into the holy City, these emblems were left behind at Cæsarea. But this wise concession, as we shall presently see, was neglected by Pilate, who incurred much unpopularity in consequence.

The procurator resided at Cæsarea-Stratonis, on the shores of the Mediterranean, and there fixed his capital and the headquarters of his army. At festival time he would ride to Jerusalem at the head of a large detachment of troops, and be in readiness to keep order amongst the crowds who resorted to the feasts. At such times there was always a disorderly element at work, due to the fanaticism of the zealots and sicarii, who were liable at any moment to raise a disturbance.

At other seasons the government of Jerusalem was left
mainly in the hands of the high-priests and the Sanhedrin, who were allowed just as much latitude as their own discretion dictated: and this amounted practically to the decision of all causes except capital causes, _judicia de capite_, which were always referred to the Roman governor.

Thus the office of high-priest, though shorn of much of its original splendour, still retained considerable dignity and importance; while at the same time the consciousness that the post was tenable on sufferance only, tended to make the holders careful of their conduct in public affairs. A kind of settlement of the affairs of Palestine, civil and ecclesiastical, was made by Cyrenius on the removal of Archelaus, A.D. 6, which was sufficiently satisfactory to all concerned to enable it to keep the balance for several years. Cyrenius raised the famous Annas to the high-priesthood, and he managed to keep in touch both with Jew and Roman, throughout the procuratorship of Coponius, Ambivius and Rufus.

Annas, or Hanan (or Ananus, as Josephus styles him), was a man of great attainments, full of energy, fond of the exercise of political influence, and possessed of great wealth. It was a difficult position he was called upon to fill, amidst the conflicting parties by which Judæa was distracted: but he contrived to hold the reins of power until Valerius Gratus came as procurator in A.D. 14. Gratus changed Cyrenius's policy, and made Ishmael, son of Phabi, high-priest: but this appointment only led to disturbance, and Gratus had to yield. After raising Eleazar, son of Annas, and Simon, son of Cai- thos, to the high-priesthood, he finally fixed upon Joseph Caiaphas, the Caiaphas of the Gospels. This restored peace. And Annas, who had continued to rule, even after his deposition, now again grasped the reins of power. Gratus might appoint Ishmael, Eleazar, Simon or Caiaphas, but the people ignored them all, and gave their allegiance only to Annas.

Annas was indeed, as Josephus remarks, "a most fortunate man" (_Antiq._ xx. 9, 1). He was himself in office as high-
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priest, for a long term; he was Sagan or deputy when out of office; and five of his sons, as well as his son-in-law Caiaphas, succeeded him. Thus, either in his own name, or through the nominee of the Romans, he was at the head of ecclesiastical affairs in Jerusalem for considerably more than half a century.

It was this Annas, and his son-in-law Caiaphas, who sent the Lord Jesus Christ to Pilate.

**List of the High-Priests,**

*From the Accession of Herod to the Destruction of Jerusalem.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Appointed by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ananel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Aristobulus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Jesus, son of Phabes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Simon, son of Boethos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Matthias, son of Theophilus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Joazar, son of Boethos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Eleazar, son of Boethos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Jesus, son of Siva</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Annas</td>
<td>Cyrenius.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Ishmael, son of Phabi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Simon, son of Camithos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. <em>Joseph Caiaphas</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Theophilus, <em>son of Annas</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Simon Cantheras, son of Boethos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Matthias, <em>son of Annas</em></td>
<td>Agrippa I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Elionaios, son of Cantheras</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Ananias, son of Nebedaios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIST OF THE HIGH-PRIESTS—continued.

21. Jonathan
22. Ishmael, son of Phabi
23. Joseph Cabi, son of Simon
24. Annas, son of Annas
25. Jesus, son of Damniaios
26. Jesus, son of Gamaliel
27. Matthias, son of Theophilus
28. Phannias, son of Samuel.

(For this last, see Josephus, B. J. iv. 3, 8.)

Pontius Pilate

The name of Pontius Pilate has come down to us as a name of singular interest on account of its occurrence in the Christian's Creed. Of all the officials, Jewish or Roman, who took part in the crime of the Crucifixion, Pilate's name alone has been thus honoured.

His nomen, Pontius, seems to connect him, either by descent or by adoption, with the ancient Samnite family, the Pontii.

His cognomen, Pilatus, has been variously explained. "Pileatus" was one who wore the pileus, or felt-cap, which was the sign of freedom, and was given to a slave at his manumission: it was a cap fitting close to the head, and was worn by Romans at festivals, and especially at the Saturnalia. He may have been a freedman, or descended from one. A more likely derivation endows him with a warlike ancestry, for pilum was the javelin with which the Roman infantry were armed.

These explanations are both purely conjectural, for nothing is really known of the family to which he belonged. But he was probably of the equestrian order, or he would not have had so important an office as procurator conferred upon him.
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The emperor, however, was under no obligation to limit his appointment to any class.

Pilate was sent to Palestine, A.D. 25, under the patronage of Sejanus, the praefectus praetorio of Tiberius, at the time when Tiberius had already retired from public affairs, and was leaving the government in the hands of Sejanus. This infamous man was inspired with a hatred of the Jews, a sentiment which appears to have been reflected in the conduct of his nominee.

Pilate, when he came into Judæa, brought with him his wife Claudia Procula, whose dream is mentioned by S. Matthew, and he resided with her in the palace of Herod at Cæsarea. He was more frequently in Jerusalem than his predecessors had been, and his presence there caused much friction, as we shall presently see. In Jerusalem he and Claudia dwelt in Herod the Great's palace, known as Herod's praetorium, a magnificent edifice furnished with all the luxurious adjuncts of the age, with gold and silver ornaments and vessels, elaborately described by Josephus (B. J. v. 4). But he sometimes occupied the Castle of Antonia, overlooking the Court of the Temple, which was conveniently close by, in the event of an outbreak. This castle was situated on the north-west of the Temple, and contained four towers, one of which, that at the south-east corner, was more than one hundred feet in height, and sufficiently lofty to command the whole Temple, in addition to which there were two flights of steps leading directly into the colonnades below (Jos., B. J. v. 6, 8). The castle also was suitably arranged and furnished for a palace, and contained ample accommodation for a whole legion of soldiers.

The character of Pilate has been drawn from two points of view. Philo described him as inflexible, merciless and obstinate. Our Gospels show that he was anxious to conciliate the popular party. His history proves him to have been reckless of human life. We may regard him as a man imbued with
the spirit of justice that animated the Roman Republic, but ready at any moment to sacrifice principle to utility—a thorough man of the world; not bad at heart; with good impulses which the spirit of the age crushed rather than encouraged.

As soon as he entered on his procuratorship, he began a career of high-handed action, which appeared to be directed against the religion of the Jews, and therefore touched them in their tenderest part. In Jerusalem, in Galilee, in Samaria, he outraged the susceptibilities of his people, thereby departing from the example of his predecessors in office.

One of his first acts on arriving in Palestine was to transfer the winter quarters of his army from Cæsarea to Jerusalem. The procurator had under his command a body of infantry, with the usual proportion of cavalry, sufficient in number to keep under control the turbulent element in the province.

The headquarters were at Cæsarea, but a legion was stationed in Antonia at Jerusalem, with garrisons in other places.

Hitherto it had been the custom of the procurators to fix their residence in pleasant quarters at Cæsarea by the seaside, and merely to go to Jerusalem at the feasts, and especially at the Passover, to keep order amongst the thousands who thronged Jerusalem at such seasons. It had also been the practice to leave behind them at Cæsarea the emblems on the Roman standards, which were, in the estimation of the Jews, of an idolatrous character. “The golden eagle” (says Gibbon) “which glittered in the front of the legion, was the object of their fondest devotion: and these eagles, called by Tacitus Bellorum Deos, were placed in a chapel in the camp, and with the other deities received the religious worship of the troops.” The ensigns also contained the effigies of Cæsar.

At Cæsarea these emblems were of less consequence, for it was a half-heathen city, but to introduce them into the holy City was an intolerable profanation.
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Pilate was apparently aware that his action would be unpopular, and the hated emblems were brought into the city by night. The next morning, the whole city was in an uproar. The Jewish authorities, however, kept the people quiet, and persuaded them to go to Cæsarea in crowds, to press upon the procurator the removal of the images. Here a striking scene occurred, which is twice described by Josephus (Antiq. xviii. 3; B. J. ii. 9).

The large crowd of suppliants preferred their request to Pilate, with all the earnestness of men inspired by devotion to their religion; and, when it was refused, they cast themselves prostrate before him, and remained inmoveable for five days and nights. On the sixth day Pilate set up his Bema in the public market-square, and summoned the suppliants before him; and when they persisted in their demands, had them surrounded by soldiers, and threatened to cut them in pieces. But the ambassadors were in no wise terrified by his threats. They cast themselves, as one man, upon the ground, tore open their robes, laid bare their necks, and bade the soldiers strike, for they declared that they would prefer death itself to so flagrant a violation of the Law of Moses.

Pilate was not at that time prepared for a general massacre, and thought it prudent to give way. The hated images were removed; and peace was restored to the city.

The next incident is of greater interest to Christians, on account of a presumed reference to it by our Lord Himself.

Pilate, honestly desiring to benefit the city of Jerusalem, and not unwilling to secure some credit to himself, determined upon constructing an aqueduct, which was to have been 200 stadia, or about 25 miles in length, to convey water from the Pools of Solomon to the city. There being no funds available for the purpose, he appropriated the Corban, the funds in the Temple treasury, which had accumulated again since the pillage of Jerusalem by Crassus, holding himself justified, on the ground that the works proposed were a public benefit.
Thus provided, he commenced the works, Caïaphas either agreeing to the diversion of the Corban, or feeling himself unable to offer opposition.

Myriads of people rose in revolt, and clamoured for the stoppage of the water-works, and the restoration of the Corban. It was at this juncture that the incident occurred to which our Lord is believed to have alluded in S. Luke xiii. 1–5. "There were some present at that very season, which told Him of the Galilæans, whose blood Pilate had mingled with their sacrifices. And He answered and said unto them, Think ye that these Galilæans were sinners above all the Galilæans, because they suffered these things? I tell you, Nay: but except ye repent, ye shall all in like manner perish. Or those eighteen upon whom the tower in Siloam fell, and killed them, think ye that they were offenders above all the men that dwell in Jerusalem? I tell you, Nay: but except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish."

All Jerusalem was in a ferment, and rioting took place both in the streets, and in the Temple itself. Pilate did his best to pacify the people. He sent some of his legionaries, dressed in long cloaks, as though they were Jews from the country districts, but with swords and staves concealed beneath, and ordered them to beat the unruly with staves. The soldiers, however, were hustled by the people, and at length drew their swords, and attacked the mob, not sorry perhaps to exact vengeance for the many insults already endured. Numbers were slain, and many more carried away wounds from the scene of disturbance. Josephus does not mention the fact, but it is extremely probable that some of the mob were slain in the Court of the Temple, at the time when the sacrifices were being offered, and thus human blood was mingled with the blood of the sacrificial animals.

We may assume that the Tower in Siloam which fell about this time formed a portion of the necessary building operations, and that the death of the workmen who were crushed
by its fall, was regarded by the people generally as a judgment for their sin in taking part in such unholy schemes.

Now the Galilæans thus slain in the Temple were the subjects of Herod Antipas, the tetrarch of Galilee, who was naturally displeased at the occurrence. He wrote to Pilate a letter of complaint, to which the procurator replied in a spirit of conciliation, explaining the transaction, and justifying his soldiers under the circumstances. But Antipas was not convinced, and the relations between the two governors became strained. There were probably other causes at work to create friction between them; questions of jurisdiction, or of boundaries between the districts, or of the occupation of the palaces at Jerusalem, where they both usually met at the feasts. This coolness continued until they were reconciled at the time of our Lord's trial.

Another of these exasperating acts of Pilate was the introduction into Herod's palace of certain bucklers of brass, dedicated to the Emperor Tiberius, and inscribed with the names of heathen deities. This is related by Philo; and though the incident is regarded by some as another version of the incident of the ensigns already related, there is sufficient authority to treat it as a different story. These bucklers were as abominable to the zealots as the legionary standards, and were repudiated with as much earnestness.

This time the Emperor Tiberius himself intervened, and gave orders for the removal of the shields. Thus for the third time Pilate had to give way.

Undeterred by these warnings Pilate continued his arbitrary action. Several times he had come into collision with the Jews and with the Galilæans: now he falls foul of the Samaritans. Thus every district of Palestine was destined to writh under his heavy hand. A certain Messianic impostor, whose name is not on record, gathered together a vast crowd of people at a village called Tirathaba, at the foot of Mount Gerizim, promising to show them the place of concealment
of certain sacred vessels, which he asserted had been deposited there by Moses. Pilate, however, was on the alert, and occupied all the approaches to the hill by a body of infantry and cavalry, with which he fell upon the deluded victims, numbers of whom were slain; many prisoners also were taken, and the rest dispersed.

The Jews cared little for the slaughter of their hereditary enemies, on the rival mountain in Samaria, but the Samaritans themselves sent ambassadors to Antioch to lay a complaint before Vitellius, the imperial legate of Syria. They excused themselves by asserting that they had taken refuge at Tirathaba in order to escape the violence of Pilate, and that his attack upon them was an act of gratuitous cruelty.

Vitellius ordered Pilate to report himself at Rome, and to explain his conduct to the emperor himself. When he arrived he found that Tiberius had just died.

Meanwhile Vitellius took the government of Judæa and Samaria into his own hands, went up to Jerusalem, and gained favour by the remission of certain taxes upon fruits; and, what pleased the Jews still more, he gave the custody of the high-priest's vestments into their own charge, those vestments having been up to that time kept in the Tower of Antonia, within the control of Herod and Archelaus and the procurators.

Gaius (Caligula), the successor of Tiberius, did not think it fit to reinstate Pilate, and Marcellus was accordingly appointed to succeed him.

Pilate was eventually banished to Gaul, and nothing more is known of him, though legend is busy with his later years and death. The most interesting of these legends, based upon a false etymology, is that which brings him to Mont Pilatus, overlooking the Lake of Lucerne, where he is said to have ended his life by plunging into a lonely tarn near the summit, his spirit still haunting the place, and perpetually engaged in the hopeless task of purging the foul blot from the blood-stained hands.
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We may conclude this notice of Pontius Pilate by quoting the testimony of Josephus concerning our Lord from Antiq. xviii. 3, 3.

"Now, there was about this time, Jesus, a wise man, if it be lawful to call Him a man, for He was a doer of wonderful works,—a teacher of such men as receive the truth with pleasure. He drew over to Him both many of the Jews, and many of the Gentiles. He was the Christ. And, when Pilate, at the suggestion of the principal men amongst us, had condemned Him to the Cross, those that loved Him at the first did not forsake Him, for He appeared to them alive again the third day, as the divine prophets had foretold these and ten thousand other wonderful things concerning Him; and the tribe of Christians, so named from Him, are not extinct at this day."

The Trial before Pilate

For the sake of clearness let us briefly recapitulate.

We have dealt with the Arrest of our Lord, and His Delivery by His captors to Annas. This process was equivalent to His being brought before a Magistrate for Examination. Annas commits Jesus for trial, and sends Him to the Sanhedrin for that purpose. Before the Sanhedrin a trial takes place, which (following Mr. A. T. Innes) we have pronounced to be illegal in all its forms.

The Sanhedrin had determined on the Crucifixion of their Victim, but are destitute of power to carry their sentence into effect. Hence Jesus is relegated to Pilate with the sole object of securing this result.

It is at this point that the Trial really begins: and, after a preliminary examination, as we shall see, begins de novo. For the previous Trial was not only informal, but illegal, inasmuch as it had been conducted in violation of Jewish Law as laid down in the Mishna, De Synedriis.
Hence the only legal Trial was that before Pilate; and that Trial was very brief, and ended in acquittal. It was between six and seven o'clock in the morning, or it may be even at an earlier hour, that the chief priests and the council appeared before the Prætorium, clamouring for an audience with the procurator. The evangelists give the time with sufficient precision, "when morning was come," "in the morning," "as soon as it was day," "it was early." We may understand these expressions as indicating the time just after sunrise, which was the hour at which a Roman Court could legally hold its session. A large crowd, amongst whom were chief-priests, and elders, and scribes and members of the Sanhedrin, filled the space in front of the Prætorium.

The question is, What was this Prætorium?

The word "Prætorium," in a camp, meant the tent of the praetor, or general, or commander-in-chief: in a province, it meant the official residence of the governor, whatever his title might be, whether praetor, proconsul, imperial legate or procurator. Outside Rome it was sometimes applied to any large country-house or palace: and in Rome itself to the Emperor's palace, and to the camp of the Prætorian guards. The Authorised Version renders the word variously, as "common hall," "governor's house," "prætorium," and "judgment hall." The Revisers render it uniformly as "palace," putting "prætorium" in the margin.

The meaning in the Gospels is obvious: it was the palace occupied by Pilate. But which palace? for opinions are divided between two.

There was the Castle of Antonia, overlooking the Temple and its courts, a strong fortress in which the Roman legion was quartered, but which also contained within its precincts a superb palace, fitting it not only for the garrison, but also for the residence of the procurator, his wife, and followers.

And there was the palace of Herod, erected by the elder
Herod, and situated at the north-west angle of the Upper City. This was a magnificent edifice, one of the most splendid of Herod’s many buildings, and enclosing a large open square between its two wings of white marble. This open space, adorned with colonnades, and provided with a rich tesselated pavement, was admirably adapted for public functions, such as the reception of a large deputation.

There was also the old palace of the Aesonanean princes, which was at this time occupied by Herod Antipas.

Whether the Praetorium to which the priestly party led our Lord was the Castle of Antonia, or the palace of the elder Herod, it is impossible to decide: either of these would be suitable as a residence for the procurator, and for his wife, or for any noble Roman lady. In all probability the “Praetorium,” on this occasion, was the palace of Herod.

To this Praetorium our Lord was led as a lamb to the slaughter, bound with cords. In the garden of Gethsemane, He was bound for security; a second time was He bound when Annas sent Him to Caiaphas: but now He is for the third time bound, with His hands tied before Him, and a cord round His neck, formally, as a condemned Criminal, in order to be delivered to Pilate for execution.

Outside the Praetorium, in the open air, stood the accusing crowd, for they would not enter the heathen palace, lest they should be defiled. It was festival time, and there was the Passover to be eaten. These men, bent upon the judicial murder of an innocent man, were yet so punctilious upon a matter of comparatively trifling importance. Bishop Wordsworth holds that Jesus Christ and His disciples had eaten the Passover at the right time, and that the chief-priests and their fellow-conspirators had been so busy in plotting the death of Christ, that, although their Passover had been slain, they had found no leisure to go home to eat it.

But this does not appear to be the meaning of the phrase in S. John xviii. 28, according to Lightfoot, Edersheim and
others, who refer the expression “Passover” here, to the Chagigah. Dr. Alfred Edersheim, who has studied Jewish law and customs with the utmost care, gives the following explanation: “Both the Old Testament and the Jewish writings show, that the term Pesach, or Passover, was applied, not only to the Paschal Lamb, but to all the Passover sacrifices, especially to what was called the Chagigah (from Chag, the feast), or festive offering, which was brought on the first Paschal day. It was offered immediately after the morning service, and eaten on that day—probably some time before the evening, when another ceremony claimed public attention. We can, therefore, quite understand that, not on the eve of the Passover, but on the first Paschal day, the Sanhedrists would avoid incurring a defilement, which, lasting till the evening, would have prevented, not indeed their offering, but their partaking of the Passover festive offering, or Chagigah.”

The Arraignment

Pilate concedes the point as to the inability of the prosecutors to enter the Prætorium, and comes forth to meet them. He asks immediately, as a necessary formal question, “What accusation bring ye against this man?” τίνα κατηγορίαν φέρετε κατὰ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τούτου; This question answers to the nominis delatio of the Roman criminal procedure, in which the first step was to apply to the prætor to allow the accusation to be made, delationem nominis postulare; the next step being to formally arraign the defendant, nomen deferro.

The words κατηγορία and κατηγορος carry a technical legal meaning, as in S. John viii. 10, “Woman, where are those thine accusers?”: and Acts xxiii. 30, 35, “Charging his accusers,” “when thine accusers also are come”: and xxiv. 8, “whereof we accuse him.”

Christ’s accusers endeavour to evade the question by answering somewhat truculently, “If this man were not an evil-doer,
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we should not have delivered Him up unto thee." The charge of being a κακοποιός was too vague; there was no definite crime laid against the prisoner, and a Roman judge could take cognisance only of some specific accusation, or overt act.

Hence Pilate retorts upon them, "Take Him yourselves, and judge Him according to your law." As though he said, "The Roman law cannot be perverted to a mere criminal inquiry into an offence not yet specified. I must have a definite charge of the commission of some actual crime, some breach of Roman law. If it be a question of words, and names, and of your law" [as Gallio afterwards said at Corinth] "I cannot deal with it. Try the case yourselves."

Thus the Roman judge brings the accusers to the point.

They reply that the Accused is worthy of death: and, as they are prohibited from inflicting capital punishment, they have brought their prisoner to Pilate.

The question of jurisdiction then is decided; by their own admission, they cannot put any man to death.

Had their own laws been in full force, they could have condemned Jesus to be stoned, on a charge of blasphemy, for that was the punishment provided by the Law of Moses for that offence. But Jesus had Himself foretold His death by crucifixion, "I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto Me," and "as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up." Also, more definitely still in the thrice-repeated prophecy of His death, in the synoptic gospels. And crucifixion also was the mode of death which the Sanhedrists desired, as being more shameful and ignominious.

The Jews have claimed capital punishment. Now Pilate must take up the case seriously, and try it according to the forms of Roman law.

All Romans had a respect for Law: it was their characteristic virtue, as the Jews had a genius for religion. The British are
the successors of the Romans, in their respect for law and order. Everywhere where the English flag flies, there is justice for all within the realm: all men are equal before the law. And the nations of the earth have learnt this, and are patient under British law. It is this principle, inherent in the race, which enables the British people to colonize, and fill up the vacant portions of the world, as no other race can.

Pilate demands of Christ’s accusers a distinctly formulated charge. This the Sanhedrists render. And now the Actual and Only Real Trial of Christ begins.

The Actual Trial

The trial begins de novo. Pilate feels himself compelled to enter upon a re-cognitio causa, for all the previous proceedings were null and void under Roman law. The prisoner is to be tried on a capital charge, and the responsibility of condemnation and execution is to rest upon the governor.

Pilate has therefore forced the Jews to formulate a definite charge. The charge already adduced, that He was a “malefactor,” was too vague: the word κακοποιός did not carry with it any technical meaning. The Judge must have a definite accusation laid before his court.

Thus compelled, they bring their charge, “they began to accuse him,” ἥρξαντο δὲ κατηγορεῖν αὐτοῦ. Here again the technical term, κατηγορία is employed. And they present a three-fold indictment (S. Luke xxiii. 2):—

“We found this Man

Perverting our nation:
Forbidding to give tribute to Cæsar:
Saying that He Himself is Christ a King.”

Such is the Accusation which Pilate is required to investigate. All that took place before his tribunal is not recorded; and we may assume that Pilate, accustomed to take his place upon
the bench, and decide points of law; and with that familiarity with legal procedure which brings the faculty of rapid decision, quickly revolves the three charges in his mind, and fixes on the third.

The first charge, that of "perverting the nation," is too vague. The word διαστρέφω was not a technical term; it had no more legal force than κακοποίως. In what sense, it might be asked, had Jesus perverted the nation? If in a Jewish sense, then it would be a question of their own religion, with which they must themselves deal, for Pilate, as Roman governor, had no concern in such matters, unless they came into conflict with Roman law. If in a Roman sense, then some overt act must be alleged.

The second charge, that of forbidding to give tribute to Cæsar, would have carried with it incriminating force, had it only been true, for Tiberius had a few years before applied the guilt of high treason to those who in words or in writing, had offended the majesty of his person, even without the commission of any overt act. The introduction of the terrible name of Cæsar made this second charge assume a serious aspect.

But this count in the indictment was false. Jesus Christ was accustomed to yield obedience to all lawful authority, and to pay all legal taxes: and only on the previous Tuesday He had distinctly replied in answer to a question publicly propounded, "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's."

The third charge was the one upon which Pilate instinctively fixed. The first he appears to have ignored on account of its vagueness, the second by reason of its falsity; but the third brings a definite accusation; it alleges a crime which at this date was being pursued with the utmost rigour of the law—the crime of Majestas or high treason. Under Tiberius proceedings against this offence had been reduced to a system, and prosecutions were carried out by Sejanus, the representative of the emperor now in retirement in the isle of Capreae, against
any obnoxious persons whatsoever. The law was worked in such a manner as to enable those in power to rid themselves of any citizens whom they wished to remove from their path. A host of informers (delatores) had sprung up, ready to give evidence against any suspected persons.

To ignore such a charge as this would not be safe. As the representative in Judæa of the emperor, it was impossible to disregard it. The prisoner before him no longer stands charged with a comparatively minor offence against the precepts of the Jewish religion, or with a breach of the traditional laws of the Sanhedrists; He is on His trial for the most grievous offence known to Roman Law, the Crimen Laæ Majeslatis, or High Treason against the Emperor.

**Majestas**

*Majestas* was an offence against the State, that was, in the earliest times of the Republic, known as Perduellio, *i.e.* very war, duellum being the old form for bellum. It was a crime punished with the utmost severity, either interdiction from fire and water (aqua et igni interdicio), or death. *Perduellis* was the guilty person, a traitor, a public enemy of the State.

Originally the crime was not precisely defined; but it comprised such offences against the State as constituted the offender an enemy, such as aiming at regal authority, conspiring against the government, misconduct on the field of battle, or giving aid to the enemies of Rome. Of such an one Cicero writes that he who "proprio nomine perduellis esset, is hostis vocaretur."

By degrees the term *Perduellio* fell into disuse, and was replaced by *Majestas*. The term *perduellio* did not indeed disappear, but the crime it indicated was merged into *Majestas* under the Empire. Ulpian describes it as a species of *Majestas*, and distinguishes between majestas which is perduellio, and majestas which is not.
Majestas was the master-crime: none greater could be committed. It answered to High Treason in the English Law. The full term was *Crimen læse Majestatis*, or as expressed in English Law, "læse" (or "leze") "majesty."

It was called *majestas* on account of the magnitude or greatness of the crime, and it implied any offence by which the sovereign power of the Roman State was injured, diminished or impaired. Hence the cognate phrases *læse, minuta, im-minuta*, or *deminuta majestatis*. It is defined by Ulpian as "Crimen adversus populum Romanum vel adversus securitatem ejus." It is more inclusive than perduellio, and embraces any offence by which the Majestas of the Roman people is impaired.

The offences under the laws de *Majestate* comprised the following:

Bearing arms against the State, levying troops without authority, sedition, mutiny, slaying a magistrate, deserting to the enemy, or causing a Roman army to be caught in ambush or surrendered to the enemy, preventing the success of the Roman arms, exciting a friendly state to make war on Rome, aiding an enemy with munitions of war, entering into communication with the enemy, or giving him advice to be used against Rome.

*Under the Empire* these laws were extended to the person of the Emperor: and this arose quite naturally, for Augustus Caesar united in himself all the offices of the now practically defunct Republic. He was consul, imperator, censor, tribune, and finally pontifex maximus, besides bearing other titles such as Augustus, princeps senatus and pater patriae. Thus all the offices of the state were accumulated in his one person. This principle applied also to his successors. Thus, without any violation of the constitution, the law of Majestas applied to the emperor, as hitherto to the Republic: hence the phrases *Majestas Augusta, imperatoria or regia*.

*Under Tiberius* this law was converted into an engine of
terrible oppression. It was left vague and comprehensive, and made the means of removing any undesirable persons whatever. No one was safe. An act, a word or a letter, was sufficient to secure conviction. The most trifling act of disrespect to the emperor or even to his statue, even the sale of his statue, or melting it down, would bring a man, whenever it was so desired, under the penal clauses of these statutes.

Later emperors considerably modified the oppressive application of this law. Mere verbal insults were not regarded as treason, and the emperors Theodosius, Arcadius and Honorius are reported to have said that, "if the words were uttered in a spirit of frivolity, the attack merits contempt; if from madness, they excite pity; if from malice, they are to be forgiven."

The laws de Majestate were, the lex Appuleia, B.C. 100; lex Varia, B.C. 92; and lex Cornelia, B.C. 81. The lex Julia Majestatis, B.C. 48, was the principal statute on the subject; it defined the offences, as already enumerated, and imposed the penalties, which were either banishment (aqua et igni interdictio), or death which was the sumnum supplicium, or extreme penalty of the law.

Trials for Majestas, in common with other Crimina publica, such as forgery, murder, parricide and adultery, were under the XII. Tables committed by delegatio to two persons appointed by the Comitia for the special cause, inquiry, or Quaestio; and these judges were entitled duo viri perduellioni judicanda, and were invested with jurisdiction under forms similar to our Bill of Attainder.

Afterwards a permanent Court, or standing Commission, was appointed under the laws mentioned above, and went by the name of "Questiones perpetue." The procedure of this Court, and the penalties inflicted by it, were regulated by these enactments. Under the Empire the Questiones perpetue were gradually superseded by special magistrates, and prosecutions brought under these statutes were termed Judicia publica.

Under the Questiones perpetue the procedure (as summed
up by W. A. Hunter in his Roman Law) was as follows:—
“The intending impeacher (it was open to any citizen to prosecute) applied to the president of the Court for leave to prefer an accusation (postulatio). If two or more persons made simultaneous application, a jury decided which of them should be the impeacher (divinatio). The impeacher then formally stated the name of the accused and the crime to be charged against him (nominis or criminis delatio). The accused was next cited before the prætor, and the charge was preferred against him in person (citatio); upon which he was interrogated for the purpose of eliciting admissions, so as to narrow the issues to be tried (interrogatio); and a formal charge was thereupon drawn up (inscriptio) and signed by the impeacher and his supporters (scriptio). The judge then formally registered the name of the accused (nominis receptio), and appointed a day for the trial. Both impeacher and accused might conduct their own case, or obtain the assistance of counsel or friends. On the conclusion of the evidence, the jury (judices) gave their verdict, at first openly, but after the lex Cassia (B.C. 137) by ballot. It might be expressed in any one of three forms—Not guilty (absolvo), Guilty (condemno), and Doubtful (non liquet). In the latter case, the judge said ‘Amplius’ (‘Further,’ ‘more fully’) and the cause was heard a second time, or oftener (ampliatio) until the jury were able either to acquit or condemn.”

These formalities would not be fully observed in the provinces, and still less in the case of one who was not protected by being a Roman citizen. This, of course, would be the case with our Lord Jesus Christ. Yet, perhaps, in the general course of the proceedings, some respect would be paid to the ordinary mode of conducting such cases; so far, that is, as the governor chose. But practically non-citizens would be at the mercy of the governor.

The charge of Majestas was worked in its most oppressive form during the reign of Tiberius. It was one which was
difficult to refute. "Every one that maketh himself a king speaketh against Cæsar." No one could be permitted to assume such a title of his own will. Archelaus had done so, after the death of his father, and was refused the title for his presumption. It was the business of the emperor and the senate to make and unmake kings, and in all cases to be the fountain of honour. The very word "king" had been hateful to the Roman people since the expulsion of the kings, and the establishment of the Republic. Julius Cæsar, though he desired to wear the kingly crown, thought it prudent to decline it when offered; and Augustus, with the same feeling in his mind, refused the similar title of "Dictator." Thus the very word itself was under a ban, and to claim it was a heinous offence. Whosoever did so was guilty of High Treason, guilty of the Crimen læse majestatis.

Examination

Such then was the Accusation or Indictment; in general terms Majestas: more specifically the three-fold Charge already named.

The next step is the Examination of the Accused, or Interrogatio, which, as we have stated, was for the purpose of narrowing the issues to be tried. This, as we have seen, Pilate effected by ignoring the first and second counts of the indictment and fastening on the third.

Pilate had gone out to meet the deputation from the Sanhedrin, with their Prisoner; and, having received their accusation, in the presence of the Accused, which was an essential condition, the preliminary process in jure was now complete, the Case was in Judicio, and the accused was in reatu.

The next step was the formal Examination of the Accused. In order to carry this into effect, Pilate returns to the Prætorium, sends for the Accused, and summons Him before the Bar of the Court. He conducts the examination in person;
for he has no Quæstor, being a procurator, and not an imperial legate. He commences the Examination by asking a question which is found, word for word, in each of the four Gospels:—

“Art thou the King of the Jews?”
Σὺ εἶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων;

The reply, again in the very same words in all the Gospels, was:—

“Thou sayest” Σὺ λέγεις.

Had we only the synoptic Gospels, it would appear from this answer that our Lord had pleaded “Guilty” to the charge; but, with S. John’s Gospel in our hands, we see that the plea is different.

Our Lord’s answer is “Sayest thou this of thyself, or did others tell it thee concerning me?”

That is to say “In what sense is the word ‘King’ here used? Is this your own question as Roman procurator, the representative of the emperor? or is it a question prompted by the Jewish priests?

“If you are saying it of yourself, and are asking whether I claim to be a King in the Roman sense, so as to be guilty of High Treason against Cæsar, I answer ‘No’: I plead the general issue ‘Not Guilty’; I traverse the Indictment.

“If, on the other hand, the Jewish priests have told it thee concerning me, and you are asking whether I am a King in the Jewish sense, in the sense in which my accusers have already understood the charge, and on the merits of which they have already brought me to trial; then I plead ‘Guilty,’ for I am ‘King of the Jews’ in that sense. I claim to be the Prophet, ὁ ἐρχόμενος, the Son of God, the King of the Jews.”

Pilate replies that it is apparently a Jewish question, a matter of dispute amongst the Jews themselves, with which properly he has no concern, “Am I a Jew? thine own nation and the chief-priests delivered thee unto me: what hast thou done?”
The Defence

Then Jesus puts in His plea. His defence does not traverse the Indictment, but consists in what is known in English law as Confession and Avoidance, “a plea which admits, in words or in effect, the truth of the matters contained in the Declaration; and alleges some new matter to avoid the effect of it, and show that the plaintiff is, notwithstanding, not entitled to his action.”

Confession. “Thou sayest” in the synoptics, simply: in S. John, “Thou sayest that I am a king”: or, as it may be rendered, “Thou sayest it; because I am a king.” Σὺ λέγεις, ὅτι βασιλεὺς εἰμι ἐγώ. And He continues “To this end have I been born, and to this end am I come into the world; that I should bear witness unto the truth.”

Yes: Jesus was a King indeed; in might and majesty far exceeding any earthly king, with a sway more extensive than any sovereign (king or emperor) that the world had yet seen; for it was world-wide. Jesus was not only King, but “King of kings, and Lord of lords.” Born indeed “King of the Jews,” as Herod and the wise men acknowledged, but with a sovereignty not restricted to the Jews, for it embraced the whole world; the kingdoms of the world are to become the kingdom of God and of His Christ. To this end He came into the world; for this purpose He, the Son of God, became Incarnate, that He might fulfil the prophecies that went before, and become the Saviour of the World. Indeed He was a King; yes, in a unique sense, as none other ever was, or ever could be, for His dominion not only embraced all the visible world, but extended far beyond, into the Universe itself; for all power was given to Him in heaven and in earth.

Avoidance. “My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight,
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that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is my kingdom not from hence."

The Kingdom of Christ was a spiritual kingdom, which involved no interference with the powers that be. Christ was not like the magnificent Herod, or other rulers of earth, who sought to impress their subjects by the display of the pomp and glory of their Court. He came not arrayed in purple and fine linen, crowned with a diadem of gold and precious stones. His kingdom was not upheld by force of arms: it had no antagonism to the existing powers. Tiberius and his successors can continue to rule, Pontius Pilate himself need have no apprehension of revolt. Jesus was the Prince of Peace. His followers would not fight.

Thus does our Lord defend Himself from the charge of Majestas. He confesses and avoids.

His Kingdom, as we said, was unique—unique in its universality; unique also in its spirituality; alike in extent and in nature.

The Kingdom He came to found upon earth is styled by S. Matthew "The Kingdom of Heaven," by S. Mark and S. Luke "The Kingdom of God." Both phrases express the same meaning: Christ's Kingdom is the Church. The Kingdom of Heaven was at hand, when John the Baptist announced the Advent of the King: the foundations thereof were laid when the disciples received the Commission to "make disciples of all the nations." The character of the subjects, and the laws of the Kingdom are proclaimed in the Sermon on the Mount.

The Kingdom of Heaven was the antithesis to the kingdoms of this world. It was not like that over which Tiberius ruled, which involved much violence and tyranny, injustice and oppression. Christ's kingdom was Heavenly and Divine. Not in antagonism to the empire, or the emperor. His kingdom and Christ's revolve in different spheres. The one affected the outward acts, the things of earth; the other
guided and ruled the heart and soul, and sought to lead men to heaven, that they might set their affections on things above.

The Kingdom of God is the antithesis to the rule of Satan, “the god of this world.” It resists all sin, all evil. In this respect there is a difference between the two phrases. The Kingdom of Heaven exists peaceably side by side with the kingdoms of earth: but the Kingdom of God is in irreconcilable antagonism to the rule of Satan. Between God and Satan there can be no amity, nor in this warfare may there be any truce. Christ therefore was no malefactor, for His mission was to resist all evil, and to inculcate and encourage all good. He came to preach purity, justice, honour, truth, all that the old Roman held so dear, and by which he had vanquished the world. “Every one,” said Jesus to the Roman procurator, “that is of the truth, heareth my voice.” But Pilate was not imbued with the old Roman spirit, he followed the fashion of the age, and cared only for worldly honour and advancement. To him “truth” was an empty word, “signifying nothing.” “What is truth?” he asks in scorn, and goes out again to the Jews without waiting for a reply.

And if Jesus was not a “malefactor,” neither was He a rebel or a traitor, for His kingdom was of another world than Cæsar’s. Had His kingdom been of this world, then could He have overthrown the kingdoms of this world, for He, like the chief-priests, had under His command “servants,” ὑπηρέται, who would fight on His behalf against the ὑπηρέται of the chief-priests (S. John xviii. 3, 12, 18, 22); nay He could summon against the procurator himself those who should outnumber his single legion of soldiers, even “twelve legions of angels.” “But now,” He concludes, “is my kingdom not from hence.”

Now Pilate understands the whole question. The Accused is no rebel, no criminal in any sense of the word: merely a
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religious enthusiast, loyal to the powers that be, and guiltless of any offence against the Emperor. The charge of Majestas has broken down. The Accused is innocent. The Prisoner must be set free.

The Roman governor, whose business it was to administer justice and not to pander to the religiosities of the priests, sees clearly from previous forensic experience, that there is no case against the accused. He claims a kingdom indeed, but a spiritual kingdom—a thing of fancy, airy and insubstantial. He is a dreamer, living in a world of imagination, without a thought of disloyalty, not indeed troubling to entertain such a thought in His mind. There is no Criminal here.

The Sentence

Pilate descends from his βήμα in the Praetorium, and, accompanied doubtless by the Accused, goes out again into the open air, as a concession to the religious feelings of the Jews, and pronounces his sentence.

"I find no crime in Him."

Οὐδεμίαν αἰτίαν εἰρύσκω ἐν αἰτῇ (S. John xviii. 38).
Οὐδὲν εἰρύσκω αἰτίον ἐν τῇ ἀνθρώπῳ τούτῳ (S. Luke xxiii. 4).

This is a sentence of Acquittal.
The judge has pronounced the word "Absolvo," Not Guilty. The substantive ἀμια or the adjective αἰτίον is a word with a more technical meaning than the word "fault" of the A.V., and is almost equivalent to what we call the "count" of an indictment. It occurs also in Acts xix. 40. This deliberate sentence of Acquittal is repeated in S. John xix. 4 in almost the same words, and again in verse 6.

Thus three times (but once would have sufficed) the Judge has solemnly pronounced the Accused innocent of the Charge preferred against Him.

The Trial is at an end. The Prisoner is acquitted.
After Proceedings

Up to this point Pilate had kept to the traditions of Roman equity, as embodied in the legal maxim Fiat justitia, ruat caelum. He had sternly refused to execute a Man without knowing the crime charged against Him; he had demanded, and had secured, a formal indictment. He had carefully examined the Accused, and had arrived at an honest decision—and now he delivers his judgment.

Here the Trial comes to an end, and the Court ought to have been cleared. All that follows is a mere Farrago of illegalities, a travesty of justice, a nightmare of iniquity.

The announcement of Acquittal calls forth a storm of accusations. On all sides the Praetorium rings with sudden outcries of vengeance. "The chief-priests accused Him of many things." To the surprise of the procurator, no defence is set up against these charges. The Prisoner stands mute. "He was oppressed, and He was afflicted, yet He opened not His mouth: He is brought as a lamb to the slaughter; and as a sheep before her shearsers is dumb, so He openeth not His mouth" (Isaiah liii. 1). "They were the more urgent," says S. Luke. What! after all they had risked, after the humiliation of an application to the hated Roman power, were they to be robbed of their prey! Should their Victim escape!

We English can hardly realise the insensate excitement of an Oriental mob, lashed to fury by religious fanaticism. The mixed crowd raged like wild beasts around the judgment-seat, and cried out that the whole land from Dan to Beersheba was disturbed: "He stirreth up the people, teaching throughout all Judæa, and beginning from Galilee even unto this place." It would not be safe to leave this Man at large. Pilate could not possibly return to Cæsarea after the Passover, if He were free.
Pilate is amazed at the tumult. Can he stand unmoved before that excited mob? Is he to submit to the indignity of rendering his own sentence nugatory? If he had been a free agent, he would have liberated the Prisoner without ceremony, now that judgment had been pronounced. But the fury of the mob upsets him. He is overborne by their clamour, driven out of his course, like a ship in a storm at sea. He is looking for a way of escape, when amidst the tumult he distinguishes the word "Galilee." Is the Prisoner a Galilæan? Then he will change the venue: he will send Him to His own prince, Antipas, the tetrarch of Galilee, at that time residing in the old Maccabæan palace at Bezetha during the Passover.

The Remission to Herod

This remission has the forms of legality. The word ἀπεσέβασις, according to Meyer and others, is a technical term, equivalent to remisit; and is the exact word that should be used in handing over an accused person to the proper judicial authority. In English law the venue must be laid in the county where the wrongful act was committed, and where the parties to the suit would be better known, and be more likely to have justice done them. Pilate, however, when he sent Jesus from the forum apprehensionis ad forum originis vel domicilii, was not endeavouring to advance the cause of justice, but merely to free himself from an embarrassing responsibility.

But it was too late. It might have been legal if it had been done at an earlier stage in the proceedings, viz. if during the Examination it had been ascertained that the Accused was a native of Galilee, and the overt acts alleged had been committed in that district. But the trial was now at an end, and the Prisoner acquitted. Pilate had no excuse, except his own fears, for detaining the Prisoner any longer in custody.
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The Remission to Herod had become illegal, and the procurator, Roman judge though he were, was playing fast and loose with justice.

Did Herod understand this? And did this consideration affect his conduct in the case?

Pontius Pilate, for his part, had several very good reasons for the Remission:—

(1) He was willing to show an act of courtesy to a neighbouring tetrarch, with whom questions of jurisdiction, or of boundary, might easily arise from time to time.

(2) He was desirous to be reconciled to Herod, with whom a serious difference had arisen from causes of which we have already made mention (page 199).

(3) Above all he was anxious to transfer his responsibility in the case before his Court. He was at this time unpopular amongst the people whom he had oppressed, and some of whom he had slain. Complaints had been lodged against him at Rome, and he was in disgrace there. More than once he had been foiled by the Jews. Tiberius had already sent him a reproof, and bidden him to reconsider his conduct. It was advisable to avoid further complications: and this might be done by transferring the Cause to Herod’s Court.

This union of the two Palestinian governors against the Lord’s Anointed was fresh in the minds of the apostles, when they sang the hymn of praise in Acts iv. 24–30, quoting from the second Psalm; “Of a truth in this city against thy holy Servant Jesus, whom thou didst anoint, both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles and the peoples of Israel, were gathered together.”

Jesus before Herod

“When Herod saw Jesus, he was exceeding glad, for he was of a long time desirous to see Him, because he had heard concerning Him: and he hoped to see some miracle
done by Him.” And now his curiosity is gratified. Jesus stands before him, and is plied with many questions. The nature of these questions we can gather from S. Luke ix. 7–9. Herod Antipas had been much perplexed since he had beheaded John, and such questions as these were disturbing his mind:—Who was this new Prophet? Was He John risen from the dead? Was He Elijah? or one of the old prophets risen again? “Who is this,” he then inquired, “about whom I hear such things?” And he sought to see Him.

Now the opportunity has come. The Prophet stands before him. These questions can be asked, and other questions too.

But Jesus vouchsafes no reply. When He had been solemnly adjured by Caiaphas, He replied: when Pilate asked a question pertinent to the case He replied again. He had answers for Jew and Roman in council assembled; but he had no answer for this half heathen Idumæan, this adulterer and murderer. He meets him with “the majesty of silence.” He treats him with the contempt already expressed, when threatened with death, “Go and say to that fox, Behold I cast out devils. . . .” (S. Luke xiii. 32, 33).

The Mocking before Herod

Angry with this contemptuous silence, Herod delivers Jesus to his soldiers to be set at nought, to be derided as priest and prophet and king. Herod took part in this mocking, himself, but it was done mainly by his “soldiers” (R.V.); “men of war” (A.V.). These soldiers were doubtless a part of the band to which those στρατευόμενοι belonged, to whom S. John the Baptist had given advice (S. Luke iii. 14), and who were soldiers on the march, engaged in active warfare, at the time: perhaps the force sent by Antipas against Aretas, the father of the wife whom he had repudiated in order to marry Herodias. These soldiers who mocked Jesus must have been a mere
handful of men: yet the phrase used is suggestive of a large number: σὺν τοῖς στρατεύμασιν αὐτοῦ, “with his armies.” This the Latin version judiciously narrows down to cum exercitu suo, and the R.V. to “soldiers.” It is a curious use of the word for a small band.

The robe in which our Lord was arrayed has given rise to some discussion. Was it purple or white? Edersheim considers it impossible to say. Bishop Haneberg suggests that it was an old high-priestly garment of the Maccabees. Dean Luckock thinks it was a white robe, which may have been chosen in mockery to indicate that He was candidatus, seeking the kingly office. Dean Plumptre traces in this a vindictive retaliation for His denunciation of those Herodian courtiers who were “gorgeously apparelled.” The Vulgate renders it “indutum veste albâ.” Theodore Beza translates “amictum veste splendidâ.” Dean Farrar gives “a festal and shining robe,” “probably a white festal garment.” Dr. Kitto, “a gorgeous purple robe, doubtless one of his own.” A.V. “gorgeous robe.” R.V. “gorgeous apparel.”

Thus there is a great variety of opinion. S. Luke’s words are περιβαλὼν αὐτῶν ἐσθῆτα λαμπράν.

Ἐσθήτα is simply a general expression for a robe or garment.

Λαμπρός, as used in the New Testament, always points to something bright, resplendent, shining, and presumably white in colour, from λάμπω to shine. Thus in Rev. xv. 6, xxii. 1, 16, it is applied to “precious stone, pure and bright”—“a river of water of life, bright as crystal”—“the bright, the morning star,” and in Rev. xviii. 14, “all things that were dainty and sumptuous.” The application, in these passages, to precious stones, to stars and to flowing water, obviously indicates things resplendent and brilliant, without the idea of special colours.

Just the same idea is conveyed in the use of the same word for raiment, as in Acts x. 30 the angel that appeared to Cornelius “in bright apparel,” and S. James ii. 1, 2, the man that might come into a church assembly “in fine clothing.”
In the account of the Transfiguration, our Lord’s raiment is described by S. Mark (ix. 3) as “glistening exceeding white; so as no fuller on earth can whiten them;” and by S. Luke (ix. 29) as “white and dazzling.” S. Matthew (xvii. 2) in the same narrative, speaks of our Lord’s garments as being “white as the light,” and says that “His face did shine (ἐλαμψε) as the sun.” In all these passages the word λαμπρὸς points rather to brilliancy than to colour. To these we may add Herod Agrippa’s “royal apparel” in Acts xii. 21. The words there are ἐσθήτα βασιλικήν, but the raiment described by Josephus, as worn upon that occasion, was “made wholly of silver, and of a contexture truly wonderful, and being illuminated by the fresh reflection of the sun’s rays upon it, shone out after a surprising manner” (Antiq. xix. 8, 4).

From the consideration of these passages, we should gather that the robe in which Herod’s soldiers arrayed our Lord in mockery, was a white robe, bright and shining, such as kings would wear upon the throne, or angels from the realms of light. The placing on Him this robe mocked His claim to be a king, for white was the royal colour amongst the Hebrews.

Thus was our Lord “despised and rejected of men; a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief,” according to the prophecy of Isaiah (liii. 3).

After heaping these insults on the true “King of the Jews,” Herod sent Jesus back again to Pilate; an act, courteous indeed towards his fellow-dignitary; but prudent also, so far as he himself was concerned, for a charge of Majestas was one with which it was very inexpedient to be associated. “The Idumean fox” (says A. T. Innes) “may have dreaded the lion’s paw, while very willing to exchange courtesies with the lion’s deputy.”
Jesus Again Before Pilate

The trial, already concluded by a Sentence of Acquittal, once more begins anew. The Jewish-crowd, instigated by the chief-priests, are dissatisfied with the sentence: and Jesus, twice acquitted, is again put on trial. Then follows a veritable phantasmagoria of injustice and brutality to the Accused, of alternate conciliation and expostulation towards the prosecutors, ending in the defeat of the Judge.

For nearly two hours Pilate is face to face with a raging mob, crying out for Blood! For two hours, like a caged lion, he paces to and fro, in and out of the Praetorium, on the judgment seat and off; all the while pelted with insults which he is compelled to pocket, and threatened with vengeance in the form of complaints to his superior at Rome.

In vain does he try experiments. He puts forward one plan after another, only to be rejected. He fights against injustice, for after all he was a Roman: he resists the reversal of his own judgment in the case: he spends the early morning seeking to save an Innocent Man. Surely we must pity him.

We regard him with feelings of mingled sympathy and contempt—sympathy with a man contending for justice against overwhelming odds; contempt for a man possessed of almost supreme power, and yet afraid to wield it. Here was a man who in the past had smitten right and left, without remorse, now cowering before a furious mob, in abject fear of being deposed from office. While we pity him for his unfortunate position, we must perforce at the same time despise him for his cowardice.

Barabbas

Pilate must have been vexed and troubled beyond measure, that his prisoner should be returned to him. What was he to do? He must again face that hostile crowd—that crowd which was continually increasing in numbers, and redoubling its
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furious demands. He summons the chief-priests and rulers and the people before him, and announces that the Accused has been twice examined and twice acquitted; that the question whether He has been guilty of a capital crime has been specially considered, and that "nothing worthy of death hath been done by Him" (in A.V. "unto him," i.e. Herod—a misconception). Accordingly Pilate suggests that he should be permitted to chastise Jesus, and then release Him. An unjust judge indeed! to punish and degrade an innocent man! Thus he tramples upon justice, in preparation for a descent to lower depths.

Presently amid the clamour the idea occurs simultaneously to all present that there was a custom at festival times to set a prisoner free. It is not known when the custom arose, whether it was of long standing, or was introduced by Pilate himself. Some have asserted that it was an old Paschal custom, in commemoration of the deliverance from Egypt. Others, connecting it with the Roman practice of the release of prisoners at a lecisternium, or feast in honour of the gods, have supposed it to have originated with the rule of the Roman government in Palestine. Pilate himself says, "Ye have a custom that I should release unto you one at the Passover." Both sides are aware of the custom, and Pilate suggests that he should set Jesus free. The people, however, incited by the priests, demand the release of Barabbas.

Barabbas was the son of "Abba," i.e. of a noble or famous father: or he was the "son of a Rabbi." In either case, he would have been a man of note, "a notable prisoner," as S. Matthew calls him. The evangelists describe him as guilty of robbery, sedition and murder. Whether he was a common robber-chief, whose business was plunder, and whose misfortune it was sometimes to be compelled to sacrifice the lives of his victims: or whether he was a patriot, like Judas of Galilee, or maybe one of those Galilæans who had rioted when Pilate had appropriated the Corban for his aqueduct, it is
impossible to say. Most probably the latter. He was obviously popular with the crowd that thronged the Praetorium, for the cry for his release was unanimous.

Origen informs us that the majority of the MSS. in his day read “Jesus” before Barabbas. Olshausen, Meyer, De Wette, Ewald, Klein and Wordsworth accept this reading as authentic: but Alford, Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort reject it. It is now found only in five cursive MSS., and in the Armenian and Jerusalem-Syriac Versions. It was no doubt, as Origen testifies, the true reading in the ancient MSS., and would have been omitted for reverence sake, to avoid the coupling of the Sacred Name with that of a robber.

If the reading be true, then we see Pilate placing two men of the same name, side by side, and inquiring sorrowfully and reproachfully of the people, “Which Jesus shall I release unto you? Jesus Barabbas, or Jesus Christ? Whom will ye choose: Jesus the murderer, or Jesus the Saviour?” And they all cried, with one voice,

“Away with this man, and release unto us Barabbas.”

Thus they saved a murderer, and murdered a Saviour, as S. Peter sternly reminded them, “Ye asked for a murderer to be granted unto you, and killed the Prince of life” (Acts iii. 14).

Pilate’s Wife

While the question about Barabbas was in progress, one of his wife’s pages came to Pilate with an urgent message. He was sitting on the judgment-seat at the time, deafened with the cries of the surging mob surrounding him on all sides. The message increased his apprehension, for it contained a solemn warning. “Have thou nothing to do with that righteous man,” she wrote, “for I have suffered many things this day in a dream because of him.”

Her name is given in tradition as Procula, or Claudia
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Procula: she is said to have been a Jewish proselyte at this time, and to have afterwards become a Christian. The Greek Church, with its prodigal ideas of canonization, has numbered her amongst the saints.

In the ancient days of the Republic the wives of governors were not permitted to accompany their husbands to the provinces; it was forbidden by the old Oppian law, which however relaxed the strictness of the rule so as to allow of a visit in the winter. Quite lately a motion had been proposed by Cæcina in the senate to prohibit the practice altogether. It was not, however, passed; and consequently Claudia Procula was in Jerusalem without any breach of the law. Ulpian lays down the rule "Proficisci proconsulem melius est sine uxore, sed et cum uxore potest."

The dream of Pilate's wife has been regarded from several points of view:—

Some have seen in it the work of Satan, endeavouring to place obstacles in the way of carrying out the death-sentence, and thereby to hinder the work of Atonement.

Others have attributed the dream to "a reflection of the day-thoughts of a sensitive and devout woman."

Others again, and amongst them Origen, Athanasius, Chrysostom and Theophylact, have interpreted the dream as a divine warning intended to save Pilate from the crime he was about to commit. This was the usually received opinion in the early ages of the Church.

And indeed it is a wonder that Pilate was not more impressed than he seemed to be, for the age in which he lived was one that was much given to omens and other forms of superstition. Suetonius, in his lives of Julius Cæsar and Augustus, shows that they devoted much attention to such puerilities. But Pilate, like Julius Cæsar, was going to his fate. Cæsar's wife, like Pilate's, had been terrrified by a dream, and entreated him not to leave his house on the day of his assassination.
But other influences were actively at work with Pilate. The bloodthirsty crowd stood before him crying out "Crucify Him!" He was torn to pieces between the two, and the only effect of his wife’s warning was to increase his apprehensions.

There was no time for consideration amidst the cries, growing each moment more and more vehement, "Crucify Him!" One more effort he will make. He cries, "Why, what evil hath He done?" Here we see the unedifying spectacle of a judge—a Roman judge too—arguing with the prosecutors and the bystanders. Was ever such a parody of justice seen? Another moment, and he is overborne: he gives way to the clamouring crowd and consents to their demands. The prey, for which they had fought, is delivered into their hands. Once more may the prophet cry in anguish to the people, "Your hands are full of blood!"

Lavabo

Pilate is anxious, if it indeed be at all possible, to cleanse his hands from Blood. He refuses further participation in the Crime. It was the custom for a Roman judge to clear himself of blood-guiltiness when pronouncing sentence of death, by calling the sun as a witness to the justice of his sentence; and now Pilate, from long experience in Palestine, accustomed to the symbolic method of the Jews, calls for water, and, almost in the very words of their law, exclaims, "I am innocent of the blood of this righteous Man," adding in the words of the priests and elders to Judas, "See ye to it."

So spake the Psalmist (xxvi. 6), "I will wash my hands in innocency," "Lavabo inter innocentes manus meas." Such also was the practice of the elders of a city in the case of a murder, the author of which was undiscovered. They washed their hands over the appointed sacrifice, and exclaimed, "Our hands have not shed this blood, neither have our eyes seen
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it" (Deut. xxi. 7). Pilate's act was a solemn and striking appeal to the people, accompanied by familiar words and symbolic action which ought to have gone straight to their hearts.

But his appeal failed. The people accepted his challenge, and replied, "His blood be on us and on our children." They pervert the prayer of Deut. xxi. 8, "Lay not innocent blood unto thy people of Israel's charge," into an awful imprecation on themselves and on their children: and their cry was heard in Heaven.

The curse was upon them. It is written in letters of blood in the pages of their own historian. Within thirty years from this self-imposed imprecation, many of the best and noblest of the Jews, among them some of the very men who joined in the imprecation, were insulted and scourged, and some of them crucified, on that very spot, within sight of that Prætorium: and a few years later their Temple and City were destroyed; Jerusalem once more became a desolation, and more than a million souls perished during the siege, besides 97,000 carried into captivity (Jos., B. J. vi. 9, 3). "It seemed," as Renan said, "as though the whole race had appointed a rendezvous for extermination."

And the curse was, yea is, upon their children. Their whole system of religion was destroyed. It was a religion of sacrifices, of sacrifices which must be offered at one place only, and that place has been destroyed: and now the spectacle is presented to us of the most religious race of antiquity forcibly prevented from the exercise of their religion. The City lies in ruins; the land that once flowed with milk and honey is a desolation; and the People, once a "peculiar people," consecrated to Jehovah as His own, are "wandering Jews," from land to land, from century to century, all through the ages, down to this very twentieth century. The Burden of the Innocent Blood clings to them still; the Curse is not removed.
The Scourging

The Judge has missed his opportunity. "Fiat Justitia, ruat cœlum" should have been his guiding principle, as of old had been the boast of the Roman people.

The unjust Judge covers himself with everlasting shame. He gives sentence that what was asked for should be done. He signs the Death-warrant. "He released him that for insurrection and murder had been cast into prison, whom they asked for; but Jesus he delivered up to their will," although final and formal judgment has not yet been pronounced.

May we here notice the phrase employed by S. Mark (xv. 15)? "Wishing to content the multitude." βουλόμενος τῷ ὕπερ τὸ ἱκανόν ποιήσαι. It is one of the Latinisms found in S. Mark: volens populo satisfacere.

It was the custom amongst the Romans to scourge a condemned prisoner, and Jesus is delivered over to the soldiery for that purpose—another act of monstrous injustice as well as cruelty; for He had already been twice declared free of fault. This horrible punishment, preliminary to the cross, was inflicted with such barbarity that it was known as "the intermediate death": and indeed the victim usually swooned during the process, and not infrequently died before he reached the cross. The stripes were laid on with the whip, and not with rods, for Pilate had no lictors to attend him. "Flagellis cædebantur apud Romanos servi (liberi virgis) et fere capite damnati, nudi et ad columnam adstricti, antequam in crucem agerentur" (Cicero, Verr. v. 66). The scourge was furnished with leather thongs loaded sometimes with balls of lead, or with sharp-pointed spikes or pieces of bone, which mangled back and chest, and left the fainting victim a mass of wounds and bruises. "Flagella erant aculeata, ossiculis pecunis fere catenata, unde 'horribile
flagellum' dicit Horatius" (Sat. i. 3, 119). "Flagellum" is the word employed by S. Matthew and S. Mark; φραγελλώσας.

Stripped to the waist, with hands tied, and body leaning forward, the condemned man was bound to a column, while the lashes were laid on by the executioner. Captain Warren believed that he had discovered, in a subterranean chamber at Jerusalem, the site of the Scourging of our Lord. He describes it as "a truncated column, no part of the construction, for the chamber is vaulted above the pillar, but just such a pillar as criminals would be tied to, to be scourged." The chamber itself is stated by Fergusson to be not later than the time of Herod.

Thus Pilate scourged a prisoner whom he himself three times pronounced to be innocent (S. John xviii. 38; xix. 4, 6). So did the Innocent suffer for the guilty. "He was wounded for our transgressions, He was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon Him; and with His stripes we are healed" (Isaiah liii. 5).

The Third Derision

Even now, after this cruel torture, the preliminary penalty is not fully satisfied. Already had Jesus been derided by the ἵππες τῶν of the Sanhedrists, and by the στρατεύματα of Herod: He is now for the third time derided, by the brutal soldiery of Pilate. This also, like the flagellation, was a customary addition to the tortures of the condemned, in the provinces.

This outrage was committed in the barrack-room of the Prætorium, by the whole band, or cohort—the σπείρα which had been granted by the governor to aid in the apprehension of the Accused. It consisted mainly of the auxiliary troops of which the larger part of the forces under a provincial governor like Pilate would consist. The few Roman legions amongst them, as Roman citizens, would have had little
sympathy with such brutalities, but would be powerless to prevent them.

The chief-priests' servants had derided Jesus as the Prophet, striking Him with their open palms and bidding Him "prophesy"; treating Him as one accused of blasphemy. The accusation before Pilate was that He claimed to be a King. The derision by the soldiers therefore was directed to this charge: the band of soldiers made pretence that He was King, clothing Him in purple, crowning Him with thorns, placing in His hand a reed, and bowing the knee before Him. The tenses in the original indicate that these acts of derision were continuous; the soldiers kept marching around Him, pretending to kneel as they passed; they continued for some time to mock and to smite Him. The words are ἐνέπαυγον, ἐτυπτόν (Matt.); ἐτυπτόν, ἐνέπαυγον, τιθέντες, προσεκύνων (Mark); ἔλεγον, ἔδιδον (John).

A few notes on the Robe, the Crown and the Sceptre are needed:—

The Robe, in S. Matthew, is "a scarlet robe," in S. John "a purple garment"; in S. Mark, simply "purple."

The ἴματον of S. John is a general term for a garment, or raiment, but usually indicating the upper garment, the cloak or mantle.

The χλαμύς, chlamys, of S. Matthew, was also an upper garment, worn over the tunic; but smaller than the ἴματον, of thinner material, and more brilliant in colour; oblong in shape, instead of square. It was often of a purple colour, and inwrought with gold. It may be identified with the Latin paludamentum, the military cloak worn by generals of the army, and by the emperors in their capacity as military commanders. It was fastened on the right shoulder with a fibula, i.e. a pin, brooch or clasp. Senators, patricians and military tribunes wore also the laticlave, a broad purple stripe, as a mark of distinction.

This special "robe" may have been some disused cloak
of Pilate's. It certainly was not, as some have suggested, the "gorgeous robe" with which Herod's soldiers invested Jesus; for that, as we have shown, was white and shining.

The colour is given by S. Matthew as "scarlet," and by S. Mark and S. John as "purple." The same colour, however, is meant, the ancients being not so careful in the discrimination of colours as we are, they having been partially colour-blind. The distinction between scarlet and purple is of course that there is more blue in the latter.

Κόκκινος, the word used by S. Matthew, means dyed with the scarlet κόκκος, a grain or berry; or more properly a small insect inhabiting the leaves of the quercus cocciferus, or holm-oak, which was anciently used for dyeing, and was then supposed to be the berry of a plant.

Πορφύρεος, the expression in the other two evangelists, was from πορφύρα, purpura, a kind of shell-fish formerly used in dyeing purple.

The Crown. The acanthus-plant, the leaves of which formed the Crown of thorns, cannot be easily identified, the word ἄκανθα having a vague meaning. It may have been the plant brank-ursine, or bear's-foot: but was more probably the Zizyphus Spina Christi, a plant common in the East, the "nebk," a shrub growing abundantly in the Jordan valley, with branches easily bent to shape, and leaves of a dark glossy green, likeivy, and armed with small sharp spines.

The Sceptre. The κάλαμος, a reed, or cane, a wand or staff, is even more vague. It may have been the stalk of a sugar-cane, a papyrus, or an arundo. The word points merely to some kind of wand.
Ecce Homo

The synoptic Gospels pass from the mocking to the Crucifixion; but St. John details further attempts of the Judge to set the Prisoner free. Pilate brings Jesus out again into the court-yard, and places Him before the tumultuous crowd, hoping that the pitiable spectacle He presented would stir up compassionate thoughts in their hearts. Jesus stands before them wearing the Crown of thorns and the purple Robe. And the Judge, pointing to the tortured Victim, exclaimed in words rendered famous by the masterpieces of mediaeval art, “Behold the Man,” Ecce Homo.

But all in vain: compassion has no place in their hearts. “Crucify Him! Crucify Him!” is the reiterated cry. A second time Pilate bids the priests deal with the case themselves; a third time he pronounces Jesus innocent of all offence. Again in vain.

Pilate, the unjust judge, conscience-smitten, and tormented with fears that his prisoner perchance is descended from the gods, enters upon another futile and illegal examination; after which he continues his efforts at release, until, at length, the chief-priests let loose their last shaft. “If thou release this man, thou art not Cæsar’s friend: every one that maketh himself a king speaketh against Cæsar.” Up to this stage they had held this shot in reserve, for they had been unwilling to provoke the procurator’s wrath, not knowing how he would take such a threat. He had been arbitrary and merciless on other occasions: Might he not be so now? But Pilate’s persistence renders them desperate, and they determine to resort to the last argument they held. If this Man is released, Cæsar shall hear of it!
Gabbatha

The priests have won the day. They have broken down Pilate's resistance. He perceives that the Jewish rulers and the Jewish people are unanimous. It would not be safe to hold out longer.

He resumes his place upon the seat of judgment, and proceeds to deliver the final sentence. But even now he cannot help making one more appeal. He had already exclaimed "Behold the Man!": he now takes a higher stand, and cries "Behold your King!"

Once more in vain. On all sides the horrible cry is heard, "Away with Him! Away with Him! Crucify Him!" One final attempt Pilate will make, hopeless though it be, "Shall I crucify your King?" The dreaded name of Cæsar is again introduced. "We have no king but Cæsar."

It is useless to contend further. Just now the question had been, Shall the Robber or the Saviour be released? It has come at length to this, Shall the Judge or the Accused be condemned? for, if Pilate sets Jesus free, the priests will report him at Rome. To save himself, therefore, he who had just acquitted the guilty, now condemns the Innocent.

The Judge takes his seat upon the bench, and pronounces a sentence which is a triumph of injustice: and then delivers Jesus to be crucified.

The scene of these events was the paved court in front of the Praetorium, called Gabbatha, or the Pavement, Λιθόστρωτον (from λίθος and στρώματος). The Hebrew word, says Edersheim, means "a rounded height," and was so called from its outlook over the City. It was an elevated spot, with its floor adorned with the tesselated pavement of marble and coloured stones, characteristic of the Roman buildings of this period, and especially of a praetorium. Thus the Hebrew name, Gabbatha, describes its shape and situation, and the Greek
word, Lithostroton, the material of which it was constructed. From Suetonius we learn that Julius Cæsar was accustomed to take with him from place to place the materials for the formation of such pavements. This, however, at Jerusalem, was no doubt permanent, like those other pavements with which, as Josephus informs us, the Temple was adorned.

The Bema, or tribunal, βημα, was a portable seat, chair or throne, placed upon this pavement for the occasion.

Pilate ascends this tribunal, and gives sentence. Such a sentence must be pronounced in public, and in the presence of the accused. In the case of Crucifixion, the words of the Sentence would be, to the prisoner, "Ibis ad Crucem." The Judge would then bid the official to execute the Sentence, by pronouncing the words, "I, miles, expedi crucem."

The transaction, in the case of our Lord, was so all-important in its nature, that S. John pauses to note the day and the hour.

The day was the παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα the Preparation of the Passover, "the Friday in Passover week," as Edersheim explains it.

The hour was "about the sixth," a statement which lands us in a difficulty, and which has been variously explained or evaded.

(1) It is supposed by some that S. John here reckons the hours from midnight, as we do; and that consequently "about the sixth hour" means that between six and seven on that Friday morning, the proceedings before Pilate commenced.

(2) Others hold that the final judgment was pronounced at that hour, and that about two hours would be required for the preparation for the execution of the sentence, and the journey along the Via Dolorosa.

(3) Again, it is said that some MSS., viz. Codex Bezae, and Cod. Reg. 62, here read ἑτεριν in S. John, as in S. Mark.
Pilate and Majestas

(4) A favourite explanation depends upon the ancient employment of letters of the alphabet instead of numbers, and that some early transcriber mistook the sign for the "third," and transformed it into that for the "sixth."

All that we can say with certainty is that the actual Crucifixion commenced, as S. Mark testifies plainly, at the third hour, or nine in the morning: and we may assume that S. John's statement points to an earlier hour, when the preliminary proceedings were only partly carried through.

Summary

We have now traced the sorrowful and shameful tale of the Trial of the Lord Jesus Christ to its close; and as, during the progress of the Trial, it was found necessary, now and again, to turn aside for a time in order to discuss various collateral questions, we may, in conclusion, sum up the whole case, with the utmost brevity.

Regarded from a forensic point of view, the narratives of the four Evangelists may be summarily grouped under four heads, or distinct stages of the proceedings, of which the first and the third appear to have been legal, the second and fourth the very reverse.

These four stages are:—

1. The preliminary proceedings as far as the delivery to the Sanhedrin.
2. The Trial before the Sanhedrin.
3. The Trial before the Procurator.
4. The subsequent events.

1. The arrest in the Garden of Gethsemane, and delivery of the Accused to a magistrate, and the subsequent commitment of the Prisoner for trial, appear to have been legal.

In these proceedings there was a co-operation of the Jewish and Roman authorities. The arrest was effected by the apparitors of the Sanhedrin, with the consent of the high-
priest, aided by the active support of a cohort of Roman soldiers.

2. As this arrest was effected by night, the next step after commitment should have been the detention of the accused in custody until He could be legally brought before the Council for trial, a proceeding which was followed in the case of the Apostles; "They laid hands on them, and put them in ward unto the morrow: for it was now eventide" (Acts iv. 3). This was not done in the case of our Lord. He was put upon trial immediately, though it was night. The whole trial before the Sanhedrin, therefore, being conducted contrary to Jewish law, was null and void.

3. The brief trial before Pilate (S. John xviii. 33–38), ending in acquittal, was justifiable by Roman law, as customarily administered in the provinces.

4. The whole of the subsequent proceedings can only be characterised as a mere travesty of Justice. The Judge, under pressure from the mob, instigated by the furiously jealous hierarchy, lost his head entirely, and converted the trial into a triumph of Injustice.

**Retribution**

All the actors in this Tragedy suffered for their participation in the Crime. By suicide, by banishment, or by degradation from office, the traitor and the unjust judges were pursued by Nemesis, and overtaken by their doom.

*Judas*, in a fit of remorse, perished by a horrible death, self-inflicted.

*Caiaphas* was deposed from office.

*Antipas* was banished by the emperor, and died in exile.

*Pilate*, like Antipas, died in exile; and, like Judas, committed suicide.

*Annas* alone continued to flourish like a green bay-tree,
although even he suffered for his share, his palace being destroyed and his son slain.

And the whole nation of the Jews are to this day in their dispersion throughout the world a standing warning to all to keep their hands from innocent blood.

Speedy and severe retribution has fallen upon all the participators in the greatest Crime that ever disgraced humanity and polluted the world.
CHAPTER VII

CLAUDIUS AND THE JEWS

"Caligula," A.D. 37-41

Caligula does not come under our scheme, as he is not named in the New Testament, nor is any reference made to him there. But, for the sake of clearness, we may give a brief account of his reign, which lasted from A.D. 37 to 41. He appointed Petronius, A.D. 39, as the Imperial Legate of Syria in succession to Vitellius; and Marullus, as procurator of Judæa, in the place of Marcellus. To him also is due the elevation of his friend Agrippa I. to the "kingdom" of Judæa (Jos.; Antiq. xviii. 6, 11). While he was on the throne, S. Paul was in retirement in Arabia (Gal. i. 17-18), and was beginning to preach in Syria and Cilicia.

"Caligula" is a misnomer: his proper name was Caius or Gaius Cæsar. "Caligula" was a mere nickname. No contemporary historian gives him that name. He was the degenerate son of the noble Germanicus and Agrippina, and appears to have been a mere madman, as all his actions proved. He lived in incest with his sister Drusilla; and his profligacy and bloodthirstiness were such that no man's life, and no woman's honour, was safe from his assaults. His insanity was manifested by his making his favourite horse a member of the college of priests, and conferring upon him the honour of the consulship. Finally he declared himself a god, and demanded divine honours, masquerading in public in the character of Bacchus, Apollo, Venus or Diana. His mock expedition to Britain has made him a byword in history.
It was well for the empire and the world at large that a conspiracy was organised against this madman which brought his disastrous rule to a close; Jan. 24, A.D. 41.

Claudius, A.D. 41–54

During the confusion in the palace when Caligula was murdered, Claudius, who was of a cowardly disposition, had hidden himself from fear of sharing the same fate. He was in mortal terror when the conspirators discovered his hiding-place, but was much relieved, and greatly surprised to find, that, not only was his life safe, but his promotion secured. The prætorian cohorts proclaimed him emperor, in spite of a desire amongst the senators to restore the Republic. For this unexpected honour, he showed his gratitude by a liberal donation to each of the prætorian guards, an act which became a precedent to successive aspirants to the imperial throne. An elaborate account of all these events is given by Josephus (Antiq. xix.).

Claudius's full name was Tiberius Claudius Drusus Nero. He was the brother of the honoured Germanicus, and uncle to his predecessor.

Like Caligula, his mind was affected, but to a less extent. Caligula was a madman, Claudius merely an imbecile. He had sufficient sense, however, to have become a tolerable ruler, if he had only had good advisers. But he had been brought up amongst women and freedmen, and he remained all his life under the same influence. Two of the most abandoned women, in an age celebrated for the profligacy of its women, became his wives—Valeria Messalina, who was eventually executed for her profligacy, and Agrippina the infamous daughter of his brother Germanicus.

Claudius had several children, amongst them Drusus and Claudia, by Plautia Urgulanilla; and Britannicus by Messalina: but none of them were permitted to succeed him, as Agrippina
managed to secure the throne for Nero, her son by Cneius Domitius Ahenobarbus. When it dawned upon the slow mind of Claudius that these plots were in progress, he made a feeble protest—but all in vain, for he was only hastening his own death. Agrippina hired the infamous poisoner Locusta to administer a deadly dish of mushrooms: and when this plan only half succeeded, the murder was completed by more poison concealed in a quill and thrust down his throat.

It was a cause for regret that the good qualities in the character of Claudius were not allowed full play; but some of them came to the surface, as evidenced by the construction of the famous Aqua Claudia (the remains of which are still seen stretching across the Campagna) and the draining of Lake Fucinus into the river Liris. He was the author also of a history of the Civil War, which, though destitute of literary merit, displayed such impartiality in the narration of facts, that his angry relatives made every effort to suppress it. Other historical works came from his pen, none of which are extant. In these literary attempts he was encouraged by Livy.

During his reign Mauritania became a Roman province, and the conquest of Britain was commenced, and a province was formed in the south, A.D. 51.

During the same period occurred the First and Second Missionary Journeys of S. Paul (Acts xiii.—xiv., and xv. 36—xviii. 22): and the two Epistles to the Thessalonians were written.

The Famine

The references to Claudius in the New Testament are all found in the Acts, viz. xi. 28, xvii. 7, and xviii. 2.

The first of these is the prophecy about the Famine: "And there stood up one of them named Agabus, and signified by the Spirit that there should be a great famine over all the world, which came to pass in the days of Claudius. And
the disciples, every man according to his ability, determined
to send relief unto the brethren that dwelt in Judea: which
also they did, sending it to the elders by the hand of Barnabas
and Saul."

This famine was foretold by Agabus, the same prophet who
foretold the imprisonment of S. Paul by the Romans at
Jerusalem (Acts xxi. 11). These two incidents are all that
is known of Agabus.

Famines were frequent during the reign of Claudius. This
is testified by all the contemporary historians. Suetonius
speaks of the "assiduæ sterilitates," and of the consequent
rise in the price of the necessaries of life. Dion Cassius
and Tacitus tell of two famines in Rome, Josephus of scarcity
in Palestine, and from other sources we hear of famine in
Greece and elsewhere. We have consequently abundant
evidence to substantiate this statement of S. Luke's.

The cause seems to have been due to the carelessness of
Caligula about the supply of corn, rendering it imperative
for Claudius to take measures to provide a remedy soon
after his accession to power. In spite, however, of the active
steps taken by him, the scarcity continued throughout his
reign.

The date of this famine is given with sufficient clearness by
S. Luke. We must look for a widely-spread famine of a
serious nature. His words are λιμὸν μέγαν μέλλειν ἐσεθαι
ἐφ’ ὅλην τὴν οἰκουμένην. It was not a partial famine, but
one that caused universal distress, and it extended over "the
inhabited world," if we are to take S. Luke's statement
literally. Such a phrase in S. Matthew might be restricted
to Palestine, his outlook being chiefly limited to Jewish points
of view: but in S. Luke, with his wider sympathies, it is
almost essential to extend the meaning to the civilised world,
and to understand it in the Roman sense. We look therefore
for a widely-spread famine though not necessarily everywhere
in the same season.
The following considerations would lead us to fix the date to the year A.D. 45 or 46.

The passage in the Acts shows that the prophecy of Agabus was given before the death of Herod Agrippa, which took place in A.D. 44: and the return of Barnabas and Saul from their charitable mission of relief to the poor saints of Jerusalem occurred after the death of Herod. The prophecy and its fulfilment were not separated by any great space of time, as is evident from the promptitude with which the funds for the relief were collected and entrusted to the care of Barnabas and Saul.

On the other hand the latest date could be the last year of Claudius. Hence our limits lie between A.D. 45 and 53, presumably much nearer the former.

Josephus (Antiq. xx. 5, 2) informs us that the pressure of the famine in Palestine was felt under the procurators Cuspius Fadus and Tiberius Alexander, who were in office from 44 to 49: and that Queen Helena of Adiabene bought corn in Egypt and dried figs in Cyprus, to distribute amongst the famishing population (ib. 2, 5).

In the account of Agrippa's death it is stated that the people of Tyre and Sidon were fed from Herod's territory, which means that they received food from the cornfields of Palestine, where apparently the scarcity had not yet commenced: and the same passage may perhaps also hint that the scarcity in Phoenicia had already begun to be felt, so as to make the people anxious to be on good terms with Herod.

Thus the date of this famine may be assigned, with reasonable certainty, to one of the two years immediately following Herod's death, that is to A.D. 45 or 46.

The Jews

"Claudius had commanded all the Jews to depart from Rome" (Acts xviii. 2). The Jews have always been "a peculiar people." They regarded themselves as being under
the special protection of Jehovah, who had said, "Thou art an holy people unto the Lord thy God, and the Lord hath chosen thee to be a peculiar people unto Himself, above all the nations that are upon the earth" (Deut. xiv. 2). They seemed ever to bear in mind that in their Book it was written of the descendants of Adam that they should "be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth." They were apparently anxious to obey this injunction, as though it applied to themselves specially.

It was true that, when they came out of Egypt, Moses and Joshua would have hemmed them in by the sea, the mountain and the desert, within the narrow limits of the promised Land: but they were a prolific race; and they soon outgrew those limits, and spread throughout the earth.

Hence, at an early period in their history, as early as the Assyrian captivity (2 Kings xvii. 6 ff.), they began that expansion which afterwards became so marked a characteristic of their nation: and soon after the Return from the Captivity, they became practically ubiquitous, forming, as has been said, with the Greeks and Romans, "a third nationality—a remarkable people—yielding yet very tenacious: everywhere and nowhere at home, everywhere and nowhere powerful."

S. Luke and S. Peter (Acts ii. 9–11; 1 S. Pet. i. 1) testify to the extent of this Dispersion, showing that it embraced every quarter of the civilised world, "the expatriated elect of the Dispersion" (ἐκλεκτοῖς παρεπιδήμοις διασπορᾶς, 1 S. Pet. i. 1) exhibiting everywhere that adaptability to environment which enabled them to hold their own in every clime and nation.

They peopled the splendid but decadent Orient, where they dwelt on friendly terms amongst "Parthians, Medes, Elamites, Mesopotamians and Arabians." They competed with the enterprising Greeks in the eastern Mediterranean, in the provinces of Asia Minor; in "Cappadocia, Pontus, Asia, Phrygia, Pamphylia, Galatia, Bithynia, and Crete." They
ventured even to dispute supremacy in mercantile pursuits with the masters of the world. They passed to and fro along the Roman roads; they crowded the Roman vessels and filled their holds with merchandise. In Egypt, Cyrene, Libya, and in Rome itself thousands of this remarkable race were found—traders, merchants, teachers, interpreters, money-lenders, diplomats, soldiers, servants—they could turn their hands to everything—brain-work, handicraft, science, art, literature, music—nothing seemed to come amiss. They were good citizens in every city, industrious, sober, intelligent; loyal also to the ruling government everywhere, except when touched in their tenderest place: they would suffer no interference with their religion. This peculiarity was recognised by the Roman authorities, and the Jewish religion was registered as a religio licita.

Their merits were highly valued by Alexander the Great, and usually also by the authorities of the Republic and the Empire: but the tenacity with which they adhered to their religion, and the persistence with which they refused to conform to any other religion, frequently brought them into collision with the ruling powers in various countries.

In the time of S. Paul Jews were found in large numbers in Corinth, Galatia, Ephesus, Philippi, Colosse, Thessalonica. To the converted Jews in these places he addressed Epistles. In his journeys he met them in the cities of Syria, Asia Minor, and Greece.

No part of the world was free from their presence: and they were gathered together in extraordinarily large numbers in Alexandria and in Rome.

In Alexandria they were allowed to dwell together as a separate community, under an ethnarch or alabarch of their own. Josephus attributes this privilege to Alexander. But even if it be not as ancient as this, it is undoubted that Jews, in large numbers, were encouraged by the Ptolemies to settle in Egypt, and were endowed with special rights and privileges
of municipal self-government. In Alexandria they formed a considerable proportion of the population, and occupied two out of the five regions of the city. This was not by compulsion, as afterwards in Rome and other places, but it arose from the characteristic clannishness of the people. It has been estimated that about one-eighth of the population of Egypt consisted of Jews (viz. one million out of eight), the proportion, as we have just said, rising to nearly one half in Alexandria itself.

As a natural consequence of the association of the Jews in mercantile enterprises with the Greek-speaking populations around the Central Sea, the Jews acquired the colloquial use of the Greek tongue, and almost entirely abandoned the use of Hebrew as a living language. This rendered necessary the translation of the Scriptures into Greek, a work which was undertaken under the patronage, even at the request, of Ptolemy Philadelphus.

The Jews of the Dispersion far surpassed the comparatively small number who remained in the Holy Land, in every way. They were superior, not only in numbers, but in intelligence, in enterprise, in influence; and more particularly in wealth. One family—that of the Alabarch Alexander—occupied a splendid position, and wielded immense influence at Alexandria. Alexander himself was able to lend Agrippa I., without delay or difficulty, the large sum of 200,000 drachmæ. He was also a liberal contributor to the Corban at Jerusalem, and to the adornment of the Temple. He was high in favour at Rome, where Antonia, the mother of Claudius, appointed him her steward, Claudius himself showing him special favour.

Three of his sons became famous: one of them succeeding him as Alabarch, another marrying Bernice, and the third actually abandoning his religion in order to become Procurator of Judæa. Philo Judæus was his brother.

In the time of Ptolemy Philometor, the Egyptian Jews, finding their numbers greatly increased, and feeling their
dependency on Jerusalem, established an ecclesiastical organisation, which rendered them independent of the priesthood at Jerusalem, except for the great Festivals. This system originated with Onias, whose father the high-priest had been slain in Judæa. Onias fled into Egypt, and, after obtaining the sanction of the king and queen, Ptolemy and Cleopatra, he erected a Temple at Leontopolis on the model of that at Jerusalem, and established a kind of schismatical worship (Jos., Antiq. xiii. 3). Onias felt himself justified in this act of schism, because he himself was entitled to the high-priesthood, which had been appropriated by the Maccabees; and he quoted in favour of his act the words of Isaiah (xix. 19), "In that day shall there be an altar to the Lord in the midst of the land of Egypt."

Finally the importance of Alexandria in connection with the Jewish people, is seen in the fact that Herod the Great married the daughter of Simon, son of Boethus, from whom several of the high-priests were descended.

In Rome the number of Jews was great; though not to the same extent as in Alexandria. Many had been brought in chains to Rome, and sold as slaves. But the exercise of their religion, in which they displayed great zeal, rendered them unprofitable, and practically useless, as slaves. Many were accordingly set free, at a small ransom. And these freedmen formed the bulk of the Jewish population.

There were about 40,000 in the time of Augustus, which had increased to 60,000 under Tiberius, and continued to increase under succeeding emperors, in spite of occasional persecution. The Jews were always liable to hatred by the other nationalities, because they refused conformity to the religious worship of the various national deities, and insisted that there was no God in all the world but Jehovah. Wise rulers, however, appraised at their true value the commercial instincts of the people, and their loyalty to the ruling powers when they themselves were allowed the free exercise of their religion.
Thus Julius Cæsar and Augustus dealt liberally with them. They freed them from compulsory military service, and allowed the Temple didrachmon to be sent to Jerusalem as a voluntary contribution.

On the fall of Antony, Judæa was granted the status of a client-kingdom. Almost unlimited power was conferred upon Herod, always saving the over-lordship of Rome. The tribute imposed by Pompey was remitted.

In Rome, Augustus assigned to the Jews the 14th region in the suburb across the Tiber on the slope of the Vatican mount, and allowed them the free use of their own cemeteries, and the full exercise of the rites of their religion in the various synagogues in different quarters of the city.

With Tiberius there came a change, which Philo attributes to Sejanus, who appears to have held the Jews in detestation. In A.D. 19 their worship was prohibited, and they were banished from Rome, 4,000 of them being sent at one time to Sardinia as convicts. Tiberius himself, however, was not opposed to the Jews, and the persecution ceased on the downfall of Sejanus.

With Caligula came a change for the worse. He declared himself to be a god. Not satisfied with the title of divus or deified, borne by his predecessors, he determined to receive actual worship as a god, a claim which was naturally resisted by the Jews. When he ordered Petronius, his legate in Syria, to set up his statue in the Holy of Holies at Jerusalem, it caused such universal horror, that Petronius feared to execute the order, though he thereby endangered his own head. Agrippa II., then reigning in Judæa, under the patronage of his friend the emperor, ventured to intercede, and at a banquet persuaded Gaius to revoke the order. An embassy was sent from Alexandria, with the learned Philo as spokesman. The emperor received the ambassadors at Puteoli, A.D. 40, but gave them no encouragement; and there is little doubt that the Jewish rebellion would have been precipitated,
had not this insane monster perished a few months afterwards under the dagger of Cherea.

The policy of his successor Claudius was more favourable towards the Jews, under the influence of his affection and gratitude towards Agrippa II., who had rendered him useful service on his accession to power. Claudius confirmed the Jews in the possession of privileges granted by previous emperors. They were again allowed the free exercise of their religion, exemption from compulsory levy for military service, and some small modicum of self-government.

The Edict of banishment was probably issued during Agrippa's absence from Rome, which was from the year 50 to 52, while the feeble Claudius was under other influence.

Suetonius (Claud. 25) attributes the decree to the disturbances caused by "Chrestus." He says, "Judæos, impulsore Chresto, assidue tumultuantes, Roma expulit." It is a matter of debate whether this "Chrestus" was an insurgent under Claudius, or whether the word is used by Suetonius to indicate the Christians, under the erroneous impression that Jesus Christ Himself was still living.

Dion Cassius modifies this statement by expressing the difficulty felt in enforcing the edict, on account of the large numbers affected by it, and explains that these were not actually expelled from the city, but that the regulations concerning them were made more strict, and especially that assemblies, whether for public worship or for other purposes, were prohibited.

It would seem that the difficulty of banishment was insuperable, and the decree was only partially enforced. It is certain, however, from the testimony of Suetonius, that some of the Jews left Rome in consequence, and amongst them Aquila and Priscilla, who arrived in Corinth in the spring of the year A.D. 51.
CHAPTER VIII
SERGIUS PAULUS AND SUPERSTITION

We have already spoken briefly of Cyprus and of its governor (page 83); we will now give further notes upon the subject.

Cyprus

Paul and Barnabas, in what is known as the First Missionary Journey, sail from Seleucia, the port of Antioch in Syria, and land in Cyprus. Salamis, their port of arrival, was situated in the centre of Famagusta Bay, to the north of the modern Famagusta, and on the banks of the river Pedias, which flows from west to east, between the two lofty ranges of mountains, and is the only true river on the island.

At Salamis many Jews had been settled for several hundred years, who possessed several synagogues in the town, in which S. Paul, according to his usual practice, preached the new faith. Nothing is said of what happened there, except the brief statement that John Mark, who afterwards deserted the work at Perga, was their assistant, having been added to the party by Paul and Barnabas, doubtless at the desire of the latter. Barnabas himself (Acts iv. 36) was a native of Cyprus; and we hear of one Mnason of Cyprus (xxi. 16). The Gospel had already made converts in the island (xi. 20).

At the western extremity of the isle, separated from Salamis by a distance of rather more than a hundred miles, was Paphos, then the capital, and place of residence of the pro-
consul. The journey between these two towns could be made, either by the coast road, which would be shorter, or by the central road which ran through the site of the modern capital Nicosia. It is impossible to determine which they chose. The first would be more direct, but the second may perhaps be implied by the reading δανηυ την νησουν, followed by the Revisers, though not by the A.V.

The Proconsul

At Paphos, they no doubt pursued their usual plan of preaching in the synagogues to the Jews. But the news of the arrival of these new teachers would spread rapidly through the town, for S. Paul had studied rhetoric and philosophy at Tarsus, as well as Rabbinical lore at Jerusalem. Now the proconsul, whom S. Luke describes as "a man of understanding," was interested in these subjects, and had taken under his patronage a magus named Bar-Jesus or Elymas. Being naturally desirous to study these subjects more deeply, he sent for Barnabas and Saul to his palace, that he might "hear the word of God," i.e., according to his ideas, the new philosophy brought by these Jewish visitors. And he listened to them, as the Bezan reviser explains, "with much pleasure" —with more pleasure, indeed, than was agreeable to Elymas, who accordingly set himself in opposition, until checked by the severe reproof administered by S. Paul, and by the sharp punishment inflicted. The result of the interview was the conversion of the governor.

The proper legal title of the governor of Cyprus, at this time, as S. Luke, with his usual correctness, states, was proconsul or δνθωπατος. The island became a province, b.c. 58, and was at first united with Cilicia. When Augustus divided the provinces into two classes, b.c. 27, he retained Cyprus for himself, and appointed a legatus Caesaris, or prœfetor, as governor. But these appropriations of provinces to the
emperor and the senate respectively were not permanent, and were liable to change from time to time, as the varying circumstances of the provinces required. Accordingly five years afterwards he transferred Cyprus and Gallia Narbonensis to the senate in exchange for Dalmatia (Dio. Cass. liii. 12). And so it remained for about 140 years, when Hadrian resumed the government of Cyprus, and appointed an imperial legate. This position of Cyprus at the time of S. Paul's visit has received abundant confirmation. Coins of Claudius Cæsar, with Cominius's name as ἈΝΘΩΠΙΑϹ ΚΥΠΡΙΩΝ. on the reverse, are extant, and others with ΠΡΟΚΟΣ in Roman letters. There is also a lengthy inscription, given in extenso in Hastings's Dictionary, of about the date A.D. 55, which ends with the words “in the time of the proconsul Paulus.”

Nothing more is known of Sergius Paulus than can be gathered from Acts xiii. 6–12. But the Sergii were a Roman patrician gens, and Paulus was a cognomen used in the family. More than a hundred years later, viz. in A.D. 168, there was a L. Sergius Paulus, a consul.

Saul and Paul

The change of name, at this point in the history, from Saul to Paul, requires some notice. Various suggestions have been made as to the cause of the change; and these we will first state for the purpose of rejection. Such are the following: that the name of Paulus was adopted to commemorate the conversion of the proconsul, as the Roman generals adopted the name of a conquered country—that, by the choice of this name, Saul would contrast the persecuting king with Paul “the least of the apostles”—that the name “Paulus,” little, was given as a nickname on account of his small stature and insignificant appearance—that, as Simon Peter had two names, Saulus Paulus would not be a whit behind—that Romans and Greeks would pronounce as “Paul” the name which
was "Saul" amongst Jews and Syrians. These opinions we cannot accept, though some of them have the support of such men as Jerome, Chrysostom and Olshausen.

The fact was that it had been a long-established custom, especially amongst the Asiatic nations, to adopt Greek, and at a later date Roman, names when mingling in society or in business with those who spoke these languages. It was a practical step to take; it was also quite the fashion so to do. The Jews, who for several centuries before the Christian era had spread throughout the world, had adopted the practice. And thus a man might be known in the bosom of his family as Simeon, but when he went amongst strangers would be called Peter. Thus it was no doubt with S. Paul. He received the name of Saul at his circumcision, but added to that name the further name of Paul, not as a cognomen as a Roman would have done, but as a name for alternative use amongst strangers.

At first he was known amongst the "brethren" as Saul, and in association with Barnabas, the name of the latter stands first up to this point, and Saul takes the second place. In the list of prophets and teachers (Acts xiii. 1) Barnabas's name stands first of all, and Saul's last of all. It was "Barnabas and Saul" who were delegated for the missionary work, and ordained by the laying on of hands: and it was again "Barnabas and Saul" who were commanded to appear at the palace of the proconsul. But this is the last time. Henceforth the Apostle becomes "Paul," and takes the lead; and the order of the names becomes "Paul and Barnabas." The two exceptions (Acts xiv. 12 and xv. 12, 25) serve to prove the rule. The heathen of Lystra naturally gave the higher title to the more dignified, and the lower to the more active agent: and the elders at Jerusalem would also naturally place the name of Barnabas first, in virtue of seniority of age, and priority in the faith.

Thus from the time of the departure from Cyprus for the
wider work upon the continent, we recognise a new development of the Gospel; we see a new policy adopted by the Apostle to the Gentiles. He is no longer the Hebrew Saul, he is now the Roman, or rather the cosmopolitan Paul. He has taken to heart the lesson which S. Peter was taught in the case of Cornelius, that the Gentiles are to be gathered into the Gospel net. He has reverted to the great Commission which the Lord Himself gave to His Apostles, when He bade them to "make disciples of all the nations."

**Elymas**

In accordance with this almost universal custom of adopting a foreign name, a practice which can be traced back to the time of Joseph in Egypt (Gen. xli. 45), the Jewish "sorcerer" Bar-jesus had taken the title or name of Elymas, which in Arabic means "a wise man," and is cognate with the Turkish "Ulemah." S. Luke represents this as equivalent to μαγός, a Persian word taken over by the Greeks, to designate the wise men or priests of the Zoroastrian religion.

Bar-jesus was a Jew, but had chosen to call himself Elymas, that he might gain the greater honour as a wise man; and by this means he had obtained great influence over the mind of Sergius Paulus. In those days the distinction between true science and mere charlatanism and imposture was not defined: the one shaded off by imperceptible gradations into the other. Some professors were honest investigators of the mysteries of nature; others were mere ignorant impostors, dealing empirically with laws of nature which they themselves did not understand, and using them fraudulently as a means of imposing on the credulity of their clients. Between these two classes came those who would hover between the true and the false from sheer impossibility of drawing the line. Hence there was in those days hardly any distinction between natural science and magic, between astronomy and astrology,
between chemistry and alchemy, between medicine and quackery—in a word between the true and the false, between genuine philosophy and vulgar imposture.

A man like Sergius Paulus, "a man of understanding," an intelligent and open-minded man, would lean to the philosophical side; and, being inspired with a genuine desire for knowledge, would avail himself of such help as Elymas could afford him, without wandering into the by-paths of imposture.

On the other hand, with men like Tiberius, Gaius or Claudius, superstition would be in the ascendant. "The eminent men of the declining republic, and the absolute sovereigns of the early empire, were tainted and enslaved by superstition. The great Marius had in his tent a Syrian, probably a Jewish prophetess, by whose divinations he regulated the progress of his campaigns. As Brutus, at the beginning of the republic, had visited the oracle of Delphi, so Pompey, Crassus, and Caesar, at the close of the republic, when the oracles were silent, sought information from Oriental astrology. No picture in the great Latin satirist is more powerfully drawn than that in which he shows us the Emperor Tiberius, 'sitting on the rock of Capri, with his flock of Chaldeans round him.' No sentence in the great Latin historian is more bitterly emphatic than that in which he says that the astrologers and sorcerers are a class of men who 'will always be discarded and always cherished'" (Conybeare and Howson).

Even Augustus, whose common-sense should have saved him from such ineptitudes, was so penetrated by superstition that, according to Suetonius, he feared to be alone in the night, and carried about with him magical remedies to ward off dangers.

Sergius Paulus, apparently not so addicted to superstitious practices as the average men of his age, had doubtless learned all that Elymas had to teach him, and was glad of the opportunity of extending his knowledge by the aid of Paul, whose
expositions of Christian doctrine, so different from the theological conceptions of Elymas, would make a deep impression on his inquiring mind, and whose miracle of judgment, inflicted on the false prophet, would strike him with a sense of power.

The proconsul, who in an honest and good heart, had asked the procurator’s question “What is truth?” had at last after long search, found the Truth, the pearl of great price. Leaving behind him the dark and tortuous paths of superstition and a false philosophy, he had emerged into the light, and would henceforth walk in “the right ways of the Lord.”

**Superstition**

The prevalence of superstition in this age of the world was extraordinary, as all the contemporary historians testify, and is abundantly illustrated in the New Testament.

From the beginning of their history the Romans had been accustomed to place much faith in auguries, for the regulation of important affairs: and, as time went on, this faith was extended to smaller matters. In the later time of the Republic when the Oriental nations came into contact with Rome, many superstitious practices, hitherto unknown, were introduced to the Western world, and were adopted with avidity. A flood of soothsayers, astrologers, necromancers, diviners and magicians, was poured out upon the West, contemporaneously with the decay of the ancient faith in a higher power. And thus scepticism and superstition went hand in hand.

The educated classes had lost all faith in the sterner virtues which had made Rome the mistress of the world: and while general disbelief in the gods prevailed, the gods themselves were multiplied, and Oriental cults were welcomed from Babylon, Egypt, Phrygia, Syria, even from further India. And, not satisfied with this, the emperors themselves were
deified, and a real worship was offered to them in temples, with a special priesthood appointed for the purpose.

Illustrations of this prevalent superstition occur in the New Testament, and may be briefly noticed here.

In the Wise men, who came to worship the Infant Saviour at Bethlehem, we recognise the purer form of the Oriental philosophy. They seem to have been, in some sense, astronomers as well as astrologers, but were actuated by the modified monotheism of the Persian religion, the purest form of religion on earth at the time, with the exception of the Jewish.

In the dream of Pilate's wife we see the working of superstition upon the educated mind. Pilate, sceptic though he were, was affected by the message from his wife, and would have set his Prisoner free, had not a stronger influence been brought to bear upon him, in the threat to report his conduct to Cæsar.

We have already spoken of the sorcerer of Cyprus. We see the same influences at work in Samaria, at Philippi and at Ephesus.

In Samaria we come across another sorcerer, Simon Magus, who had bewitched and amazed the people by his pretended marvels, claiming, as many false prophets at that time had done, to be the expected Great One, endowed with power from God. It is related of him that he was the object of divine worship at Rome in the time of Claudius, and that a statue had been erected to him bearing the inscription "Simoni Deo Sancto." This however is doubtful; and Justin is supposed to have mistaken an inscription to the god Semo Sancus, the Sabine Hercules, for one to Simon.

In Philippi we see a supposed spirit of Python at work in the soothsaying damsels. This is understood by Dean Alford, as a genuine case of demoniacal possession, the spirit enabling her to utter false prophecies, being a δαιμόνιον μαντικῶν. Professor Ramsay represents the maid as being an
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ἐγγυστρήματι, or ventriloquist, and as actuated by a belief in her supernatural possession, and intuitively proclaiming S. Paul and his companions as the "Servants of the Most High God."

In Ephesus we come across exorcists, like those to whom our Lord refers in S. Matt. xii. 27. These Jewish exorcists at Ephesus had a wide reputation; and the sons of Sceva, hoping to obtain additional powers, and thereby to render themselves equal to Paul in this respect, imitated his method, and employed as the form of exorcism the words, "I adjure you by Jesus, whom Paul preacheth." But this incantation produced an unexpected result: the evil spirit, instead of being dispossessed, flew at them and drove them from the house naked and wounded.

Presently the news of this disaster to the exorcists spread throughout the city, and caused great alarm among the Jews and Greeks who practised magical arts. Ephesus was the chief seat of this form of superstition. Though it was mainly a Greek city, its manners and customs, the nature of its religion, and its very idols, were Oriental in character. The occult arts of Babylon and India were practised here, and formed a subject of study even to the educated classes. These things were not abandoned to such persons as "the strolling Jews, exorcists," mentioned in the narrative, who made these "curious arts" a matter of vulgar profit: they were treated as a science by the philosophers themselves. Books were written on the subject, which sold for large sums. What were called "Ephesian letters," Ἐφασία γράμματα, were celebrated throughout the world. Certain mystic words and symbols, such as "Aski Cataski Lix Tetrax," and other unmeaning combinations of syllables were inscribed on parchment, or engraved on the image of the Ephesian Artemis. These were worn as amulets, and pronounced as charms. This practice prevailed to so great an extent at Ephesus, that, during S. Paul's stay there, when a portion of these magic
rolls was collected and burnt, the value of them amounted to 50,000 “pieces of silver.” As Ephesus was a Greek city, these coins must be regarded as drachmæ, not as shekels; and the value in our coinage would have been about £1,800.

Further illustrations of ancient superstition are given in the Acts in connection with Lystra and Athens.

At Lystra occurred the healing of the congenital cripple (Acts xiv. 8 ff.), a miracle so wonderful as to induce the impression that the gods in human form had descended from Olympus. The Lystrans were worshippers of Jupiter, whose temple or image faced the gate of their city; and it was natural, when they saw the miracle, that they should suppose their own tutelary deity was paying them a visit. There were stories in the neighbouring Phrygia of the appearance of Jupiter and Mercury together. Ovid had related a beautiful story of the entertainment of these two divinities by Baucis and Philemon.

Hence the Lystrans came to the conclusion that they themselves were now being similarly honoured; and they identified the venerable and dignified Barnabas with the father of the gods, and the more energetic Paul, who delivered the message of the deity as the chief speaker, with his companion Mercury or Hermes.

At Athens the evidences of superstition are still more remarkable. While S. Paul was waiting there, “his spirit was provoked within him, as he beheld the city full of idols.” So it was literally. The expression “full of idols” is no figure of speech. When he landed at the port he was confronted with temples dedicated to Ceres, Minerva and Jupiter. At the Peiraic gate stood an image of Neptune, and a second temple of Ceres. Immediately within the gate were representations of Athene, Jupiter, Apollo, Mercury and the Muses—and in every street of the city were temples, statues or altars in such profusion, that it was said satirically that in Athens it was easier to find a god than a man. Pausanias,
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who visited the city about fifty years after S. Paul, gives an elaborate description of the works of art it contains, which reads almost like a guide-book. Every deity in the Pantheon was represented here; and neither god nor hero was omitted from the "objects of their worship," σεβάσματα. Truly did the Apostle charge them with being "somewhat superstitious"; or perhaps compliment them upon being "too religious," δευτεραμονευτέρους, too much given to reverencing gods and men. Besides the whole of the Pantheon, there were representations, in one way or another, of the Heroes. You would find there Hercules and Theseus, and all their companions; you would see the effigies of the Graces, the Muses, the Nymphs, even the Furies—and the great men of past ages, Pericles, Solon, Colon, Demosthenes, and also of those more recent as Hyrcanus, Agrippa and Augustus; and this devotion to religious objects of worship was carried so far that even attributes, such as Victory, Pity, Fame, Modesty and Energy, were personified, and honoured by the erection of altars.

Thus the city was literally "full of idols." And lest any should have been omitted, one of the altars bore the inscription, "To an unknown God," whom S. Paul, in his address in the Areopagus, identified with the true God, the Maker of the world and of all things therein.
CHAPTER IX
BERNICE AND MARRIAGE

BERNICE was one of the most profligate women of a profligate age, exceeding even Cleopatra in her sensuality and shamelessness. It is not a pleasant career to contemplate: we will pass it by with as rapid a survey as possible. Our only interest in her consists in the fact of her presence with her brother Agrippa at the examination of S. Paul at Cæsarea, after Festus had become procurator of Judæa. On that occasion, with her usual fondness for display, she made her entrance into the audience-chamber “with great pomp,” accompanied by the military officers and men of quality belonging to the city (Acts xxv. 23).

She was the eldest daughter of Herod Agrippa I., and the great-granddaughter of the first Herod. She was born about A.D. 28, being 16 years old at her father’s death.

Her first husband was Marcus, the son of Alexander Lysimachus, the Alabarch, or governor of the Jews at Alexandria; and on his death, she became at a very early age the wife of her uncle Herod of Chalchis, by whom she had two sons, Bernicianus and Hycanus. He died in A.D. 48; and thus at the age of twenty, she was already twice a widow.

She then took up her residence in Rome with her brother, Agrippa II., who was about a year her senior, and lived with him on such terms as to create the suspicion of incest, and to give point to the pen of satirists (Jos., Antig. xx. 7, 3; Juvenal, Sat. vi. 156). In Rome she made herself notorious,
and became a kind of professional beauty, a worthy compeer of the Messalinas and Agrippinas who then led the fashions in the Imperial City. It was said that the most brilliant diamond became infinitely more valuable, if it had once adorned the finger of Bernice, as a present from Agrippa to his sister.

"Adamas notissimus, et Berenices
In digito factus pretiosior; hunc dedit olim
Barbarus inceste, dedit hunc Agrippa sorori."

Juv., Sat. vi. 156.

Such scandal was caused by her conduct, that even Rome, the Paris of the first century, began to cry "Shame." And it was arranged that she should contract a third marriage. A husband was found without difficulty, in Polemo II., king of Cilicia, the last independent prince in Asia Minor. She was still young and beautiful, and, what seemed more to the purpose in the estimation of Polemo, she was wealthy. With some still lingering remnant of religious feeling, she insisted upon her husband submitting to the outward rite of the Jewish religion, which he was quite willing to do, and accordingly became nominally a Jew, though S. Paul, writing a few years after, and bearing such cases in mind, would have said "He is not a Jew, which is one outwardly, neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh" (Rom. ii. 28). It is possible that Polemo and Bernice were in Asia Minor about the year 52 when S. Paul was travelling in the same region.

The union, however, did not last for any length of time, for Polemo was a man of inferior talents, and Bernice, through mere wantonness, was craving for a life of greater excitement. She accordingly deserted her husband, and went back to her brother.

It was after this, about the year 58 or 59, that the brother and sister, again united, paid a complimentary visit to Festus, who invited Agrippa, as an expert in the Jewish religious customs, to examine his prisoner Paul.
It was some years later, in the spring of 66, that we find her in Jerusalem, influenced apparently by some revival of womanly feeling. She had undertaken a vow, probably the vow of a Nazarite, under the stress of sickness; and for thirty days she went barefoot, and at the end of the period sacrificed the locks of her head. While this vow was in progress, the Jewish war had broken out, through the high-handed action of Florus, the last of the procurators of Judaea. He seems to have deliberately incited the Jews to insurrection for purposes of his own, and had scourged and crucified Jewish citizens, to the number of as many as 3,600 in one day. Horrified by these massacres, Bernice appealed, bare-footed as she was, to Florus, and entreated him to stay his hand: but all in vain. The massacre continued, even in her presence, and she only saved her own life by taking refuge in her palace, and surrounding herself with her guards. Agrippa and his sister did their utmost to save the despairing Jews; but after their palace was burnt by the Jewish populace, they became supporters of the Roman cause and of the Flavian dynasty.

And now we hear of Bernice again, plunged into profligacy as of old: first as the mistress of the aged Vespasian, and next of his son Titus. This is testified by Josephus, Tacitus and Suetonius. She was now fired with ambition to attain the very highest position that the world had to offer to a woman, and Titus was so infatuated with her that he was desirous of making her his wife. She had lived in Palestine with him, and behaved as his wife, and in the year 75 she followed him to Rome, and resumed relations with him. Titus would doubtless have married her, but the proposal stirred up such indignation amongst the Romans, that he felt himself compelled to abandon his intention: and when she came again to Rome after the death of Vespasian, he took no notice of her. After this she disappears from the pages of history, and we hear of her no more.
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Bernice's career extended over the whole period embraced by the Acts of the Apostles, and the glaring vices of her life, as exhibited in her shameless immorality, her inordinate love of display and her insatiable vanity, were at their height when S. Paul delivered his address before the criminal couple. This address which we must not call a defence, made some impression upon its auditors; for, though we hear nothing of its effect upon Bernice, we find the assessors unanimous in their conviction of the innocence of the accused, Agrippa himself declaring, "This man might have been set at liberty if he had not appealed unto Caesar."

Marriage

Bernice, in her various marriages and other connections, was but one woman out of many. She had learned these evil ways from the "smart" ladies in the corrupt society at Rome, where such women as Messalina and Agrippina shone as brilliant stars in a black sky of deepest hue. The profligacy of women at that time was incredible. Luxury and extravagance, combined with immorality, were so rife, that marriage itself became discredited. Men feared to undertake responsibilities which would involve them in innumerable complications, and expose them to the danger of dishonour. Divorce indeed was easy, but marriage had become hateful. The holy associations of home, as they had existed under the ancient republic, had disappeared from society, and concubinage had taken the place of matrimony.

"The degeneracy and profligacy of the freeborn female citizens," says Niebuhr, "was so awful, that many a man who was no profligate, may have found a much more faithful and estimable partner in a slave, than in a Roman lady of high birth; and thus it was looked upon as a point of conscience not to marry." The children of such irregular unions occupied an inferior status; they followed the condition
of their mother. Thus it came about that the number of Roman citizens was constantly and seriously diminishing, and slaves and freedmen were increasing out of due proportion, until they constituted not merely the vast majority of the population, but outnumbered the rest by millions. It has been estimated that there were at this time throughout the Empire no fewer than 60,000,000 slaves.

The innocence, the purity and the romance had departed from the marriage union, which of old had lasted for life, but which, in these later degenerate days, was treated with such levity that divorce was a matter of constant occurrence, and it was difficult to remember, at any given time, who were husband and wife. Roman society had become so corrupt that the leaders of fashion amongst the matrons were reputed to reckon the passing years by the names of their husbands, instead of the consuls. And so Seneca wrote, "Non consulum numero sed maritorum, annos suos computant." The same writer gives a remarkable instance of a Roman matron who is said to have gone the round of eight husbands in five years.

Marriage was defined as a "union of a male and female, giving both a common lot throughout life; a union of all their rights, both human and divine." Nuptiae sunt conjunctio maris et feminae, et consortium omnis vitae, divini et humani juris communicatio." Such a union was called justus nuptiae, or justum matrimonium; and the right to enter into such a contract was called jus connubii, and was limited to Roman citizens.

Marriage was, in the eye of the law, a civil contract only: and no ceremonies, religious or otherwise, were legally essential to the contract. In ancient times the effect of marriage was to place the wife under the power of her husband, in manu mariti. She left her own family, where she had been filia familias, and she entered into her husband's family, and stood in the same relationship to him. The husband acquired all her property, and exercised over
her a kind of *patria potestas*, as though she were his daughter. This kind of marriage was known as *Matrimonium cum conventione uxoris in manum viri*.

Naturally marriage under such harsh conditions as these was distasteful to most women or their parents, hence the other form of marriage, *Sine in manum conventione*, was usually preferred, and at length became so generally adopted that the first form practically disappeared. In the case of marriage without *manus*, the wife was merely *uxor*, and remained under her father’s *potestas*, as before marriage. She was outside her husband’s household (*extranea*), and had no civil relation to her own children. She however retained the free disposition of her own property.

The usual preliminary to a marriage was the Espousal or *Sponsalia*, a mutual promise of marriage between the parties, though, in the case of the woman, her paterfamilias must also consent. No written documents or witnesses were required. Anciently this mutual promise, as under the laws of Latium, conferred a right of action in case of a breach of performance; but after the enactment of *Lex Julia de Maritandis ordinibus*, this promise could not be enforced by one of the parties against the other so as to compel marriage. At the sponsalia the young people became *sponsa* and *sponsus*, and were said respectively to *spondere* and *despondere*.

At the actual marriage no written documents or certificates were necessary, the marriage being contracted by the simple consent of the parties, according to the maxim *consensus facit nuptias*. The only essential ceremony seems to have been the bringing home of the bride, *deductio in domum mariti*. The whole transaction has the look of a contract completed by delivery of the goods.

There were, however, various customary ceremonies added to the verbal contract, which were picturesque, and pleasant to those who took part, though the absence of them did not deprive the marriage of legal validity.
Thus, corresponding with the two forms of marriage already mentioned, there were two kinds of accompanying ceremonies; the *confarreatio* and the *coemptio*.

The *confarreatio* was a solemn religious ceremony, before ten witnesses, in which an ox was sacrificed, and a cake of wheaten bread, *panis farrens*, was divided by the priest between the bride and bridegroom, in token of the common lot in life they were henceforth to share—the *consortium vitae* mentioned above. This form brought the wife into the *manus* of her husband, and was in consequence gradually disused.

The *coemptio*, at first in use only amongst plebeians, was afterwards adopted also by patricians, and employed in the place of *confarreatio*. It was a sort of symbolical purchase of the wife by her husband, in the presence of five witnesses.

There was also a third form, viz. *usus*, by which if a man lived for a whole year with a woman as his wife, she acquired the rights of a wife, and came *in manum viri*.

The following were the *usual ceremonies at a Marriage*, all of them without legal obligation, except the bringing in of the bride to her husband's house. It is asserted by some authorities that even this was not essential, but it was argued that, if marriage depended upon consent alone, such consent might be given even in the absence of the parties. Thus it came to be agreed that there could be no certainty of the fact unless the bride was taken to the house. From this consideration there arose the necessity of such delivery in order to make the fact of the marriage a matter of certainty.

The customary ceremonies took place at the house of the bride's father, or tutor. At the *sponsalia*, the question *Spondes ne?* and the answer *Spondeo* had been asked and answered, and the bridegroom and bride had exchanged gifts, called *Arrhae Sponsalitiae*. These gifts were of a substantial kind and were forfeited by the party in fault, should the marriage be broken off without good reason.
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At the actual marriage, certain ceremonies were usually observed which are strikingly similar to those in use amongst ourselves, and which in our marriage service are obviously a survival of those of ancient Rome. One of these, connected with the espousals, was the placing of a ring on the fourth finger, that finger being selected, as being supposed to be directly connected by a nerve with the heart. On the day before the marriage the bride put aside her *toga praetexta*, and other belongings of childhood, and put on the *tunica recta*, woven in one piece. At the marriage she wore a flame-coloured veil (*flammeum*), and a wreath of flowers upon her head. The marriage documents were signed in the presence of witnesses. The bride was given away by the *pronuba*, who joined the right hands of the couple, the bride uttering the significant phrase “*Quando tu Gaius, ego Gaia.*” There was also the *mustaceum* or wedding-cake; of which all the guests partook.

The preceding ceremonies were not always the same; but the invariable, and essential, and apparently the only legal part of the marriage rite, was the bringing in of the bride to her new home. When the sun was set, the bride was taken by force from her mother, in memory of the rape of the Sabines, and three boys, *paranymphi*, surrounded the bride and escorted her with lighted torches. Meanwhile the procession of servants, freedmen and clients, with musicians and torch-bearers, had formed, and led the way towards the new home, whither the bridegroom had already gone to receive his bride. On arriving at the house, the bride bound the doorposts with wool, and anointed them with swine’s fat. And now the door opened and the bridegroom appeared, holding in one hand a torch, in the other a bowl of water, and exclaiming “Who art thou?” to which the reply was made in words already spoken, “Where thou art Gaius, I am Gaia.” Then, bearing the distaff and the spindle, she was carefully lifted over the threshold, and set down safely in the hall.
The keys of the house were handed to her, and the newly-made man and wife touched fire and water, in token of their joint participation in the family hearth and religious rites.

Such were the beautiful symbolical acts associated with marriage in the purer days of the Republic; but they had lost all their significance in the dissolute age of the Empire. Small families, as in France in our own days, or childless marriages, had become the rule; and marriage itself was avoided as though under a ban.

Even when a couple ventured on the experiment, they did so with their eyes upon the door of escape ever ready to hand; for, as we have seen, divorce was alarmingly prevalent. The faculty of divorce had existed in Rome from the beginning of its history, but was very little used for five hundred years. There is, indeed, a statement by Aulus Gellius, that Calvisius Roga was the first to divorce his wife, 523 years after the building of Rome; but this is mere legend. Divorce had always been legal, though resort to it was so exceptional that it was practically non-existent. In the later ages of the Republic the leading men availed themselves of this means of deliverance, with great frequency. It was a private act, and could be effected without the intervention of a court of law: the wife gave up the keys, and left the house: the husband returned her dowry; and by this simple means the marriage was dissolved. Sulla, Cæsar, Pompey, Cicero and Antony put away their wives; and their example was generally followed under the Empire. These marriages, divorces and re-marriages succeeded each other so rapidly that the utmost confusion prevailed: and such laxity of morals was the result, that marriage was disparaged, and libertinism and celibacy became the order of the day. The old race that had conquered the world was fast dying out: Roman citizens were diminishing day by day, and a race of freedmen, foreigners and slaves was stepping into their place.

Some remedy became peremptorily necessary, and resort
was had to legislation. The *Lex Julia de Maritandis ordinibus*, passed B.C. 18, (or as some say A.D. 4), dealt exhaustively with the subject of Matrimony, with the view of coping with the abounding moral depravity of the age. It was supplemented in A.D. 9 by the *Lex Papia Poppaea*. These laws, sometimes cited simply as Lex Julia, or Lex Papia, treat of everything connected with marriage, such as betrothal, divorce, dower, concubinage, and the like. They impose severe penalties upon celibacy, and offer rewards and privileges to those whose marriages were fruitful. Hence the *jus trium liberorum*. They divide Society into celibates, parents, and the childless. The unmarried could not take property under a will, and even the married, if they were childless (*orbi*), could only take half. Neither husband nor wife could bequeath to each other, unless they had a common child. The property thus lost was called *caduca*, and the fruitful succeeded to the *caduca*. If no heir or legatee had children, this lost property was swept into the *ararium* or treasury.

The object of these laws was to increase the number of Roman citizens into some due proportion to the overwhelming number of freedmen and slaves. When, in after times, these provisions became less necessary, through the liberal extension of the privileges of citizenship by Caracalla and his successors, they were gradually modified. Caracalla transferred the *caduca* of the *calibes* and *orbi* (the unmarried and the childless) from the *ararium* to the *fiscus*, i.e. from the treasury of the senate to that of the Emperor: and Constantine almost entirely removed the disabilities of these two classes.

**Adoption**

It will be observed, as we go through this book, that there are, here and there, various points of contact between Roman Law and the Law of England. The amount of correspondence between the two is a matter under dispute. But in
regard to the law of Adoption there can be no difference of opinion—Adoption has never been recognised as a legal institution in England: whereas in Roman Law adoption was a very real thing. In England anyone is free to adopt whom he will; but the act is an entirely private matter, having no legal force. It can be embodied, if it be desired, in a deed duly executed; but the provisions of that deed fall within the province of the general law of the land: there is no law of adoption in England. This sometimes bears heavily on the adopted person; but he has no remedy.

In Roman Law, as we said, *Adoption was a very real thing.* The adopted son became a member of the family, just as if he had been born of the blood of the adopter: and he was invested with all the privileges of a *filius familias.* As a matter of fact it was by this means that the succession amongst the Cæsars was continued. It never descended from father to son. What with poison, divorce, luxury and profligacy, the surviving members of the family were few, the descent suffered constant interruption, and whole families disappeared. Thus the emperors were reduced to carrying on the succession by means of adoption. In no case amongst the Cæsars did the throne pass from father to son. A reference to our diagram of the Lineage of the Cæsars on page 43 will show that *Augustus* was the great-nephew of Julius Cæsar, and was adopted from the Octavian into the Julian gens. *Tiberius* was no relation at all to his predecessor: he was merely the son of Augustus’s wife, Livia, by Tiberius Claudius Nero. Here we have the introduction of another family—the Claudii. Augustus had previously adopted Agrippa and Marcellus, and two of his own grandchildren, Caius and Lucius Cæsar, the sons of his daughter Julia. An arrangement was made on the adoption of Tiberius that the latter should adopt his nephew Germanicus; the effect of which was that Tiberius became the son, and Germanicus the grandson of Augustus at the same time. *Caligula* (Caius Cæsar) was
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the grandson of Tiberius's brother, Nero Claudius Drusus, and was the great-nephew of Tiberius, as Augustus was the great-nephew of Julius Cæsar. Claudius was the nephew of Tiberius, and the uncle of Caligula. And finally Nero was the great-nephew of his predecessor Claudius, who had adopted him in the year 50 A.D.

From the preceding we see how large a part this system of adoption plays in the succession of the Cæsars, and what immense value and importance it possessed in the eye of a Roman. We, who think so much of blood-relationship, are surprised that a line of emperors should be continued merely by adoption: but we see that, in the estimation of a Roman, an adopted son was a real son.

Indeed this practice was not merely a convenience at this period—it had become a necessity. Many of the ancient patrician families were dying out, as a consequence of childless marriages. But they were revived by Adoption. The blood-relationship had worn itself out: the true, natural family had come to its end: but new blood was introduced by this legal relationship, and the old, honoured name gained a new lease of life. It was, of course, much to be preferred that the family-tree should put forth true branches only: but, in the absence of these, men must perforce be content with the foreign branches which had been grafted on to the original stem.

Adoption was of two kinds:—Adoption, properly so called; and Adrogation; the distinction between the two depending upon the legal position of the person adopted.

I. Adoptio. This term was employed when the person to be adopted, whether child or grandchild, was dependent on his father. The filius familias was subject to the potestas of his father or grandfather, whose control over him was absolute. The father of a family, paterfamilias, was the despot of the household. He possessed the same rights over his children, as over his slaves: he had his children in bondage. The
*patria potestas* deprived the son of the right to hold property; conferred on the father the right to inflict all kinds of punishment even to death; enabled him to sell his son into bondage, not however as a slave, but in *mancipio*; and gave other rights which, to our conceptions of justice, seem cruelly oppressive. In fact the whole idea of family-relationship was based so entirely upon the *patria potestas*, that a family was regarded in law as consisting, not merely of parents and children, but of the all-powerful *paterfamilias* and those under his *potestas*, including not only children, but other descendants, and wife, and adopted children, and slaves. The conception of blood-relationship was displaced by the conception of a number of persons subject to the same *patria potestas*. Thus the slaves were regarded as belonging to the *familia*; the married sister fell under the *potestas*, or, more strictly speaking, the *manus* of her husband, and was no longer related to the other members of her family for any legal purpose; and the adopted children took their place in the family upon equal terms with the rest.

Adoption was the transferring of a dependent person (*alieni juris*) to the power (*patria potestas*) of another: the transference from one family to another. The person adopted lost his rights in the family to which he originally belonged, and acquired corresponding rights in the family to which he was introduced.

This was effected in ancient times by emancipation *per as et libram*, and subsequent surrender to the adoptive father by the legal form called *in jure cessio*. This was a fictitious suit founded on the law of the XII. Tables, by which a father forfeited his *potestas*, if he subjected his son three times to a sale: “If a father sells a son thrice, let the son be free from the father.” Accordingly a triple sale took place, with two manumissions between. By the third sale the father lost his *potestas*, but retained his son as property, *in mancipio*. The adopter now by an action (*vindicatio*) before the Prætor
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claims the son as his own: the father offers no opposition, and the transaction is complete—the son has been transferred from the potestas of his father to that of the adopter.

This was the ancient form. But at a later date, a more simple form was substituted for this complicated transaction. The parties attended before the Prætor at Rome, or the Governor in the provinces, and the business was transacted by simple declaration, under the authority of the magistrate. This was called Adoptio quæ apud prætorem fit.

II. Adrogatio. When the person to be adopted was his own master (sui juris), the process was called Adrogatio, or Arrogatio. Gaius (i. 99) explains the meaning of the term: "This kind of adoption is called arrogatio: because, first, the man adopting is asked (rogatur), that is, questioned, whether he wishes the man he is going to adopt to be his legally recognised (justus) son; and then the man adopted is asked whether he will suffer that to be done; and lastly the people are asked whether they order it to be done." Then a vote of the people in the comitia curiata was taken, after the necessary questions had been asked, and a bill (rogatio) for the purpose had been introduced.

This was called Adoptio quæ apud populum fit.

The sanction of the Pontifex was essential, in order that the sacred rites (sacra privata) of the family of the arrogatus might be preserved, in the case in which he was the only representative of the family.

This arrogation by the vote of the people prevailed during the whole period of the Republic, and was employed by Augustus when he adopted Agrippa and Tiberius. After his time the rescript of the Emperor took the place of the popular vote.

There were certain restraints imposed upon the freedom of Adoption, the most important being that the adopter or arrogator should be older than his adopted son by the full period of puberty, that is by eighteen years at least; or by
thirty-six years in the case of a grandchild: for, says Justinian, "Adoption imitates nature; and it seems unnatural that a son should be older than his father."

III. Adoption by Testament. Niebuhr writes, "Octavius is the first example which I know of in history of an adoption by will; afterwards this was very often done." This statement is misleading, for there never was such a thing as adoption by testament. Julius Cæsar’s nomination of Caius Octavius as his son, had no validity if it stood alone: it would only operate as an injunction to the people to sanction the act. It was necessary that the nomination should be confirmed by a *lex curiata*. It was becoming a custom to declare in a Will that the testator acknowledged a certain citizen as his son. But this was void unless confirmed by a *lex*. This may be regarded, not as a case of adoption, but rather as a particular mode of nominating an heir.

The Effect of Adoption

"It created the relation of father and son for all practical purposes." "Adopted children, as long as they are held in adoption, are in the position of children born to us" (Gaius, i. 136). It involved a change of family, of name, and of home; and brought with it new responsibilities, and conferred fresh privileges.

I. A change of Family. The family of a Roman citizen was a little kingdom, in which the *paterfamilias* was autocrat, and all the other members subjects. Amongst the Romans there existed the same pride of family as amongst ourselves. They had, so to say, their county-families, with their patrimonial estates and historical associations, of which they were as proud as our own untitled nobility are of their armorial bearings and their numerous quarterings. Thus Tiberius, when adopted by Augustus, was not overwhelmed by the honour; for he esteemed his own *gens*, the Claudian, superior
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to the Octavian, to which Augustus belonged; or the Julian, into which he had been adopted.

Adoption involved the abandonment of his own family, and the transference of the adopted person to the family of another. He no longer belonged to his own blood-relations; he was under the potestas of another father; and, in the eye of the law, the potestas carried with it relationship equivalent to the ties of consanguinity. For all legal purposes his own brothers and sisters were his no longer: he had acquired others in their place.

II. A change of Name. The adopted person acquired a new name; for he assumed that of his adopter, and modified his own name by the termination -ianus.

Thus when Caius Octavius, of the Octavian gens from the municipality of Velitriæ, was adopted by Julius Cæsar, he became Caius Julius Caesar Octavianus. And similarly, when L. Domitius Ahenobarbus, of the Domitian gens, was adopted by the Emperor Claudius (whose full name was Tiberius Claudius Drusus Caesar Augustus) he became Nero Claudius Caesar Drusus Germanicus.

Thus in passing into another family by adoption, the adoptee dropped his nomen—his principal or middle name, that of his gens or clan—and assumed that of his adopter. At the same time his own nomen was displaced, and became, when modified, his cognomen; and he retained only his original prænomen, the forename which distinguished the individual members of the family.

To some persons this change of name might seem a matter indifferent: they might say,

"What's in a name? that which we call a rose
By any other name would smell as sweet."

Not every one, however, would take the change in so philosophic a spirit; for there are tender associations connected with a name borne during a happy childhood.
III. A Change of Home. There are usually still sweeter memories associated with a home. A man adopted in mature years would naturally feel the wrench involved in leaving the home of his youth and abandoning his own brothers and sisters and others related to him by consanguinity. It might become a real difficulty to accustom himself to live under fresh conditions, in the bosom of a new, and perhaps a strange, family. One cannot abandon the habits of a life in a moment.

IV. New responsibilities. Adoption might carry with it certain disqualifications: arrogation undoubtedly did so.

If it were a case of simple Adoptio, then the person adopted, being already alieni juris, dependent on another, as being under the potestas of his father, would be merely transferred from one potestas to another. He might not suffer any disadvantage in the process. Yet he would be required to abandon his own sacra privata, and to comply with the religious rites of the new familia.

If it were a case of Arrogatio, he, being sui juris, might himself be in possession of the potestas over others. His wife might be in his manus, or power: his children (if he had any) certainly would be held in potestas. When he gave himself in arrogation, he would lose his manus and potestas; and both himself and his children would fall under the power of his adoptive father. He would take an inferior position, and suffer a reduction of status—status permutatio, or capitis diminutio, as it was called. At the same time there would be a transfer of property; and in this respect also he would suffer loss.

Now let us consider these three items of deterioration—

(1) Detestatio Sacrorum. The sacra privata, or private religious rites of a gens or a family, were esteemed amongst the ancient Romans as of the highest importance. They involved the worship of the lares and penates—the household deities, the representatives of the deified founder of the gens.
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The images of these Lares were kept in the interior recesses of the house, in the place called the Lararium. And here was their worship carried on: hither also the religious Roman would resort to say his prayers. This worship must be kept up, though it might be costly; and the heir was bound, out of the property he inherited, to provide for the sacrifices required for the comfort of the deceased in the world of spirits. Hence the pontiff, in every case of arrogation, would require to be satisfied that this duty should not be overlooked. When this was ascertained, the person about to be arrogated (arrogatus) would comply with the ceremony known as despectatio sacrorum, which consisted in the renunciation of his own family rites, in order to share the cultus of the new family. It is easy to understand that a religious mind would feel a reluctance to make the change.

(2) Capitis Deminutio. The Status, or position held by a citizen, was summed up in the technical term Caput, which included the three principal heads of Freedom, Citizenship and Family rights. Under certain conditions a citizen was liable to the loss of one or more of these; and he was then said to undergo a reduction of status, Capitis deminutio. The loss of freedom carried with it the loss of the other two privileges, and was thus an entire destruction of caput. The loss of citizenship included the loss of family rights also. Thus the reduction of status comprised three degrees of degradation; as in the accompanying table:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freedom</th>
<th>Libertas</th>
<th>Maxima capitis deminutio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>Civitas</td>
<td>Media or minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family rights</td>
<td>Familia</td>
<td>Minima</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The arrogatus suffered the third reduction. Having been sui juris he became alieni juris; he lost his family rights, and fell under the power of another. He suffered the least reduction of status, Minima deminutio capitis.

(3) Loss of property. Another disqualification of the person
arrogated was the transfer of his property to his adoptive father (Gaius ii. 98); and such possessions as he might acquire afterwards passed from him to the arrogator. His children too, who had been in his power, became the grandchildren of the adopter of their father.

Thus a person might suffer serious loss by the process of adoption.

V. Fresh Privileges.

If there were losses, there were also gains. And the gains would outweigh the losses: otherwise an independent person would not bring himself under the power of another.

The chief gain was the capacity to inherit. If the adoptive father had no children of his own, the adopted son became his heir: if there were other children, the adopted son became co-heir. It was not necessary to name him in the will as would be the case under English law; for he stood in the same relation to the arrogator as the children born in lawful wedlock. In the case of intestacy also, the adopted son had acquired rights of succession.

S. Paul on Adoption

These considerations throw great light upon certain passages in S. Paul’s Epistles to the Romans and Galatians, in which he illustrates the relation of Christians to their Heavenly Father by comparing it with the legal relation between the father and son, brought about by adoption. Adoption would represent so much more to the Roman, than to the Briton, that such passages as we are now about to quote would strike him with so much the greater force.

And it is S. Paul, the Roman citizen, who treats of Sonship from the point of view of Adoption. In S. John and S. Peter the idea advanced is that of simple sonship, the natural relation by the ties of blood. Thus in 1 S. John iii. 1–12, where the phrase “children of God,” or “sons of God,” is
several times introduced, the idea is evidently that of blood-relationship; for these “children” are represented as being “begotten of God.”

But S. Paul, as a Roman citizen, valued this privilege of citizenship, and understood all that it comprised. He could defend himself in a Court of Law upon equal terms with a practised orator, such as Tertullus. He had evidently acquired a knowledge of Roman law in the course of his studies at Tarsus and elsewhere. And when he writes to the Romans, he deals with the subject of sonship in a more technical manner than his fellow-apostles; and instead of speaking of mere sonship, he imports the idea of adoption. This appears plainly in such a passage as Rom. viii. 14–17, ix. 4 and Eph. i. 5, in which such expressions occur as “the spirit of adoption”; and again, “if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ.”

He seems to say: God our Father has other children, the angels and other glorified inhabitants of Heaven. They are possessed of all manner of privileges, of immortality, of bliss supreme. But we, who believe in His Son, have become children of God by adoption; and in virtue of that adoption are equal unto the angels, co-heirs with them, even joint-heirs with Christ Himself.

This relationship by Adoption would carry with it similar privileges and duties as those under the Roman law. The Jews or Gentiles who had accepted the mediation of the Lord Jesus Christ had been set free from “the spirit of bondage, unto fear.” They had abandoned Judaism or heathenism, and had been adopted into the Family of God. Thus, as with the adopted son under the Roman law, they had gained:—

(1) A new Father, even an Heavenly.

(2) A new Name—the name of Christ, a “Christian” name: not the birth-name, but that one conferred at baptism when they were adopted by God.
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(3) A new Home. Hitherto they had been children of this world; henceforth they were inheritors of the Kingdom of Heaven. And in this new home, new relationships had accrued; and as the adopted son was on the same level in all respects with those born in the house; so the primitive disciples esteemed their Christian brotherhood a closer tie than that of consanguinity.

(4) New Duties. There must be, further, the Sacrorum detestatio. The gods worshipped by the brethren when in their unregenerate condition, must be repudiated and abandoned, and the Lord their God must receive their whole-hearted worship.

(5) Fresh Privileges. The adopted sons have gained a title to the inheritance of the saints in light. Fresh privileges are theirs which do not belong to them by nature. They are heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ, whom God has made Heir of all.

S. Paul on Patria-Potestas

This principle, recognised by Roman Law, is used by S. Paul as an illustration of our relation to the Heavenly Father. In Gal. iv. 7 S. Paul writes, "thou art no longer a bondservant, δοῦλος, but a son." The son, being under the power of his father, stood to him in the relation of a slave, as we have shown on page 273.

Again in the same passage, verse 1, S. Paul observes, "The child differeth nothing from a bondservant." In the old days of the Republic the power of the father over his children was absolute, even to the infliction of death; for he possessed the jus vita et necis. To some extent this right was restrained by the censors, when it was grossly abused: and under the Empire the magistrates had further powers of interference conferred upon them: but the principle that "killing was no murder" in the case of children, lasted until the time
of Constantine, A.D. 318; and later still, up to the time of Valentinian A.D. 374, the exposure of infant children was within the option of the father.

All these monstrous customs, giving the father absolute rights over the conduct, the property, and the very life of his children, were in full force when S. Paul wrote his Epistles to the Romans and Galatians. And in this connection it is interesting to recall the remark of Gaius, that this principle of excessive paternal authority was peculiar to Roman jurisprudence, except that the nation of the "Galatae" admitted the same principle. Whether he means the Gauls or Galatians cannot be decided; but, if the latter, then the language of S. Paul, quoted above from the Epistles to Rome and Galatia, acquires additional force.

S. Paul on Tutelage

This subject is incidentally introduced in Gal. iii. 23—iv. 4, in which passage the Revised Version employs technical terms, such as "kept in ward"—"tutor to bring us to Christ"—"under guardians and stewards"—"children, held in bondage"; and in 1 Cor. iv. 15 "ten thousand tutors in Christ."

S. Paul's words are παιδαγωγὸς, ἐπίτροπος and ὁἰκονόμος. The last two are not specially applicable to children, and we comment on them on page 315. The παιδαγωγὸς was the person, usually a slave or a freedman, who had the care of the sons of a family during their hours of recreation, and on their way to and from the public school; and who exercised general superintendence over them. This word is very aptly employed in the two passages already quoted.

Amongst the Romans Infancy lasted until the age of seven: puberty was fixed at twelve for girls and fourteen for boys: full age was reckoned from the completion of twenty-five years.

Guardians were appointed, either by Will or by operation
of law, for all minors, who are *sui juris*, the object being the care and protection of the person and property of the *pupillus*. The guardianship was more or less absolute according to the age of the *pupillus*. If he were under seven years of age, his guardian or *tutor* acted alone, the infant being regarded as incapable of exercising a will of his own. The *Tutor*, *i.e.* *tuitor*, was his protector. Between seven and fourteen the *tutor* could either act alone, or else authorise the pupil to act for himself, in any particular transaction.

Above the age of puberty, the minor who was *sui juris*, was placed under a *curator*, who assisted him in the administration of his property, until he reached full age. But this *minor pubes* had a free hand so far as his property was concerned, unless he proposed to burden his estate, or part with it altogether, in which case the consent of the curator was necessary.
CHAPTER X

GALLIO AND PROVINCIAL GOVERNORS

Provincial Governors and Officials

It will save time and space if we append to this chapter the references to these rulers. Where these are numerous we give only the principal; in other cases we give them all.

Governors

'Επαρχία. Acts xiii. 34. xxv. 1.
'Ηγεμόν. Matt. ii. 6. xxvii. 2, 11, 15, etc. Mark xiii. 9.
Luke ii. 2. iii. 1. 1 S. Peter ii. 14.


Θρόνοι. Col. i. 16.

'Εδώραρχης. 2 Cor. xi. 32.


Κοσμοκράτωρ. Eph. vi. 12.
Officials

1 Cor. iv. 2. Gal. iv. 2.
Μεγαστάντες. Mark vi. 21. Rev. vi. 15. xviii. 23.
Col. i. 16. Titus iii. 1.
Ἀρχων. Matt. ix. 18, etc. xii. 24. xx. 25. Rev. i. 5.
Γραμματεύς. Acts xix. 35.
Δεσμοφύλαξ. Acts xvi. 23, 27, 36.
Πολιτάρχης. Acts xvii. 6, 8.
v. 24, 26.

Gallio

“Dulcis Gallio.” By this endearing epithet he was known amongst his friends, and by this adjective his general character is well expressed. So his friend, Statius the poet, speaks of him: so also his brother Seneca wrote “whom every one loved too little, even he who loved him most.” We meet with so few, in this degenerate age, of whom this testimony
may be given, that we might be pardoned, were we to dwell for a while upon the incidents of his life. He was gentle, amiable and lovable, straightforward and honest. His character had gone before him into his province, and he was presumed to be weak and compliant. Soon after his arrival, the Jews, relying upon this report, brought S. Paul before his judgment-seat. They expected to obtain without difficulty a sentence in their favour.

The charge against S. Paul was that he was "teaching men to worship God contrary to the law." Now, as Judaism was a "religio licita," this accusation might be regarded as serious. It was a charge similar to that brought against the Lord Jesus Christ before Pilate's tribunal. The two judges were very different in character. Pilate was apt to be severe: at times he was ruthless, and prone to shed blood. Yet the Jewish priests had their way with him. After alternate bluster and conciliation, he gave way. A much more easy victory might be expected, before the mild Gallio.

But they had miscalculated. Gallio could be firm, when occasion required.

We infer, from his reply to the plaintiffs, that he made a preliminary examination: and finding that no crime or civil wrong ἀδίκημα, nor even a misdemeanour, or reckless act of levity ῥαδιοῦργημα πονηρὸν, had been committed by the defendant, he came without hesitation to the conclusion that it was a comparatively trifling question of their own law, relating to words and names, and interpretation of the utterances of the Jewish prophets. It was a matter with which the Roman Law had nothing to do. The Jews must look to it themselves. He would not be a judge in such matters. His decision, in fact, is precisely the same as that at which Pilate first arrived, when he said "Take ye Him, and judge Him according to your law." Pilate was overborne by the clamours of the priests: but Gallio refused to alter his decision, and drove the accusers from his judgment-seat.
Gallio was justified in his action: for the Jews at Corinth had ample powers to deal with ecclesiastical causes themselves. They appear to have formed at Corinth, as at Alexandria, a self-administering community, a kind of "imperium in imperio," under the designation of "the nation of the Jews in Corinth." The matter in question was quite within their rights. In bringing it before Gallio, they had taken it to the wrong court; it must be removed to their own.

Doubtless, from their point of view, sufficient ground for action had been given. Paul had not, apparently, endeavoured to make things easy for himself. He had provoked their opposition when he shook out his raiment in the synagogue, with the accompaniment of exasperating words; and he had transferred his heretical platform from the synagogue to a house close by. Thus the opposing parties were liable to constant collision. Further than this, Crispus, the Archisuna-gogos, had become a convert to the new doctrine, and many other Corinthians believed.

Paul had given enough offence to the Jews. But he had kept within the law of the Empire: no breach of Roman law could be brought against him. This was so clear to the Judge, that after a few preliminary questions, he was satisfied. It was purely a Jewish question, and he peremptorily refused to deal with it. He would not even listen to the defence. None was needed. And when the accused was about to open his mouth, he bade him be silent. He dismissed the case, ordered the court to be cleared, and retired from the bench.

This "bench," as we should call it, or βηγα, as it stands three times in the text, is a word of frequent occurrence in the New Testament, of which we will speak more particularly when we come to the trial of S. Paul at Jerusalem and Cæsarea.

As soon as Gallio’s back was turned, and before the court could be cleared, a disturbance arose amongst the mob in front of the tribunal. It is inferred by some that this riot
occurred in the presence of the proconsul; and there is an ancient gloss to the effect that he feigned not to see. But we can hardly suppose that his indifference would be carried so far as to pass by so gross an insult. We are surely at liberty to conclude that he had left the court; and that while the lictors were trying to persuade the contending parties to retire, which they did very slowly, the mob of onlookers, Greeks from various quarters of the town, rushed upon the Jews, and seizing upon Sosthenes, the leader of the Jewish faction, beat him before the judgment-seat.

The true reading in verse 17 is πάντες, according to the best authorities; and this is followed by the Revisers, "and they all laid hold": that is, the whole crowd of Gentiles in the court fell upon the Jews and roughly handled their leader. Several uncial MSS. and some of the ancient versions read οἱ Ἑλληνες after πάντες, and this reading is adopted by the A.V. This is obviously the meaning of the passage. But, from the identification of this Sosthenes with the Sosthenes of 1 Cor. i. 1, it was assumed that he was beaten by the Jews in revenge for his desertion to the Christians. Hence another gloss arose, and in some MSS. οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι was substituted for οἱ Ἑλληνες. If this outrage had been perpetrated by the Jews, they would have been more likely to have beaten Paul himself. The sense of the passage requires us to understand that the mob sympathised with the accused, who was apparently contending for the right of free speech; and as they hated the Jews they were glad to have an excuse for the assault.

Gallio, when he heard of the incident, treated it with contempt; "he cared for none of these things." He was probably not altogether displeased that the Jews, so fanatical and troublesome here as in other places, should be taught a rough and ready lesson by the operation of a kind of Lynch law. He took a broad view, and was wise enough to ignore this act of rowdiness on the part of the Greeks. It was not worth
while to take notice of it: the Roman law was strong enough
to vindicate itself when necessary.

The proconsulship of Gallio in Achaia depends wholly
upon this passage in the Acts, but receives support from the
statement of Seneca that when Gallio took a sea-voyage for
the benefit of his health, he went on board at Corinth.

Gallio was well connected. He came of a literary family—
a family of philosophers and poets; a family also, some of the
members of which had held important political appointments.

His true name was Marcus Annaeus Novatus: but when
he was adopted into the family of Lucius Junius Gallio, he
assumed the name of Junius Annaeus Gallio. He was the
brother of Seneca, the philosopher and tutor of Nero. Lucan,
the poet, was his nephew, being the son of his brother Mela.
Another poet, Statius, was his friend.

His health was delicate. He was attacked by fever while
at Corinth, and a sea voyage became necessary, on account,
as his brother Seneca relates, of the climate of Achaia not
agreeing with him.

In his later years he was involved in political complications.
His brother Seneca had been in exile in Corsica for eight
years, and on his recall in A.D. 49 was appointed prætor.
Gallio himself, probably after he left Achaia, had risen to
be consul. His life was in danger in A.D. 65, when Seneca
was sentenced by Nero to put himself to death, but he begged
for his own life, which was spared by Nero for the time: but
soon afterwards he and his brother Mela, the father of Lucan,
were sentenced to death. Death was very busy in those days,
and no one knew who might be the next victim: it was even
made the subject of a joke: and a *jeu d'esprit* of Gallio's, on
the death of the emperor Claudius, has been preserved by
Dio Cassius, to the effect that the emperor had been caught
up by a hook into heaven, "unco in cœlum raptum," in
double allusion to the deification of the emperors, and to the
custom of dragging criminals by a hook to the Tiber.
Provincial Rulers

At the head of this chapter we have given a complete list of the words employed by the writers of the New Testament, to designate the Rulers of the world. It will be convenient, at this point, to give a very brief summary of the mode of government of the Roman Empire, so far as this can be gathered from the New Testament.

The various branches of the subject are dealt with elsewhere. In this place we give nothing but the barest outline.

**SCHEME OF GOVERNMENT**

I. Provinces.

1. Imperial. Ηγεμόνας Syria, Egypt.
2. Consular. Ἀρχηγός Cyprus, Achaia, Asia.
3. Procuratorial. Ηγεμόνας Judæa.
4. Kings. Βασιλεὺς, Ἑρών Ἡρῴδας, Ἀγριππας, Ἀρετᾶς.
5. Tetrarchs. Τετράρχης Antipas, Philip, Lysanias.
6. Ethnarchs. Ἐθνάρχης Archelaus.
7. Alabarchs.
8. Protos. Πρῶτος Publius.
10. Free Cities Thessalonica, Athens, Tarsus.

At the head of all was the Imperator, Cæsar or Augustus, combining in his single person all the offices of the State, assisted by his Praefects, viz. the praefects of the guards, of the city, of the night watchers, of provisions, and by other officials, who, in process of time, superseded the ancient Republican magistracies, some of which were retained merely in name, and others disappeared altogether.

**Notes on the Scheme of Government**

On looking over the above list, it will be observed that these various modes of government resolve themselves into two.

In the Provinces the rulers were sent direct from the
supreme authority at Rome. They were distinguished men who had held the office of praetor or consul in the Imperial City; or, in the case of the procurators, they were of the equestrian order, or sometimes merely freedmen of the Emperor.

The Provinces, then, were governed by pro-praetors, pro-consuls, and pro-curators, acting on behalf of the Senate and the Emperor ostensibly, but in reality on behalf of the Emperor, in whose person, under Augustus, were accumulated all the ancient offices of the Republic, which, theoretically, still continued to exist. This system was handed on to the successors of Augustus.

Another system stood side by side with this. The Romans were determined to be supreme throughout the countries over which their rule extended. They had a genius for law and order, which they had reduced to a system: but so long as this was obtained, they would not push the system to extremes. They moved along the line of least resistance, and were wise enough to see that in outlying regions they could best attain their object by committing the government to native princes, and allowing the ancient laws and customs to continue, provided that these involved no actual conflict with Roman law. A little friction was permissible, but it must not pass beyond certain well-defined limits. These native chiefs ruled under the titles of kings, tetrarchs and ethnarchs.

The boundaries of these provinces and principalities were liable to alteration from time to time as the circumstances of the case required, or even at the mere caprice of the emperor. In Asia Minor such changes were more frequent than elsewhere. Provinces were united to each other, or were subdivided, or grouped together, or reunited, until such confusion was introduced as to render the task of map-making almost impossible. This was the case especially with Galatia and Phrygia. Professor W. M. Ramsay, in his
S. Paul, the Traveller and the Roman Citizen, has given much attention to this subject, upon which he has thrown great light. Besides the alteration of boundaries there was another element of confusion. The provinces were interchanged between the Emperor and the Senate. The original division made by Augustus was not permanent; he and his successors made frequent exchanges with the senate, so that, in the course of its history, a province might be at one time imperial, at another time senatorial. Many of these changes, both in regard to area and mode of government, have already been noticed in the chapter on the Provinces.

To make the system of government as plain as possible, we will here append a few notes on each of the headings indicated above, taking care to avoid repetition by referring to the various chapters in which the particular branch of the subject is treated at greater length.

1. The Imperial provinces. Unsettled or border provinces; the governor a military officer, at the head of legions: his title, Praetor, or ἀντωποπατηγός: as representative of the emperor, styled Legatus Caesaris or Augusti, or πρεσβευτής. In the New Testament ἤγεμων, as Cyrenius. (But ἤγεμων is a term so general that it extends from such rulers as Pilate, Festus and Felix, to the Emperor himself and to the Lord Jesus Christ. The corresponding word in Latin is praeses, or president). These rulers were assisted by procurators (stewards) instead of quaestors.

2. The Senatorial provinces. The more settled provinces, under a civil governor, such as Sergius Paulus and Gallio: his title proconsul or ἀνθύπατος: his officials were quaestors, or finance officers, for the collection of the tribute. He was attended by legati proconsulis pro pretore. Three of these were assigned to a proconsul of a more important province, such as Asia or Africa: but one only to one of a lower class, such as Cyprus or Cilicia: attended also by lictors and fasces.
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For these two, see the chapter on Augustus and the Provinces.

3. The Subordinate districts, governed by a procurator, ἐπίτροπος, or ἡγεμόν, directly appointed by the emperor, and responsible to him; but nominally on emergencies, under the supervision of the nearest provincial governor. Such was Judæa under Pilate, Festus and Felix (see the chapter on Pilate).

A distinction must also be drawn between the wealthier, the more extensive, or more important provinces (such as Syria and Asia), and the less important, as being smaller in area, or less productive, or less useful for strategic purposes, such as Pamphylia, Lycia or Cyprus.

Egypt occupied a position by itself above all other provinces, and its governor had a special style and title: he was called Prefectus Augustalis.

4. Kings (see the chapter on Aretas).

5. Tetrarchs. The tetrarch, by the etymology of the word (τετραχώς and ἄρχω), was one of a governing body of four; but in the New Testament, the word is used generally for a minor governor or prince. The tetrarchs of the Gospels are Antipas, Philip and Lysanias. Antipas (or at least his wife) was not content with this title, and aspired to the higher title of king, borne by his father. He was so addressed by his courtiers; and consequently S. Mark, falling in with the custom of the day, five times styles him ὁ βασιλεὺς (S. Mark vi. 14 ff.): so also does S. Matthew (xiv. 9).

6. Ethnarchs. This word occurs but once in the N.T. (2 Cor. xi. 32) and is applied to an official under Aretas (page 318). It was the proper designation of Archelaus, and so occurs on his coins. But Archelaus, like his brother Antipas, also claimed to be king. He was so named in his father's Will, and he assumed the title without waiting for the emperor's confirmation of the Will, for which he was accused at Rome (Jos., Antiq. xvii. 8 and 9). Augustus,
however, refused him the kingdom, but appointed him ethnarch, promising him the royal dignity in the future, on good behaviour (Jos., Antiq. xvii. 11, 4). S. Matthew (ii. 22) speaks of him as reigning (Βασιλεύει).

7. Alabarchs. This word is not found in the N.T., but is used of the ruler of the Jews in Alexandria. Strictly speaking, it means a writer or clerk, an officer of the customs, but is employed to designate an officer that should rather be expressed by “ethnarch,” viz. the chief of a nation living with separate laws and customs amongst those of a different race.

8. Πρωτος. There is one provincial ruler, whose position has not been exactly determined. Of him we must speak in this connection, though probably he might be more appropriately included amongst provincial officials, instead of provincial rulers. We refer to Publius, the chief man of the island of Melita.

Melita may be safely identified with Malta. Various attempts have been made since the days of Constantine Porphyrogenitus to identify it with Meleda, one of the Liburnicæ Islands in the Adriatic off the coast of Illyria: but the conditions given by S. Luke fit exactly with the opinion that the modern Malta is the island on which S. Paul was wrecked.

At that time the governor of the isle was Publius. He is called πρωτος τῆς νησίου by S. Luke, i.e. the first, or chief or primate. Both A.V. and R.V. render “chief man of the island.” The word is used elsewhere in the N.T. of quite subordinate officials, such as “the chief men of Galilee,” in the train of Herod Antipas (S. Mark vi. 21); or “the principal men of the people” at Jerusalem connected with the priesthood (S. Luke xix. 47); or “the chief men” of Antioch in Pisidia (Acts xiii. 50), a town which, like Philippi, was a colony. But at Melita πρωτος seems to have been an official title: and this is all the more likely in the case of Publius, seeing that his father was alive, and would have been esteemed
the "chief," if the word had been loosely used. The title, then, was obviously not derived from the position held by Publius for rank or wealth, but was official. Two inscriptions, found at Citta Vecchia, in the centre of the island, confirm this opinion—one in Greek containing the words πρῶτος Μελιταίων, the other in Latin, "Primus Melitensium." As Melita was a dependency of the province of Sicily, which, it will be remembered, was the first of all the Roman provinces, the πρῶτος, or ruler of the isle, would doubtless be a delegate appointed by the Praetor of Sicily.

The governor's name was Ποπλίως, which is the Greek form of the praenomen Publius; or perhaps of the nomen Popilius. If we can conceive of the islanders calling their ruler by his praenomen without ceremony, then the former was his name: if otherwise, the latter.

The father of the governor was suffering from "fever and dysentery," i.e. since the word for fever, πυρετοῖς, is in the plural, from intermittent attacks of fever, combined with dysentery. Luke, the physician, was present on the island, and would in the ordinary course have been called upon to prescribe for the sick man: but it was Paul, the tentmaker, who effected the cure; and that, not by ordinary means, but by prayer and imposition of hands.

For this and other miraculous interpositions the islanders evinced their gratitude by many liberal gifts. They are styled "barbarians": but we must not be misled by our own use of the word: it must be regarded from the point of view of S. Luke himself, to indicate, not that they were uncivilised, or uncultivated, but merely that they were not of Greek birth. Malta lay near the seats of two ancient civilisations, and was in constant communication with both, viz. Rome and Carthage. The people were mainly of Phoenician origin, and in Greek estimation would be classed as "barbarians" or foreigners: but their courteous conduct to the wrecked crew and passengers, their ready hospitality and their generous gifts
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to S. Paul, were evidences of the civilisation to which for centuries they had been accustomed.

9. Colonies. The colonies of the British Empire surpass anything that the world has yet seen, and far exceed in extent, in population and in wealth those of the Roman Empire itself. A comparison between the two would be without value, there being so wide a difference between them.

Our colonies are usually founded by bodies of men who leave their native land on their own initiation, and settle down in some distant region where there is land unoccupied, or very sparsely inhabited. These original settlers will take possession of large tracts of country, and live solitary lives, separated at first from each other by great distances.

It was quite otherwise with the colonies sent out from Rome.

The definition of a "Colony" is, however, equally suitable for both. In each case we see a body or number of persons sent out from the mother-country to settle in some distant land, and remaining subject to the jurisdiction of the parent state. With this definition the resemblance ends.

The Roman colonies may be included in two main divisions—those of the Republic, and those of the Empire.

The earlier colonies under the Republic were situated mainly on the Italian peninsula, as Rome gradually extended its boundaries over the neighbouring states: and the main object of these colonies was to keep in check a conquered population. They were, as Cicero describes them, *propugnacula imperii*, garrisons of soldiers in military occupation, ever on the watch to repress a rising amongst the subject inhabitants, or to defend the frontiers against aggression from without. This was the case with Carthage, the first actual colony; which was founded by C. Gracchus, who sent out 6,000 men to found a new city after the destruction of the old.

There were also, somewhat later, the *agrarian colonies*, making a provision for the superabundant population, for
whom no adequate employment could be found at home: and in some instances to remove to a distance certain of the lower classes, who, by reason of poverty and discontent, were likely to prove a danger to the Commonwealth.

Such colonies were never self-originated, growing by degrees in the waste places of the earth, as with the modern British settlements: they were established in a formal manner by a decree of the senate; the place to which they were sent was a district already inhabited; and the colonists went to their destination provided with a full and complete municipal organisation, like that of the sovereign City of Rome. At their head were certain commissioners, varying in number from two to five; generally three, and entitled triumviri ad colonos deducendos. In addition to these leaders there were numbers of other officials, secretaries, architects, subordinate officers for various purposes, in such proportion as to constitute the whole body a completely organised municipality.

The kind of colony, however, with which the New Testament makes us acquainted, was that of the civil wars and the empire. The word itself occurs but once in the N.T.: viz. in Acts xvi. 12, where it is applied to Philippi. Other cities visited by S. Paul, such as the Pisidian Antioch, Troas and Corinth, were also colonies, though not expressly described as such.

These Imperial colonies, as we may call them, were in the first instance established by Julius Cæsar, Antony and Octavius, by their own sole will, without the formality of a Lex, as in the colonies of the Republic. They formed a convenient means, during the civil war, of rewarding towns which had supported the cause of a particular triumvir, and of disposing of the veterans disbanded at the end of their term of service. They were useful also, as in the ancient days, for the protection of the empire from foes beyond the frontier.

These colonies were of two kinds, “Roman” and “Latin.”

The Roman colonies, Coloniae civium Romanorum, consisted
exclusively of Roman citizens, who carried with them to their new home all the rights and privileges which belonged to them in Rome. They retained the citizenship with the right of voting, and the privilege of holding office: the *jus suffragii*, and the *jus honorum*. They went forth to their destination with all the prestige of Roman citizenship: and not merely as citizens but as soldiers. When they took possession they marched in *sub vexillo*. It was a military occupation. There was an army with its standards, its ensigns, its officers. And when they settled down they formed, not a civil community, as with our modern colonies, but a kind of camp under military government. But they reproduced, as far as possible, the institutions they enjoyed in the mother city. As has been said, they stood in the relation of children to a parent, and their colony was a miniature Rome. The colonists were supreme, the old inhabitants were a subject race: the one possessed the *civitas cum suffragio et jure honorum*, the other merely the *civitas sine suffragio*.

*The Latin colonies* were on a lower level. Those who belonged to them had only the privileges enjoyed by the Latins, which were of an inferior order. Roman citizens might join a Latin colony, if they chose; but in that case they lost their full franchise as Romans. These, however, in the event of their return to their original home, they could recover without difficulty.

The Colony, then, was a *reproduction of Rome*. The people who dwelt there spoke the Latin language, and were governed by Roman law: their dress, their architecture and their customs were Roman, and their coins were impressed with Roman characters. Their government, also, closely followed that of the imperial city. There was a town-council, or senate, usually of one hundred members, who were called *decuriones*, and who passed laws to regulate their own community, as the Senate did at Rome.

Among the colonies in the Acts of the Apostles, Philippi
is the most interesting, as being specifically named as a colony by S. Luke, who writes the Latin word in Greek characters. There were also the Pisidian Antioch, Troas and Corinth.

*Antioch in Pisidia* (Acts xiii.) was built by Seleucus, the head of the Seleucid dynasty in Syria. Like other princes of his time he was a great builder, and his custom was to name the cities he built, after his own family. It sounds improbable, but he is said to have founded 9 Seleucias, 16 Antiochs, named after his father, and 6 Laodiceas, named after his mother. The Pisidian Antioch was made a colony by Augustus, who renamed it Caesarea: and this fact is commemorated by Latin legends on coins of the city, as well as in the pages of Strabo and Pliny.

*Troas*—properly speaking, Alexandria Troas. As the Roman arms extended eastward, the Greeks of Troas adopted the cause of Rome, and their city was erected into a colony by Augustus, and its full name became Colonia Alexandria Augusta Troas. It possessed the *Jus Italicum*, which exempted the lands of citizens from taxation. Not all colonies were endowed with this privilege.

*Philippi*, as its name indicates, was so named by Philip of Macedon, the father of Alexander. Its original name was Crenides, or “place of fountains.” Philip made it doubly useful; as a means of wealth, for it contained productive gold-mines, and as a border fortress against the wild Thracians.

It was the scene of the famous *battle of Philippi*, in which the Republicans were defeated by Antony and Octavius, B.C. 42. There were some curious incidents in this battle. Octavius himself was not present, but his army was opposed to that of Brutus, and was defeated so completely that Brutus was able to send reinforcements to Cassius. Meantime Cassius had been decisively beaten by Antony, and was so demoralised that he mistook the reinforcements for enemies, which led to further disaster. Twenty days later, a second battle issued in a decisive victory for the Triumvirs, and the
ancient Roman Republic came to an end, the final blow being dealt at Actium, a few years later. After the battle of Actium, Augustus, having to provide for his veterans, gave them lands in Italy, and transferred the dispossessed inhabitants to Philippi and Dyrrhachium. He established also other colonies of Roman burgesses in Macedonia. Philippi received the privileges of a colony, and its name became *Colonia Augusta Julia Philippensis*. Like Troas, it possessed the Jus Italicum.

In most cities of the Roman empire the Jews of the dispersion were usually found in large numbers: in Philippi there must have been but few, for the town was a military colony, and not a mercantile city. Consequently it did not possess a synagogue, but merely a temporary erection, situated outside the gate, by the river side, and designated a proseuche. Here S. Paul met Lydia, the purple-seller of Thyatira, and converted her and her household to the faith: and on the way thither, on another day, he encountered the damsel with the spirit of Python, which he cast out.

This act brought Paul and Silas into collision with the authorities of the city, the ἀρχιερεῖς, as they called themselves, who sent their lictors to apprehend them and convey them to prison.

The word πρῶτη, as applied to Philippi, has had three meanings assigned to it—the "first" in dignity and importance, as compared with its rival Amphipolis; and so the A.V. understands it, rendering the phrase "the chief city of that part of Macedonia"—the "first" town of Macedonia, at which the traveller arrives on leaving the coast; so, apparently, the R.V., "the first of the district"—and thirdly, a city of Macedonia Prima. Of these three we must select the first, as being a characteristic touch of S. Luke's pride in a Greek city, in which he spent several years while engaged in the work of organising the Christian Church. *Corinth*, Acts xviii., was another colony.
During the war with the Achæans, Corinth was at the head of the patriotic Achæan League; and when the ultimatum of the Roman Senate was conveyed to Corinth, the ambassadors were attacked, insulted and driven out of the theatre. This infuriated the Romans, and Metellus marched his army into Greece, B.C. 147, and defeated the members of the League. He used his victory with moderation, but L. Mummius, the consul for the next year, exacted vengeance for their insolence. Corinth was taken; all the males were slain, the women and children sold into slavery, the city was given over to pillage, and finally reduced to ashes. It had been the richest city in Greece, and abounded in artistic treasures. The most valuable of these were taken to Rome, and the city became a desolation. And so, says Cicero, was extinguished the lumen totius Græcia. This was in B.C. 146.

It lay in ruins for a century, and was then re-established by Julius Cæsar as a colony. A number of veterans and freedmen were sent thither, and the town was named Colonia Julia Corinthus Augusta. It speedily recovered its former splendour, and when S. Paul came thither more than a hundred years later, it had again become a populous and wealthy city, the capital of the Roman province of Achaia, and the residence of the proconsul Gallio.

Here it was that S. Paul met Aquila and Priscilla, and worked at his trade of tent-making: here too he preached the Gospel in the house of Justus, after he had been expelled from the synagogue: here he stayed for more than eighteen months and was then haled before the judgment-seat of Gallio (Chapter X.).

10. Free Cities. In addition to the Colonies there were the Free Cities, such as Antioch in Syria, Tarsus, Thessalonica and Athens.

A city became entitled to freedom in various ways. Sometimes this privilege was conferred as a reward for fidelity during the civil wars; sometimes on account of the wealth
or importance of the town; or on account of its antiquity and prestige. In fact there were many circumstances which might lead to this honour being granted. It was a privilege which was greatly appreciated amongst the Greeks; and accordingly it is in the eastern part of the Empire that we expect to find such cities.

A free city, like the ancient Greek colonies, enjoyed its own government. The mode of government in one city might differ very materially from that in another, but the fact of self-government was the point of the privilege. The free cities had their own public assemblies, and passed laws to regulate their own internal affairs. They appointed their own magistrates and officials, and held all power within their own city, even to the infliction of capital punishment. They were independent of the provincial governor under ordinary circumstances, and were exempt from the burden of military occupation. The governor of the province, however, was not precluded from residence in a free city, should it be convenient for him so to reside. Such taxes as their citizens were required to pay were sent direct to Rome.

*Tarsus* took the part of Cæsar in the civil war, and was given over to plunder by Cassius as a punishment; but Mark Antony restored the balance, and rewarded the faithful city by conferring on it municipal freedom and exemption from taxation. Augustus added to these favours.

*Thessalonica*, after the battle of Pydna, B.C. 148, was made the capital of Macedonia Secunda; and it became a free city as a reward for its support of Octavius and Antony.

*Athens* received the privilege of freedom in virtue of its ancient renown.

Besides the Colonies and the Free Cities, there were the *Municipia*. These, however, we need not take into consideration, as they were confined almost entirely to Italy and the west of Europe.
CHAPTER XI

ASIARCHS AND PROVINCIAL OFFICIALS

The "Asiarchs" (of whom mention is made in Acts xix. 31 only) were undoubtedly historical personages, as is abundantly testified by coins and inscriptions. A coin of Ephesus is extant, with the effigy and name of Nero, and on the reverse a figure of the famous Temple of Diana, and the same words, ἀνθρώπινος and νεωκόρος, which meet us in Acts xix. 35, 38. There are also inscriptions from Ephesus bearing the words "Asiarch," "Neocoros," "proconsul" and "town-clerk," and recording the actual names of some of these officials.

Conybeare and Howson associate the Asiarchs with the worship of the Ephesian Artemis; but more recently they have been shown to have been officials for the newly introduced worship of the emperors.

They were certainly officials of the province, not merely of the cities. Much difference of opinion exists as to their number, mode of appointment and other details: but the following may be accepted as representing as nearly as can be known what is believed to be the truth.

They were, then, officials of the Province of Asia, with duties and privileges similar to those of neighbouring provinces, styled Bithyniarchs, Pontarchs, Galatarchs, Lyciarchs, and Pamphyliarchs. These all appear to have been associated together in a cult recently established for the worship of the emperors, and extending over the whole of Asia Minor. This form of worship was almost coeval with the foundation of the Empire. Soon after Augustus's victory at Actium, he allowed,
so Tacitus states, temples to be erected in Pergamus the capital of "Asia" to the honour of himself and of Rome, a precedent speedily followed in the neighbouring provinces of Bithynia and Galatia. In Smyrna also, a temple was, in a.d. 26, dedicated to Tiberius, jointly with his mother Livia and the Senate. The fashion spread rapidly through Asia Minor, and soon developed into a systematic worship of "the divine majesty of Rome incarnate in human form in the series of emperors, and especially in the reigning emperor." Professor Ramsay speaks of this as a new imperial religion, fostered by Roman policy in order to encourage a sense of unity and patriotism in the empire. "Each province," he says, "was united in a formal association for this worship: the association built temples in the great cities of the province, held festivals and games, and had a set of officials, who were in a religious point of view priests, and in a political point of view officers of the imperial service. The priests of the imperial religion became by insensible degrees a higher priesthood, exercising a certain influence over the priests of the other religions of the province. In this way a sort of hierarchy was created for the province and the empire as a whole; the reigning emperor being the religious head, the Supreme Pontiff of the State, and a kind of sacerdotal organisation being grouped under him according to the political provinces."

The Asiarchs were the high-priests of this cult in the province of Asia, and the Association was known as the Commune Asiae, or Κοινὸν Αἰαίς. The various towns, such as Pergamus, the ancient metropolis, Smyrna, Ephesus, Cyzicus, Sardis and others appear to have selected each one representative, and from the body thus nominated ten were appointed as "Asiarchs." These ten constituted a Council for the purpose of administering the funds of the Community, and providing for the ceremonial observed in the temples in the various towns. They also had charge of the public
festivals and religious spectacles, and presided at the annual games.

The elections took place in the spring, and the whole month of May was given up to the enjoyment of the populace, not only at these festivals of the Commune Asia, but also at other celebrations in connection with the worship of Diana, the great goddess of the Ephesians. Ephesus was not the only seat of this worship of the deified emperors: for the Council transferred its sittings from town to town. Probably at the time of S. Paul's visit at Ephesus, the Council was holding its sittings in that town, and the festival had attracted from the surrounding districts that vast concourse of people who helped to crowd the amphitheatre, when Demetrius had stirred up the silversmiths.

The expenses incidental to these celebrations were considerable; and, as a consequence, none but the wealthiest citizens were able to accept office. It was, however, an office of great dignity, and was much sought after by prominent personages. Their names were recorded on the coins issued in the province. One of these Asiatarchs presided in the amphitheatre at Smyrna on the occasion of Polycarp's martyrdom there.

They were also amongst the most cultured class of persons in the province, and on that account would be disposed to a friendly attitude towards S. Paul. They were indeed responsible officially for the maintenance of the emperor's shrines; but would be too well educated to have any real belief in the ceremonies they practised, regarding them merely as a matter of state. Thus they would be in sympathy with a highly educated man about to expose himself to the fury of an Oriental mob of ignorant fanatics; and would press him not to trust himself amongst them. The theatre in which this riotous concourse assembled was of vast size, perhaps the largest of any of which the ruins still remain. The site is easily identified, and the ruins attest its immense area, rendering it capable of holding 25,000 persons. Had the Apostle
ventured into the theatre, and faced the infuriated crowd, he would probably have been torn in pieces. From this fate the friendly Asiarchs were anxious to save him.

**Provincial Officials**

On page 286 we have given a complete list of such officials as are mentioned in the N.T., with the necessary references. An examination of that list will show that the civil rulers or officials are alluded to, only in the case of Antioch, Iconium, Philippi, Thessalonica and Ephesus. With these let us deal first.

At Antioch in Pisidia the Jews stirred up "the chief men of the city" against Paul and Barnabas (Acts xiii. 50). These "chief men" are described as πρῶτοι. They may have been merely unofficial Roman citizens: but if πρῶτος is an official designation, then they would have been, as at Philippi, prætors attended by lictors. For Antioch, as well as Philippi, was a colony. It is likely that the persecution at Antioch and Lystra included the beating by the rods of lictors, to which S. Paul refers in 2 Cor. xi. 25. At the same time it is quite possible that Paul and Barnabas were driven forth from Antioch, or persuaded to leave, by the magistrates, at the instigation of their wives, the "devout women of honourable estate," without formal process of expulsion; for we find them re-visiting the city, on their return, not long after, preaching and confirming openly.

At Iconium (Acts xiv. 5) an attempt at stoning was made by both Jews and Gentiles, led by their "rulers." Here the word is ἀρχῶν, a word with a general meaning, and of frequent occurrence in the N.T. Iconium, in the time of S. Paul, was an insignificant town, about ninety miles from Antioch, but belonging to the same "Region," and administered from Antioch. These "archons," therefore, would be members of the board of magistrates at Iconium, deriving their authority
from the governing centre at Antioch. Professor Ramsay, in his *S. Paul, the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, discusses the question of the "Regions" in Asia Minor, with much learning. Iconium, under the name of Konieh, became a town of great importance under Mahommedan rule, a walled city with 100 towers and 80 gates.

The word ἀρχων is of wide application. In our list we have given a few of the chief places in which the word is employed, from which it will be seen how general the term is. It is applied to Jairus, to Beelzebub, to the princes of the Gentiles, to the rulers at Philippi, and to magistrates and persons in authority generally.

At Philippi we have four words applied to the rulers or officials of that city: prætors, lictors, archons, and the jailor. Of these the first two are of the most importance, as being the appropriate titles of officials of a Roman Colony.

Στρατηγός. This word, which means literally the leader or commander of an army (στρατός and ἀγων), is, as our references show, applied by S. Luke to the captain or prefect of the temple, both in the singular and the plural. But in Acts xvi. it is used in a more technical sense, to represent the Latin "prætors." Strictly speaking, the official title of these magistrates was Duumviri. But in course of time they assumed the title of prætors, and as a matter of courtesy they were so designated by the colonists, just as Herod Antipas’s courtiers gave him the title of "king," though he was merely "tetrarch." This custom began in the time of Cicero, who says sarcastically of the Duumviri of Capua, "Cum in cæteris coloniis Duumviri appellentur, hi se Praetores appellari volebant." The practice spread gradually from Italy through the provinces until the title of prætor or στρατηγός seemed to belong of right to the Duumviri. The title is still extant in the Italian "Stradigo." ἀρχων, Acts xvi. 19, is another word employed by S. Luke to designate the same officials. It would be a more usual term for one writing in
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Greek to employ. S. Luke, however, as was his custom, adopts the word current in the place of which he is speaking.

'Paβδουχος. The Duumviri, having acquired by long usage and consent the title of prætors, next proceeded to provide themselves with lictors like their namesakes at Rome. The lictors at Rome bore fasces, which consisted of rods fastened together in a bundle, with an axe in the middle, the head of which projected from them. The lictors of the colonial duumviri, however, bore rods, bacilli, only; and not fasces.

The privilege of being attended by lictors was highly prized by the Roman magistrates. In the city of Rome, the prætor would have two such officials in attendance: outside the city the number was increased to six. The proconsuls in the time of Ulpian were allowed six lictors. The tribunes, aediles and questors had the lictors, only when outside the city. These officials marched before the magistrates in Indian file, the one next the magistrate being called proximus, or primus lictor: their office was to inflict the punishments adjudged by their superiors, the form of command given to the proximus lictor being, "Summave, lictor, despolia, verbera." "Go, lictors, strip off their garments; let them be scourged." In the case of S. Paul and his companion, this very command was given: "the magistrates rent their garments off them" (i.e. by the action of the lictors) "and commanded to beat them with rods."

In 2 Cor. xi. 25, S. Paul writes, "Thrice was I beaten with rods," τρις ἑρραβδίωτη. This punishment at Philippi is the only occasion of the kind mentioned in the Acts; it was doubtless the third occasion. The other two may have occurred at Antioch and at Lystra. To inflict such a punishment upon Roman citizens without due inquiry was an unpardonable outrage; and more zeal appears to have been exhibited than the case required, "they laid many stripes upon them"; and also "cast them into prison, charging the jailor to keep them safely": and he, becoming impressed with the extreme seriousness of the case, from the point of view of the
self-important magistrates, "cast them into the inner prison, and made their feet fast in the stocks."

This jailor, or δεσμοφύλαξ, is the fourth of the colonial officials mentioned as exercising their functions at Philippi; and he heaped further indignity upon these two Roman citizens by making their feet fast in the stocks; εἰς τὸ ἀλογον, an instrument described by Plautus, as very similar to our pillory with five holes, for arms, and legs and neck.

The whole proceedings were unwarrantable. But why did not Paul and Silas plead their privilege as Roman citizens at this point? They did so the next day, after the outrage had been perpetrated: why not have prevented the outrage by claiming immunity at once? Perhaps the proceedings were conducted so hastily and tumultuously that the opportunity was not afforded. The "praetors" and the colonists were so anxious to assert their own dignity as Romans (v. 21), that they refused to listen to any defence on the part of the prisoners. Or it may be, that the right was claimed, but in the hurry and rush of the proceedings overlooked or disallowed. Evidently S. Paul would not have submitted to a perfectly useless outrage, if he had not been compelled by circumstances. However, the next day, when the excitement of the populace had cooled down, the protest was made; and when the "praetors" wanted to dismiss the prisoners quietly, they refused to leave until the authors of the outrage came with due apologies and entreated them to go. And even then they did not leave the city, until they had arranged for the carrying on of the work of the Church. This was apparently done in the house of Lydia; and when all things were ready Paul and Silas went on their way, leaving S. Luke in charge of the Church at Philippi.

Thessalonica.

When Paul and Silas left Philippi, they journeyed along the Via Egnatia through Amphipolis and Apollonia to Thessalonica, a distance of just about one hundred miles, performed perhaps
in three stages. The Roman road, δῶξις, is perhaps denoted by the word employed, viz. διοδεύοντες.

At Thessalonica they were in a "Free City"; the freedom having been conferred upon it, as a reward for the support it afforded to the Triumvirs in their contest with Brutus and Cassius.

The mode of government in this Urbs Libera differed somewhat from that of Philippi the colony. We do not read of praetors and lictors as at Philippi, but of a Demus and Politarchs.

Δῆμος. Three meanings have been attached to this word, as it stands in the narrative of Acts xvii. 5. The Jews, with the assistance of the "rabble" (ἀγοραίων), i.e. of the idlers in the market-place, the "corner men" as we know them in the East End of London, stirred up a riot, gathered together a mob, and swarmed to Jason’s house with the intention of bringing Paul and Silas before the δῆμος.

This may mean merely the crowd assembled in front of the house, with the desire to punish the offenders on the spot by the rough and ready means of lynch-law. Both the A.V. and the R.V. seem to have adopted this view, their rendering being, literally, "the people."

Professor Ramsay, going a little further, translates, "a public meeting."

Conybeare and Howson seem to incline to a formal senate or assembly, with legislative and administrative powers.

There is not sufficient information attainable in regard to Thessalonica in particular to decide this question.

But the magistrates of this town were Politarchs, πολιτάρχαι. This word is unique in literature, and its use by S. Luke is an evidence of the independence and accuracy of his narrative. Had there been nothing more to say, we should feel confident that S. Luke had given us here the correct technical words for the local government of Thessalonica, or, at all events, the words in current use for the purpose. But it is interesting
to know that an inscription on the Vardar Gate at Thessalonica repeats this word, and gives the names of several of these magistrates.

ΠΟΛΕΙΤΑΡΧΟΥΝΤΩΝ ΣΩΣΙΠΑΤΡΟΥ κ.τ.λ.

It can be but a coincidence, but it is noteworthy, that three of the names recorded by this inscription correspond with the names of the companions of S. Paul at this time, and also connected with the very neighbourhood; viz. Sosipater, of Beraea; Secundus, of Thessalonica; and Gaius, the Macedonian (Acts xix. 29; xx. 4).

Before these Politarchs Jason and other brethren were brought, for Paul and Silas were not in the house when it was surrounded by the mob. And the politarchs, discounting the elements of which the crowd was composed, dealt leniently with the case, and merely took steps to prevent the recurrence of a breach of the peace. For this purpose they took security from Jason and his friends—λαβόντες τὸ ἰκανὸν παρὰ τοῦ Ἰασονοῦ—or, in technical terms, satisfactione accepta. In the Vulgate this phrase is rendered satisfactione accepta.

The satisfaction was the giving of security for a certain object—in this case the prevention of a recurrence of a breach of the peace. Jason and his friends became sureties (vindices or fidejussores), and entered into recognizances (vadimonia), in answer to the question, “Do you become surety for this purpose?” (Gaius iii. 116). They were doubtless bound over to pay a certain sum in the event of further disturbance, or perhaps to deposit a sum of money to be forfeited if further troubles arose.

The object of the Politarchs was to preserve the peace; and this end would be most effectually secured by the removal of those who had caused the disturbance, i.e. Paul and Silas. Accordingly it was essential that these two should at once leave the city, which they did the same night. And not only
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that they should leave Thessalonica, but not return thither, lest the disturbance should be renewed. Hence, as Professor Ramsay observes, S. Paul was prevented from re-visiting the Thessalonians. "We would fain have come unto you, I Paul, once and again; and Satan hindered us" (1 Thess. ii. 18). The politarchs, representing "Satan," in their opposition to the preaching of the Gospel, were an effectual bar to the return of the Apostle, as long as they remained in office.

And thus it came about, that the danger to which S. Paul and his companions were exposed at Thessalonica was much more serious than at Philippi. They departed from Philippi leisurely: the retreat from Thessalonica was hurried and immediate (Acts xvii. 10).

 Ephesus.

We have already spoken of the Asiarchs, who were provincial officials. We now come to such officials of Ephesus as find a place in the narrative of Acts xix. And this limits us really to one only, viz. the town-clerk or γραμματέως. S. Paul's preaching usually led to a popular disturbance: it was so at Antioch, Lystra, Philippi, Thessalonica and at other places: and here, at Ephesus, the usual incident occurs. He was delivering a doctrine, which, if generally accepted, would ruin the whole trade of the town, as Demetrius the silversmith showed conclusively in his harangue. This led to a serious riot, which the town-clerk came forward to appease—and most successfully. It was an admirable speech, full of sound common sense; and it had the effect of quieting the mob and persuading them to disperse.

The province of "Asia" was under the rule of a proconsul; and this town-clerk at Ephesus was the most important official in that city. Subject to the supreme authority of the proconsul, the chief towns in the province had a large measure of local government, by means of a local Council and Assembly (Βουλή and Ἐκκλησία) to which the town-clerk refers in v. 39. This γραμματέως, as S. Luke, using the official
title, styles him, was the leading man of the city, the Recorder, the keeper of the archives, the public reader of decrees in the Assemblies: we might almost call him the Mayor. In virtue of his office, he appears upon the scene in the vast amphitheatre, and takes the chair. It was an unlawful, tumultuous meeting, he reminds them, and he advises them to adjourn for the purpose of asserting their rights in due legal form. “The courts are open, and there are proconsuls.” They had their remedy either in the local municipal court, or in the court of the province, where the Proconsul or one of his deputies, assessors or consiliarii, sat at stated times to administer justice. ‘Ἄγοραι ἄγονται, Κονβεντος περαγυντυρ.’ The province was divided into districts or dioceses, and Ephesus was the seat of one of these municipal councils: and if that would not satisfy them, then ἄνθιστατοι εἰσιν, there was the court of the Proconsul himself. This speech was a masterly address, which compels our unreserved admiration.

One other word we must refer to, viz. νεοκόρος. It is an official title, not however connected with the municipal government, but only with the worship in the temple of the Ephesian Artemis. It means literally, a temple-sweeper, and then one who has charge of a temple, such as a verger, custodian, or warden. But it was really much more than this—it had become an honorary office, which was desired by persons of distinction, and was granted by the Emperor also to various cities in Asia.

These three technical words, neokoros, anthupatos and grammateus, which S. Luke mentions in connection with Ephesus, are found associated together in the following inscription, showing how “the Augustus-loving senate of the Ephesians, and its temple-adorning Demos consecrated a building in the proconsulship of Pedoeaeus Priscinus, and by the decree of Tiberius Claudius Italicus the Recorder of the Demos.” Ἡ φιλοσεβαστὸς Ἕφεσιῶν βούλη, καὶ ὁ νεοκόρος δήμος καθιερώσαν ἐπὶ ἄνθιστατον Πεδουκαιον Πρεσικεινον
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ψηφωσάμενον Τιβ. κλ. Ἰταλικον τοῦ γραμματέως τοῦ δήμου. The same designations, anthupatos and neokoros, appear frequently on coins.

Having thus dealt with official titles as connected with particular cities, it now remains for us to speak of those of more general meaning, which occur in the N.T. principally in the Gospels. The references have already been given and need not be repeated.

Ἐπίτροπος and οἰκονόμος are words of similar meaning; bailiff, steward, manager, agent or overseer. But the former is the more important word, as it is used by Josephus and others for procurator, or High Steward, thus involving an official title. It is applied also to Chuza, Herod Antipas’s bailiff. In other places it carries only a general meaning.

Οἰκονόμος has no specific meaning from our point of view, except in Rom. xvi. 23, where it is applied to Erastus, as being “the treasurer of the city,” viz. of Corinth (R.V.); or “chamberlain” as in A.V. This was an official post; Erastus was the public treasurer, arcarius, ὁ ἐπὶ τῆς δημοσίας τραπέζης. He was probably the same Erastus who is mentioned in 2 Tim. iv. 20, as abiding at Corinth.

The word is used in the parable of the Unjust Steward; and is applied to the clergy, as “stewards of the mysteries of God.”

We may class together the following words βασιλικός, μεγιστάνες, ἐξουσία and κυριότης, as indicating persons in authority, or in a high position, generally and indefinitely. The nobleman at Capernaum, βασιλικός, literally “king’s officer,” held some official position, either civil or military, at the court of Antipas. The μεγιστάνες, or “great men,” were also courtiers of Antipas, or civil servants of the State.

The other words are of too general a signification to need any comment.

The πράκτωρ was literally an exacter of penalties, a jailor.
CHAPTER XII

ARETAS AND PRINCIPALITIES

Aretas, or Hareth, was the king of the Nabataean Arabs from B.C. 9 to A.D. 40; and, though his name occurs but once in the New Testament (2 Cor. xi. 32), he was a ruler of considerable importance. His kingdom also has received more attention of late from historians since the publication of Mommsen's History of the Provinces.

The predecessors of Aretas make a considerable figure in the two Books of the Maccabees and in Josephus, having come to the front as the power of the Seleucidae and Lagidae in Syria and Egypt was on the wane. The name first occurs as king of the Arabians in 2 Mac. v. 8, about B.C. 169. Other princes of this race were Erotimus B.C. 105; Aretas III. B.C. 85, who took part with Hyrcanus in his contest with Aristobulus, a dispute which was decided by Pompey. This Aretas, taking advantage of the weakness of the later Seleucidae, had possessed himself of Damascus, and had struck coins with the legend Βασιλέως Αρέτος Φιλέλληνος. He was however attacked by Marcus Scaurus, and under his successors, Malchus B.C. 50 to 28, and Obodas II., Damascus fell into the hands of the Romans; but apparently not permanently, for we find Aretas IV. (of 2 Cor. xi. 32) in possession of Damascus, at the time when S. Paul made his escape over the wall. His original name was Æneas, but he assumed the dynastic name of Aretas on his accession to the throne.

The dominions of Aretas comprised the territory at the back of Palestine, enclosing it almost on all sides: it in-
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cluded Arabia Petraea, or the land of the Nabataeans, with its capital Petra, situated half-way between the Dead Sea and Ezion-geber the ancient trading port of Solomon. His rule extended far into the interior of Arabia, and along the shores of the Red Sea; and, in a northerly direction, beyond Damascus.

Commentators have been accustomed to make a difficulty about Aretas's rule in Damascus, on account of that ancient city being included in the great province of Syria, and being consequently under Roman rule. But it would appear that it came into the possession of Aretas under the following circumstances.

From Josephus we learn that a daughter of this Aretas became the first wife of Herod Antipas, and was repudiated by him for the sake of Herodias. Josephus gives a long account of her flight from Galilee and of her taking refuge in the frontier fortress of Machærus, where John the Baptist was beheaded. A war ensued between the two princes, in which Antipas sustained a severe defeat. On this, Antipas complained to the emperor; and Tiberius, angry that one subject king should make war upon another, without permission asked, ordered Vitellius his legate in Syria to chastise Aretas (Jos., Antiq. xviii. 5).

Vitellius was very unwilling to take this step, for he was on bad terms with Antipas on account of a disagreement between them, arising out of a treaty with the Parthians on the Euphrates, which had led to Vitellius receiving a snub from the emperor. Vitellius accordingly moved his army as slowly as he dared, and presently arrived at Jerusalem, where he was fortunately relieved from his embarrassment by the arrival of the news that Tiberius was dead. This changed the aspect of affairs. Vitellius could delay further action till he had ascertained the policy of the new emperor. This was Caius Caligula, the friend of Agrippa I. What happened in regard to Damascus is not on record: but the probability
is, that Agrippa, who was jealous of Antipas, persuaded Caius to restore to Aretas a town that in time past had belonged to the Nabataeans.

This conjecture receives confirmation from the coinage of the period. Coins of Damascus belonging to the reigns of Augustus and Tiberius are extant; so are those of Nero. But the intervening emperors, Caius and Claudius, are not represented. What is wanted, to complete the case, is a coin of Damascus between A.D. 37 and 54.

Aretas, being in possession of the town, committed the government to an "ethnarch": and it was during the rule of this ethnarch that S. Paul's life was attempted by the Jews, and that he escaped by being lowered in a basket through a window overlooking the wall.

The date of this escape may be with confidence fixed between A.D. 36–38, by calculating backwards from the visit to Jerusalem mentioned in Gal. ii. 1, which may be taken as A.D. 51. S. Paul's escape, consequently, falls within the period of Aretas's rule over Damascus, which ended with his death in A.D. 40.

King Malchus, who succeeded Aretas IV., was a subject king under Nero and Vespasian, and rendered them assistance during the Jewish war. His son, Dabel, who was contemporary with Trajan, was the last of the line. Under Trajan the Nabataean kingdom was erected into a province under the name of Arabia A.D. 106, and Damascus was restored to Syria.

**Principalities**

The title of "king" was detested by the Romans. From the time of Tarquinius Superbus no one had borne that title in Rome: Julius Caesar, even, in the plenitude of his power, dared not accept it, much as he should have wished. After Tarquin, the kingly dignity was cast aside and never restored, for Brutus, the first consul, caused an oath to be taken by
the whole people that this principle should be a fundamental element of the Constitution: and the next year, B.C. 508, P. Valerius Publicola carried a law that: "Whosoever should attempt to obtain royal power should be devoted, person and property, to the infernal gods."

In after times, as the dominions of the Republic extended further and further from the central City, alliances were made with the rulers of kingdoms in different parts of the world: and in the days of the civil wars and of the Empire, those in authority were much occupied in the making and unmaking of kings. A system of allied, or subject states, under the government of kings and princes of various grades and powers, gradually came into existence. They were mostly doomed in the end to lose their crowns, and to see their kingdoms reduced to the position of provinces, but the system flourished vigorously for a long period, partly because it was a convenient mode of governing the peoples of the Orient, but principally because it was gratifying to the pride of the emperors to be in a position to confer a dignity which was highly prized by the provincials, though at the same time despised by the Senate and the Roman people.

These client-kings were of various grades, in all proportions, from almost supreme power to absolute dependency, the one principle maintained throughout being that, in any emergency the ultimate decision rested unquestionably with the Emperor. The amount of power in the hands of each sovereign depended very greatly on himself, though very frequently he was the creature of circumstance: an accident, a mere chance, might make him king, or hurl him from his throne. An insurrection, a foreign invasion, the friendship or enmity of the emperor, or even his mere caprice, the plots of a rival, complaints from his subjects—these were matters of ordinary, everyday occurrence, leading to perpetual changes in the constitution of these subject states.

A king might be an Ally, Rex Socius, on the frontiers of
the empire, merely nominally associated with Rome, and retaining all the rights of an independent sovereign, the right of making war with whom he would, freedom from tribute. Or he might be a Rex Amicus, more closely connected with the imperial power, and be liable to tribute, precluded from declaring war, and be bound to supply auxiliary troops when necessary. Within their own realms they bore all the insignia of royalty, and were practically supreme, both in civil and military affairs; and their subjects for the most part knew of no other rulers: yet they themselves were well aware of their subjection, and took care to keep on good terms with Rome. In the west of Europe the Roman law and system of government were more freely adopted; but amongst the Asiatic peoples the looser system was found more suitable.

This system of subject or allied kingdoms came into existence as early as the time of the Punic Wars, when the Romans began to interfere in distant principalities, as e.g. with Macedonia and Egypt, in the time of Perseus and Ptolemy Epiphanes. And presently Rome became the lord of various principalities by bequest.

Thus in B.C. 133, Attalus III. bequeathed his kingdom of Pergamus to the Senate, who formed it into the province of Asia. This precedent was followed by Ptolemy Apion, king of Cyrenaica, B.C. 96; and by Nicomedes III., king of Bithynia, B.C. 75. Thus Rome opened its arms to embrace the East.

When Pompey was operating in the East, he bestowed kingdoms upon Deiotarus of Galatia, and upon Eumenes, son of Attalus, who received a large territory in the interior of Asia Minor. He also selected Hyrcanus as the ruler of Judæa, and received the homage of Hareth, or Aretas, the king of the Nabataean Arabs.

Antony, in like manner, made Amyntas king of Galatia, after whose death the kingdom became a province. Antony was very liberal in his donations to Cleopatra, making her the
sovereign of Cœle-Syria, Judæa and Cyprus, under the name of Chalcis. He also appointed Archelaus king of Cappadocia; and, in conjunction with Augustus, made Herod the Great king of Judæa.

When Augustus divided the provinces, there were kings in Thrace, Macedonia, Mauritania and Numidia: these kingdoms ultimately became Roman provinces.

An interesting illustration of the cheapness of “kings” at this time is given by Josephus (Antiq. xix. 8, 1), who states that Agrippa was highly esteemed by neighbouring kings, five of whom paid him a ceremonious visit at the same time. These were Antiochus, king of Commagene, Sampsigeranus of Emesa, Cotys of lesser Armenia, Polemo of Pontus, and his own brother Herod, king of Chalcis. The proprætor of Syria, C. Vibius Marsus, scenting some disloyal plot in this assemblage of royalties, betook himself to Tiberias to make inquiries. He was met, about a mile from the town, by these six kings in a chariot, all of whom presently received directions from the imperial legate, through his messengers, to return without delay to their respective principalities.

Thus the Romans, though they repudiated the actual title of “king,” asserted their lordship over the whole civilised world, and proclaimed their ruler the “great king,” the “king of kings.” Thus did their provincial governors, armed with full authority from the central source of power, appoint and popose kings and princes at pleasure, and play football with the crowns of the world.
CHAPTER XIII

CLAUDIUS LYSIAS AND THE ARMY

That portion or division of the Acts of the Apostles at which we have now arrived is concerned almost entirely with the history of S. Paul, and only incidentally with the history of others. We meet with Mnason, Lysias, Felix, Festus, Agrippa, and several more; but they are merely actors in the Great Drama of the Trial of S. Paul. S. Paul takes the leading character: around him all the interest revolves; the other personages introduced play subordinate parts.

The Trial of S. Paul by the Roman authorities is evidently regarded by S. Luke as of prime importance. The same principle pervades his Gospel. He there gives great prominence to the last journey of our Lord to Jerusalem and His Trial before Pontius Pilate; and it will have been observed, in our present book, how much more frequently we have had occasion to refer to, and to quote from, S. Luke, than the other Evangelists, his Gospel being indeed, as it has been styled, "the Gospel of the Historian."

S. Luke's Three Books

Professor Ramsay, in his S. Paul, the Traveller and the Citizen, advances the opinion that S. Luke appears to have planned a systematic history of the Foundation of the Christian Religion, especially in its relation to the Roman Empire; and that his plan involved the production of three Books, each of them dedicated to Theophilus:—
I. The History of our Lord Jesus Christ, the very beginnings of the Church, in his Gospel.

II. The History of the First Preaching of Christianity, in Jerusalem and the East, as far as to the City of Rome. This we find in the Acts of the Apostles.

III. It was obviously intended that there should be a Third Volume, relating the incidents of the Trial of S. Paul before Nero, his acquittal and subsequent journeys to Spain and other parts of Europe to the west of Italy, concluding with S. Paul's second Trial at Rome and his martyrdom.

The whole plan does not seem to have been carried out: or, if it were, the Third Volume has been lost.

That there was, in all probability, such an intention in S. Luke's mind, is derived from the following considerations.

First. The close of the Acts of the Apostles seems to be inconclusive and incomplete. S. Luke, after giving an elaborate account of S. Paul's Trial before various Roman officials, and of his appeal to Cæsar, and even a long narrative of his shipwreck on the voyage to Rome, brings the Apostle to Rome and leaves him there in custody, without giving any hint as to the result of the Trial. We cannot gather from the Acts whether that imprisonment ended in acquittal or in condemnation. We have been interested in the history of the Trial, and we are anxious to know the result. But we are not told.

Why is this?

The "two whole years" of the detention at Rome afforded ample leisure to S. Luke, with the advice and assistance of S. Paul, to produce the first two volumes. But the imprisonment continued. Nero did not send for the accused. Meanwhile the books were ready, and the author proceeded to publication without delay. Thus the date usually assigned to the production of the Book of the Acts, viz. A.D. 63, may be accepted without hesitation; and the place of publication we may believe to be Rome.
The inconclusive termination of the Acts has exercised the ingenuity of commentators. Meyer (as Dean Alford points out) suggests that the rest of S. Paul's history was so well known to Theophilus (whom Meyer, without any evidence, assumes to be a Roman) that it was unnecessary to bring the account to a later date. But if this were so, then presumably Theophilus would have been well informed as to the previous history of the Apostle. Besides, the book was intended for others as well as Theophilus.

De Wette asserts that the words of our Lord in Acts i. 8 having been fulfilled, there was no necessity to pursue the narrative further. But, in reality, those words, viz. the witness borne "in Jerusalem, and in all Judæa and Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth," had not been fulfilled, for the Gospel had not as yet been preached beyond Italy. And further that command of the Lord had not been formally laid upon S. Paul.

It has been further asserted that the narrative was brought to a close because the promise of chapter xxiii. 11, "so must thou bear witness also at Rome," was now fulfilled. This assumption is quite untenable, because in that case the inconclusiveness of the Book would be still more obvious, inasmuch as the voyage to Rome was for the very object of standing before Cæsar (Acts xxvii. 24), a fact which is not related.

Obviously the Book of the Acts is incomplete, and requires a further work to bring it to perfection.

Secondly, We are entitled to assume from the opening words of the Acts that the Book was intended to be followed by another. S. Luke is usually credited with writing good Greek. Now he begins his second Book with the words Τὸν μὲν πρῶτον λόγον, which the Revisers render "The former treatise," but noting in the margin "the first." In our chapter on Cyrenius we have given instances from S. John of the use of πρῶτος for πρότερος, the superlative for the comparative;
and we have also shown how Winer and Huschke have vindicated S. Luke for such a use of the word.

If then we take S. Luke’s πρῶτον in Acts i. 1 in the superlative, as he writes it, and not in the comparative, as the A.V. and the R.V. have rendered it, we shall understand him to imply that the Gospel was not merely a former volume, of two; but the first volume of a series of more than two.

Thus there are grounds for accepting Professor Ramsay’s theory that there was an intention to publish a third volume, recording the result of the Trial before Nero, and S. Paul’s missionary travels in the West.

S. Paul’s arrival in Jerusalem

We now take up the narrative of the events which led to S. Paul’s journey to Rome. This narrative, beginning with chapter xxii., occupies the rest of the Book, to the exclusion of all other matter. It is regarded by the historian as a crisis in the History of the Church of Christ. After relating the Third Missionary Journey of S. Paul, the writer brings the Apostle to Jerusalem. At Cæsarea he had been solemnly warned of the dangers which beset his path. Agabus, after the manner of the ancient Hebrew prophets, had in symbolic form, and by dramatic action, foretold bonds and imprisonment for the Apostle: he should be delivered “into the hands of the Gentiles.” But the prophet could not divert the Apostle from the path of duty: he was ready not only for bonds and imprisonment but also, if need be, for death.

For a long time past the poverty of the saints at Jerusalem had been upon his mind; and he had made careful preparations for collections to be taken up in Galatia, Asia, Macedonia and Achaia. A generous response had been made to his appeal; and at his suggestion, delegates from the four provinces had been appointed to travel with him in charge of the contributions from the various churches. He and they
had survived many perils on the way, and now were nearing their destination, with the alms safe in their "baggage" or "carriages." Before his conversion he had, in his persecuting zeal, been instrumental in bringing trouble upon the poor saints at Jerusalem, and he was now rejoicing in the opportunity of making some amends.

Besides, it was part of his plan, now that he had, as it were, conquered the East, and brought it under the banner of the Cross, that he should carry the war into the very heart of the enemy's country. "I must also see Rome," he had himself determined: "thou must bear witness also at Rome," was the Lord's appointment. All things beckoned him towards the imperial City. Thither must he travel, whether in bonds, or as a free man, that he might conquer the West, as he had already conquered the East.

To Jerusalem therefore he was bound to go: and he took up his baggage, and went (Acts xxii. 15).

At Jerusalem

Arrived at Jerusalem, S. Paul fixed his abode at the house of Mnason, who is described as an "early" disciple, a designation which probably means that he was a follower of the Lord during His ministry, and one of those upon whom the Holy Ghost fell on the Day of Pentecost, ἐν δυνάμει ἀρχισυνέλευσεν being used in that sense in Acts xi. 15. S. Paul apparently had a sister living in Jerusalem at this time, for mention is made of a son of that sister in xxiii. 16. It is of course possible that she and her son came to Jerusalem with S. Paul and his company; but it is more probable that she was residing there (as Mark's mother did). Her son may have been a student in the schools of the Doctors in the Holy City, and have heard of the plot "to kill Paul" from some of his fellow-students. He would certainly have known nothing of it from the body of the "brethren." If, then, S. Paul's sister was
an inhabitant of the City, why not have stay'd with her? Many reasons, of prudence, of business, and the like, may be suggested.

On his arrival he received a warm welcome from the brethren at Mnason's house: but, as some suggest, a cold reception from the Apostles and elders, before whom he and his company presented themselves the very next day. S. James, the bishop, was present, attended by the elders or priests. S. Paul and the delegates from the four provinces presented the offerings which had been collected for the poor saints at Jerusalem, and S. Paul himself gave in a full report of his work amongst the Gentiles, "rehearsing one by one the things which God had wrought by his ministry." The Report was well received; "they glorified God."

But there was a party amongst the presbyters, who, in their excess of zeal for the Law of Moses, took exception to the prominence assigned to the Gentiles. Paul had been too lax, he had favoured the Gentiles too much. And then, passing beyond the limits of the truth, they asserted that he had everywhere taught the Jews to forsake Moses, to neglect circumcision and to abandon the national customs. This, they urged, was a serious matter, likely to injure the infant Church, composed of myriads of Jews, all zealous for the Law. Πάντως δὲι συνελθεῖν πλήθος, "The multitude must needs come together" (R.V. omits this). "There will have to be a meeting of the whole Church"; or, as it may be understood, "These myriads of Judaizers will assemble, and fault will be found with your principle of action in regard to the Gentiles. Something must be done to satisfy them that you have not abandoned the customs of the fathers." It was proposed to him that he should prove that his zeal for the Law, which had been so conspicuous a characteristic of his before his conversion, had not altogether faded out.

S. Paul might have represented that the charge against him was false; that he had not interfered with the observance of
the Law by Jewish converts; that he had merely permitted uncircumcised Gentiles, who had embraced Christianity, to remain uncircumcised; and that he himself had even administered that Jewish rite to Timothy. However, he would make no difficulty about their proposal: he would be willing, as he had been wrongly judged, to remove the misconception. He would do as they desired.

The Nazarite Vow

We deal with this vow, not from the Jewish point of view, but merely as concerns S. Paul, viz. by bringing him into the Temple during the Festival of Pentecost, and thereby into collision with the crowds of devotees assembled for the feast.

The next day after the proposal was made, S. Paul began to carry it out. It was the Day of Pentecost (according to Conybeare and Howson), and he went into the Temple to take part in the vow with the four Jewish Christians, purifying himself with them. The number of days for the observance of the vow, when it was not for life, is not stated in Num. vi., but the Mischna makes it thirty days. It would seem that seven of these days had yet to run, at the end of which the shaving of the head and the offering of the sacrifices must be accomplished. S. Paul did everything in accordance with the requirements of the Law, and "declared the fulfilment of the days of purification," i.e. gave due notice of the approaching completion of the vow to the officials of the Temple.

The offerings required on the occasion were somewhat costly, and were beyond the means of poor men: they comprised two lambs and a ram and various other offerings. In order to enable conscientious poor men to take upon themselves this vow, it had become the custom for wealthy persons to provide the cost. Thus Agrippa I., with the view of ingratiating himself with the Jews at his accession, undertook
this duty in regard to many Nazarites whose vow was about to terminate (Jos., Antiq. xix. 6, 1).

S. Paul does this now, in accordance with his agreement: and thereby proves his sympathy with the Law of Moses, as shown in his compliance with a purely Jewish rite.

But whence did he obtain the means to defray this expense?

From the collection which he had recently handed over? It has been suggested that a grant might have been made from that fund for this purpose. But had it been proposed, S. Paul would most certainly have rejected the proposal. It would have been a wrongful use of alms which had been provided for the relief of the poor, had they been diverted to another purpose. S. James and the elders would not have allowed such a misappropriation of the fund.

Was a special collection made for the purpose? This may have been, but is hardly likely, as the saints at Jerusalem were notoriously poor, having apparently impoverished themselves by the practice of community of goods.

S. Paul may have provided the means himself; for, as we shall presently have occasion to show, he was at this time in possession of considerable funds. Whether this were so or not, S. Paul might very well have thrown the onus of defraying the cost upon those who made the proposal.

During the period of the vow Paul must have been dwelling with those four poor men in the Nazarites' chambers, which were situated within the sacred enclosure, at the south-east corner of the court known as the Court of the Women. This court, however, was not appropriated specially to the use of the women; indeed it was chiefly used by men; but women were permitted to penetrate as far as this court into the Temple area.
Riot in the Temple

It was in this Court of the Women that the riot began.

During the period included within the terms of the vow, S. Paul and his four companions would have been passing frequently to and fro between the Nazarites' chambers and the Court of Israel. On one of these occasions he was recognised by some of the Jews from Asia, especially from Ephesus, where, shortly before, the disturbance raised by Demetrius the silversmith had taken place. These men gave the alarm. They raised against Paul the same charge that had been preferred against Stephen, in almost the same words; that he was accustomed to teach all men against the People, the Law and the Holy Place; and further, that he had defiled the Temple by introducing Greeks within the sacred enclosure. They had seen Trophimus in the city, with S. Paul, and they concluded too hastily that he had brought him into the Temple. This charge, if true, would have been serious; for the Romans had given power to the Jews to exact the penalty of death from any Gentile, even though he were a Roman, who trespassed beyond the Court of the Gentiles (Jos., B. J. vi. 2, 4).

The alarm was given: the courts resounded with the outcries of the people whose religious susceptibilities were outraged by this supposed profanation. The Jews were at this time in a more than usually inflammable condition, and the least spark would kindle a conflagration. Shortly before this, under the procuratorship of Cumanus, the next before Felix, a disgusting act committed by one of the Roman soldiers on the roof of the cloisters had led to a serious riot, which resulted in the death of 10,000 Jews. Other high-handed acts of the military occurred soon after, and eventually Cumanus was superseded by Felix (B. J. ii. 12). Thus the Jews were at this time ready for an outbreak at any moment. Very little
would suffice to create a crisis. The mere suspicion that one of the uncircumcised had overpassed the sacred boundary was enough. The cry was raised, "Men of Israel, help!" That cry reached the ears of the citizens: the report spread like wildfire; "all the city was moved, and the people ran together."

There were no entrances to the Court of the Gentiles on the east, the ground being precipitous on that side; nor on the north, where the Castle of Antonia stood. But from the other two quarters the people could crowd in, especially from the west. On this side there were four gates (Jos., Antiq. xv. 11, 5), one of which gave access to a bridge across the Tyropoean Valley, and led to the king's palace and the whole district of Mount Zion; the other three gates led to the lower city. From Ophel also on the south, gates opened into the Royal Porch, across which the people could rush into the Court of the Gentiles. Thus, from the south and the west the court would speedily be filled with a surging mob, swaying to and fro in their wild excitement, and all bent on making their way towards the South Gate of the Women's Court.

Meanwhile the assailants of S. Paul were endeavouring to drag him from the Women's Court towards the South Gate of that court, in order to remove him from within the sacred enclosure. But that gate would have become blocked by the crowds pressing in from the City. Consequently they must have changed their direction, and hurried their victim towards the East Gate of the Women's Court, which would lead them into the narrower space of the Court of the Gentiles opposite Solomon's Porch or Cloisters. The intention of the mob was to avoid offering any violence to S. Paul while within the sacred enclosure, but to drag him into the Court of the Gentiles, where they would consider themselves justified in exacting punishment for his supposed offence, even to the extent of beating him to death.
Josephus informs us (B. J. v. 5, 2) that the pavement of the Women’s Court was fifteen cubits above the floor of the outer court, a difference of level which would require more than thirty steps between. Of these thirty or more steps, about twenty descended to the place where the Chel or stone wall stood which formed the partition between Jew and Gentile. Below this were fourteen steps to the Lower or Outer Court. The Chel was three cubits in height, and was inscribed with legends in Greek, Latin, and Hebrew characters, prohibiting all the uncircumcised from passing that boundary on pain of death, a penalty which it was permissible to enforce even against a Roman citizen (B. J. vi. 2, 4).

Within this boundary wall no blood, except the blood of the sacrificial animals, must be shed. Across this boundary, therefore, must the victim be led, before he could be put to death. Down these two flights of steps, and through the East Gate, was S. Paul hurried; and when the crowd reached the Court of the Gentiles, they fell upon him with a will, striking him with their fists, and seeking to kill him.

Meanwhile the riot had attracted the attention of the authorities.

First, the Levites and the Temple Guard, the Captains of the Temple, with a military title, στρατηγοὶ τοῦ ἱεροῦ. From the Levites’ Court they could have witnessed all that had occurred: and, fearing profanation, they came out from the Court of the Priests, and closed the great gate which led down to the place where the riot began. This gate is described by Josephus as being exceedingly beautiful, and excelling all others. The others, he tells us, were covered with silver and gold; but this one, more costly still, was made of Corinthian brass, and was distinguished by the immense weight of its two leaves, rendering the exertions of twenty men necessary to open and close it. This the Temple guard proceeded to do. Thus they had secured the Temple itself, the ναός, from profanation. They next ran down the semi-
circular flight of fifteen steps, cleared the Court of the Women, and closed the other three gates. Thus the whole enclosure within the Chel was now secure: none were left within, except the officials themselves.

The Roman authorities also had been alert. From their stations on the roof of the cloisters the sentinels had observed the disturbance, and had reported it to the officer in command.

The whole of the Outer Court was surrounded by a beautiful covered colonnade of Corinthian architecture. The space thus enclosed formed a square of 400 cubits each way, or one stadium, or about 200 yards. On three sides there was a double row of Corinthian columns nearly forty feet in height, surmounted by a roof of costly cedarwood. The eastern colonnade had the name of Solomon's Porch. On the south side the Royal Porch extended from east to west between the Kedron Valley and the Tyropean. It consisted of a nave and two aisles, the whole width being just over one hundred feet, of which the central avenue occupied forty-five feet. The height of the aisles was fifty feet, that of the nave just double. The whole afforded opportunity for a pleasant promenade, protected from the sun's rays.

On the roofs of these cloisters sentinels were posted at intervals; and on the north-west corner of the Temple area was situated the Castle of Antonia, where a legion of soldiers could be quartered.

This Castle was founded upon a lofty precipitous rock, and extended along the greater part, if not the whole, of the north wall of the Temple. It appears to have stood upon the site of the palace of Ezra and Nehemiah, which is described in Neh. ii. 8, as "the palace which appertained to the house." It certainly was the palace of the Maccabæan princes, in whose time it was known simply as "the Tower." Herod extended the buildings and strengthened the fortifications, and renamed it "the Tower of Antonia," in compliment
to his patron, Mark Antony. A huge square tower, not unlike the white keep of our own Tower of London, raised its head with a turret at each corner 75 feet in height, the one at the S.E. angle exceeding 100 feet, and dominating the whole Temple area, and doing this so completely as to overlook even the Holy House in the inmost court. The Altar of Sacrifice itself was visible from the Castle, and thus the whole ceremonial of Jewish worship was open at all times to the inspection of the Roman military authorities. The roof of the cloisters communicated with the Castle, and two flights of steps led down to the western and northern cloisters respectively.

Thus there was no privacy for the Jews while engaged in the worship of God. As a consequence, all the proceedings in the riot, from the commencement, had come under the observation of the sentinels, who sent up notice (ἀνεβη παύς) to the commandant, that “all Jerusalem was in confusion,” as soon as the affair began to look serious. It was not merely that there was some excitement in the Temple precincts, for that would have been of little consequence, and could soon be set right; but from their posts of observation the sentries could descry crowds of persons crossing the bridge from Zion, and climbing the steps leading up to the Temple Mount, all hurrying through the external gates, under the porches and into the Court of the Gentiles, where the crush was becoming worse every moment.

The matter was urgent, and no time was lost. Forthwith Claudius Lysias, the chiliarch, took soldiers and centurions, and ran down (κατέβαλλον) the steps. The importance of the occasion is shown in the number of the soldiers who took part. This must have amounted to several hundred, as indicated by the use of the word “centurions” in the plural. This force soon cleared a way through the throng, and secured Paul who seemed to be the cause of the disturbance. In order to prevent any further difficulty the order was given to
bind him "with two chains," i.e. to fasten him with handcuffs to a soldier on each side of him. It was now time to inquire into the cause of the tumult. Lysias accordingly asks who the prisoner was, and what he had done. But the excitement was so intense, and the confusion through the shouting of many voices was so great, that it was impossible to ascertain anything definite. Lysias, accordingly, orders Paul's captors to remove him into the Castle or παρεμβολή, i.e. more properly into the camp or barracks attached to the citadel. This order renewes the tumult. Another rush was made; and the violence of the mob became so furious that the two soldiers were forced to lift Paul in their arms and carry him bodily up the staircase.

Paul, however, kept quite calm amidst the tumult, and turning to the chiliarch, prefers the request that he might be permitted to address the people. It was a dangerous concession to make, for it might only have increased the uproar; but the chiliarch consents, perhaps with hope of hearing something that would give a clue to the cause of the riot. In this he was disappointed, for S. Paul spoke in Hebrew, or Syro-Chaldaic, a language which the Roman officer did not understand. But the people did; and the officer was surprised at the sudden silence which fell upon the multitude, when the prisoner opened his lips.

With this discourse we do not deal, as it does not come within the scope of this work. But we will take the opportunity of speaking of Claudius Lysias and the Army.

**Claudius Lysias**

Nothing whatever is known of him except what we read in the Acts. But from this we gather that he was a military tribune, commandant of the Fortress of Antonia, a Roman citizen, and probably a Greek by birth.

*As commandant of the Roman Forces* in the barracks within
the Castle of Antonia, he was the chief officer in Jerusalem, under the procurator Felix. The procurator usually resided at Cæsarea, as Felix was doing at this time. In that bright seaside town he would find congenial society, such as he would look for in vain at Jerusalem: he would find also the baths and other luxurious accessories of contemporary Roman civilisation which would be conspicuous by their absence in the Jewish capital. Hence the procurator would spend the greater part of his time at Cæsarea, resorting to Jerusalem merely at the Festival seasons. During his absence the garrison at Antonia would be under the command of the chiliarch, who thereby became a personage of importance. Thus Claudius Lysias would be always on the spot, in the Castle, overlooking the Temple courts where the Jewish riots usually began.

His office of chiliarch, as S. Luke calls him, or legionary tribune, as the Latins would express it, put him into command of a cohort or σπείρα, consisting of about 1,000 men; in addition to a complement of troopers and a body of auxiliaries from the province. This force of infantry and cavalry was quartered partly in the Castle of Antonia, and partly in the old palace of Herod, known as the “Prætorium,” and situated to the west of Antonia in the Upper City, near the tower of Hippicus. In these two buildings there was ample accommodation for the troops under Lysias’s command: indeed Josephus informs us that the tower of Antonia provided quarters for a legion. There would be at least six centurions in the cohort, several of whom took part in the capture of S. Paul.

Lysias was also a Roman citizen, a privilege which he had purchased, as we shall see presently.

We may presume also that he was a Greek by birth. He certainly spoke that language. We are not at liberty to argue his nationality from this fact, for Greek was very generally spoken throughout the civilised portions of the Empire: but
if his mother tongue had been Latin, and he had been born in Italy, he would have been *ipso facto* a Roman citizen, free born, like S. Paul; for by the Leges Julia and Plautia Papiria, B.C. 90, the privileges of Roman citizenship had been extended to all the people of Italy.

**Arrest without Warrant**

Such, then, was Claudius Lysias, who rescued Paul from the infuriated mob. With the aid of several centurions and the men under their command he apprehends S. Paul.

It will be remembered that, when Judas betrayed our Lord, those who arrested Him were provided with due authority for the purpose, from the Sanhedrin, supported by a cohort of the Roman guard. But in S. Paul’s case it was an arrest without warrant, *per manus injectionem*. The Roman Law allowed this act to be put in force by any private person in the case of a debtor who had failed to discharge his obligation: and all superior magistrates possessed the *jus prensionis*, or the right of taking a person into custody, and Lysias was justified in laying hands upon a man who had committed a breach of the peace in his presence. It was doubtful whether he was justified in loading the prisoner with chains, after he knew that he was a citizen, for none but provincials and slaves were liable to such an indignity.

**Custodia Militaris**

S. Paul was now *in custody*. There were three kinds of Custody under process of Roman criminal law:—

*Custodia publica*, when the prisoner was committed to gaol, as in the case of Paul and Silas at Philippi.

*Custodia libera*, when the accused was placed under surveillance either in his own house, or in the house of a magistrate, who became responsible (sponsor) for his pro-
duction in court on the day of trial, and gave a legal promise (vadimonium) for that purpose.

*Custodia militaris*, when the accused was given in charge to a guard of soldiers. It was this last kind of detention to which S. Paul was subjected. It was a mode of detention that had been originated by Augustus when he established his military system throughout the empire. A small detachment of soldiers was told off for the purpose, who relieved each other from the task of guarding the prisoner, the guard being responsible, with his own life, for the safe custody of his prisoner.

In the case of S. Paul two soldiers were in charge, and he was bound to them by two chains. This was for the greater security while the riot was at its height. The severity of the bondage was afterwards alleviated, and he was committed to the care of a single legionary. Encumbered by those two chains, and standing between those two soldiers, S. Paul delivered his address on the steps of the Castle. On the next day he was temporarily released from his bonds (ἐλυττον αὐτῶν ἀπὸ τῶν δεσμῶν) for the purpose of being brought before the Sanhedrin (Acts xxii. 30).

It was an ordinary incident in military custody to allow of alleviations or relaxations, either by special permission of the superior authorities, or by collusion with the guards. An exceedingly interesting instance of this is given by Josephus (*Antiq.* xviii. 6) in the case of Agrippa, when imprisoned by order of Tiberius. By agreement with the centurion in charge he had been freed from his fetters during a feast, a report of the death of Tiberius having been spread. When the report was found to be false, he was again put into bonds and subjected to stricter surveillance. Gaius (Caligula) on his accession released him, and gave him a golden chain of equal weight with his iron chain, in memory of his captivity.

S. Paul throughout was treated with kindness: his guards evidently had confidence in his integrity: and even Felix,
who on leaving the province left Paul in bonds, gave orders to the centurion that he should have every indulgence, and free access to his friends (Acts xxiv. 23).

Later on, Julius the centurion (xxvii. 3) paid him the same attention; and, in Rome, though in military custody, he was allowed the use of his own hired dwelling, and permission to receive visitors and converse with them freely, even to the extent of preaching the very doctrines which had been the original cause of his apprehension.

The Roman Army

The subject is extensive, and we can only touch upon the points in which we are specially concerned.

In early times the army consisted exclusively of free-born Roman citizens, i.e. as Gibbon puts it, of those who "had a country to love, a property to defend, and some share in enacting those laws, which it was their interest as well as duty to maintain." This principle was effective when wars were brief in duration, and the area over which they extended was limited. But as the Republic extended its conquests, and its citizens grew more wealthy and luxurious, this Citizen Army was augmented by the enlistment of mercenaries, even of freedmen and slaves; and thus, as Gibbon further remarks, "In proportion as the public freedom was lost in extent of conquest, war was gradually improved into an art, and degraded into a trade." This change was inaugurated by Marius.

In the time of the civil wars, when long-continued military operations under Marius, Sulla, Pompey, and Julius Caesar had brought the art of war to greater perfection, this army of Citizens and Mercenaries or Auxiliaries was developed into a Standing army, στρατιωτας αδιανατοι, as Dio Cassius calls them. Hence Augustus had under his command between 40 and 50 legions (the number is variously estimated), making in the whole, including the auxiliaries recruited in the provinces,
considerably more than 400,000 men. The auxiliaries were almost equal in number to the legionaries.

These legionaries, all presumably Roman citizens, constituted an army of heavy-armed infantry, commanded by mounted officers. In addition to these were small troops of cavalry, attached to each legion.

The career of a legionary soldier may be regarded as falling into three periods.

His term of service lasted for sixteen years.
He then served for some years in the reserve.
And finally, becoming a veteran, he obtained a grant of land.

This system of military colonies was established by Augustus. The veterans, who had fought his battles and placed him on the throne, were clamorous for a reward for their services, and Augustus satisfied their claim by founding 28 of such colonies in the best parts of Italy, assigning to each soldier from 50 to 100 jugera (a jugerum was about 8 of an English acre), the centurions and tribunes receiving larger shares. The system was worked oppressively as far as the inhabitants of the districts were concerned, for they were simply expelled from their farms, to make way for the soldiery. In many cases the original proprietor was allowed to farm his land as the agent of the new owner, but large numbers of them were driven to Rome, where they constituted a disaffected element of the population. Augustus found it impossible to check the insolence of these veterans, and their conduct formed a precedent for the outrageous audacity of the Prætorian guards, who eventually became the nominators of the Emperor himself.

The whole force of more than 400,000 men was under the command of the Emperor. The title "Imperator" under the Republic was awarded to a victorious general, and was borne for a time only. Under the Empire the chief ruler had it conferred upon him for life, Julius Cæsar being the first to
be thus honoured. It was not merely a military title; for the "Imperium" included the civil power as well.

To the Emperor the legions took the oath of allegiance, swearing to devote themselves to the welfare of the Emperor and of Rome, even to the sacrifice of life itself. This oath was renewed annually, with great solemnity, in the presence of the imperial effigy displayed on a pole.

The legions were dispersed throughout the provinces, mainly in those provinces which were assigned to the Emperor, as being those on the outward limits of the Empire, where the population had not yet become accustomed to settled government, or where incursions from the barbarians beyond might be apprehended. This was the case principally on the north and the east, where the Rhine, the Danube and the Euphrates formed the boundary line. The largest armies were posted on the northern frontier: no less than 16 legions were required to keep the German tribes quiet, while 8 more were stationed in the east, where the Parthians were ever ready for the fray. The 2nd, the 9th and the 20th legions were assigned to Britain. The three wealthy provinces of Spain, Africa and Egypt were kept in order usually by a single legion in each. This accounts for about 30 legions. The others were required in Italy and in the rest of the Empire. The legions remained on one station for many years at a time, and were recruited from the provinces to which they were attached. Thus Josephus several times speaks of cohorts being raised in Syria.

**The Forces in Judæa**

With regard to Judæa, a large armed force was always essential, on account of the excitable nature of the population, ever ready to fly to arms in defence of their religion. This force consisted of about 35,000 men, belonging to the 5th, the 10th and the 15th legions. These numbers of the legions are given by Tacitus and by Josephus: they are merely
numbers and nothing more, for we cannot attach a name to any of them. The three legions would account for about 18,000 men; and these, together with an almost equal number of auxiliaries, would bring the total to about 35,000. They were stationed at Jerusalem, Caesarea and Ptolemais, and were under the command of the procurator, subject in case of emergency, to the imperial legate of Syria.

In addition to these, there were the bodies of armed men attached to the neighbouring tetrarchs, such as the soldiers of Antipas who took part in the mocking of our Lord, or those of Agrippa who guarded S. Peter in prison.

Legion

The Legion itself may be aptly compared with a brigade in the British army. The similarity between the two is close enough to be worthy of notice; for our companies, battalions, regiments and brigades, with their captains and colonels, may be placed side by side with the centuries, maniples, cohorts and legions, commanded by the centurions and tribunes, of the Roman army.

This may be most readily illustrated by the following table—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROMAN ARMY</th>
<th>BRITISH ARMY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 century = 100 men.</td>
<td>Company, under a Captain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 centuries = 1 maniple = 200 men.</td>
<td>Battalion , Lieut.-Colonel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 maniples = 1 cohort = 600</td>
<td>Regiment , Colonel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribe.</td>
<td>Brigade , Major-General.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 cohorts = 1 legion = 6000 men.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The numbers must not be taken too literally, nor the correspondence pressed too far, for in both armies the numbers varied from time to time, being fewer in time of peace. There was this important difference between the two, that in the Roman army there was no permanent general, but six tribunes were attached to each legion, and took the command...
in turn. This somewhat inconvenient arrangement was modified by the temporary appointment of a single commandant in times of emergency, and also by the creation of adjutants of the legion with praetorian power, these officers being designated legati legionis pro praetore. The references to Ἄγεων are S. Matt. xxvi. 53, Mark v. 9, 15, Luke viii. 30. Those to στείρα, Matt. xxvii. 27, Mark xv. 16, John xviii. 3, 12, Acts x. 1, xxi. 31, xxvii. 1. There are no references to the century or the maniple.

The officers of the legion were the 60 centurions and the 6 tribunes.

**Centurion**

The *Centurion* is prominent in the New Testament. He appears as ἑκατοντάρχος, ἑκατοντάρχης, and κεντυρίων. Outside the New Testament he is also styled ταξιάρχος. Sixty of these were attached to each legion. They were required to be capable of exercising command, brave in action, but not rash. They were invested with considerable powers. They bore the staff, or vitis, made of a vine-branch, with which to chastise refractory soldiers; and the chief of them, the primipilus, took part in the councils of war. They were men able to command, and also to obey, as the one at Capernaum stated “I am a man under authority, having under myself soldiers.” On retirement from the army they frequently took a leading position in the town where they dwelt, and were sometimes appointed to posts of importance, such as procuratorships.

Five such men are brought before us prominently in the New Testament, and all seem to have been kindly and good men.

(1) The Centurion at Capernaum, captain of the force there belonging to Antipas. Of him Jesus testified, “I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel.” He was kindly and courteous, benevolent and even religious, for he loved the Jews, and had built them a synagogue, ruins of which, in
white marble, are said to be still extant at Tell Hum. The references to him are in S. Matt. viii. 5, 8, 13, and S. Luke vii. 2, 6.

(2) *The Centurion at the Crucifixion*, who testified that Jesus was "a righteous man" and "the Son of God" (S. Matt. xxvii. 54, S. Luke xxiii. 47). In S. Mark xv. 39, 44, 45 the word used is κεντυρίων.

(3) *Cornelius, of the Italian band* or cohort (Acts x. 1, 22, where the word is ἐκατοντάρχης). He was "a devout man, and one that feared God with all his house, who gave much alms to the people, and prayed to God alway." High praise indeed!

But what was the "Italian band"?

Some have regarded this as allied with the "Augustan band" of Acts xxvii. 1, the latter being a part of the former: but we shall presently give reasons for distinguishing between the two. The Italian band, cohort or σπείρα, was apparently not attached to any legion, it not being customary to give names to legionary cohorts: it was doubtless one of the many independent cohorts of Italian volunteers, formed in Italy and willing to serve in any part of the empire. The cohort to which Cornelius belonged was at this time serving in Syria, and stationed at Caesarea. The name "Italian" enables us to distinguish it from the troops raised in Syria, to which Josephus alludes several times. Thus Cornelius would be a citizen of Rome: but need not be associated with the noble Cornelian gens, the members of which were very numerous. There were also the 10,000 slaves upon whom Sulla bestowed the franchise, giving them at the same time the name of Cornelius.

We must avoid any identification of this "Italian cohort" with the "Italica legio," which was not commissioned until the reign of Nero.

(4) The *Centurion of Acts xxii. 25, 26*, who was appointed to superintend the scourging of S. Paul, and who reported to
the chiliarch that their prisoner was a Roman citizen. In the same connection mention is made several times of centurions and soldiers; as when Lysias delivers Paul from the violence of the mob (xxi. 32); when Paul tells one of the centurions of the plot to kill him; when Lysias sends two centurions to Cæsarea in command of the escort (xxiii. 17, 23); and when Felix committed Paul to the care of a centurion, xxiv. 23.

(5) Julius of the Augustan Band: xxvii. 1, 6, 11, 31, 43, xxviii. 16. (This completes all the references to centurions in the N.T.)

The Augustan Band, οὔτείρα Σέβαστή. What this cohort was, has given rise to much discussion. Let us clear the ground by dismissing, without discussion, the following opinions as untenable.

It was not part of the "Italian band" to which Cornelius belonged.

Nor was it the troop of Sebaste, mentioned by Josephus (B. J. ii. 12, 5, Antiq. xx. 6, i); for that was a troop of cavalry.

Nor did it belong to any legion with the honorary title "Augustan," though several legions, e.g. 2nd, 3rd and 8th, are known to have borne that title. This of Julius's was a cohort, and legionary cohorts never bore surnames.

Nor was it a band of volunteers from Sebaste in Samaria, who would have been provincials and not Romans.

Nor was it a detachment of that guard of Praetorians who accompanied Nero in his tour through Greece.

Nor, lastly, was it any other detachment of the Praetorian Guards. We cannot, perhaps, do better than adopt the view expressed by Professor Ramsay in S. Paul the Traveller and Roman Citizen. Following Professor Mommsen, he holds that S. Luke, in employing the phrase, οὔτείρα Σέβαστή, was describing in a popular colloquial way a certain corps of officer-couriers, a body in the Roman service likely to be called "the troop of the Emperor." Julius, belonging to this
body, would be a legionary centurion on detached service for communication between the Emperor and his armies in the provinces. Such officers, known as frumentarii, acted not only for commissariat purposes (whence the name), but as couriers, and for police purposes, and for conducting prisoners; and in time they became detested as agents and spies of Government. They all belonged to legions stationed in the provinces, and were considered to be on detached duty when they went to Rome; and hence in Rome they were “soldiers from abroad,” peregrini. While in Rome, they resided in a camp on the Celian hill, called Castra Peregrinorum. In this camp there were always a number of them present, changing from day to day, as some came and others went away. This camp was under command of the Princeps Peregrinorum, the Stratopedarch of Acts xxviii. 16, to whom Julius, on his arrival at Rome, delivered his prisoners.

**Chiliarch**

Having touched upon the Centurions, let us now consider the Chiliarchs. In doing this it will be convenient to give a list of all the references in the New Testament: and these, it will be found, fall conveniently into four divisions.

There are, first, the chiliarchs of Herod Antipas’s force (S. Mark vi. 21).

Next the Roman officer of S. John xviii. 12.

Thirdly, the references to Claudius Lysias, as χιλιαρχος, are numerous. They are as follows: Acts xxi. 31, 32, 33, 37, xxii. 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, xxiii. 10, 15, 17, 18, 19, 22, xxiv. 7, 22, xxv. 23. (This last is in the plural, and is used in the same sense as in S. Mark vi. 21.)

Lastly Rev. vi. 15 and xix. 18.

These are all.

1. Antipas’s chiliarchs. S. Mark, in his narrative of the death of John the Baptist, represents the daughter of Herodias
Claudius Lysias and the Army

as dancing before the "lords, and the high captains, and the chief men of Galilee," i.e. before the principal officials, civil and military, of his realm. Herod's little army would have been enlisted within his own territory, and would consist of Galilæans, Samaritans and Syrians; it would have been modelled after the fashion of the Roman legions, and amongst its officers there would be tribunes and centurions, like the "chiliarchs" or "high captains" at Machærus, the centurion at Capernaum, and perhaps the "nobleman" or "king's officer," or Βασιλικός of S. John iv. 46. Whether the latter was a civil or a military officer cannot be determined: he might have been either: the word by which he is described occurs frequently in Josephus in the general sense. Three other meanings have been attached to the word: viz. royalist or Herodian—courtier—prince or one of royal descent.

In connection with the forces of Antipas we may mention the στρατευόμενοι of S. Luke iii. 14, the στρατεύματα of S. Luke xxiii. 11, and the σπευκολάτωρ of S. Mark vi. 27.

Στρατευόμενοι. The participial form of the word indicates soldiers, not in the general sense, as στρατιώται, but soldiers engaged in active service, soldiers on the march: not a portion of the Roman legions, but most likely, a detachment of Antipas's force in the field against the Nabataean prince Aretas or Hareth, whose daughter Antipas had married and afterwards repudiated.

Στρατεύματα. Thus S. Luke describes the body of soldiers who mocked our Lord: see page 222.

Σπευκολάτωρ. This was the designation of the official who was sent to decapitate John the Baptist. It is a Latin word, which by its derivation means a spy or scout. Such a body of men was attached to every Roman legion, and the members of it acted as adjutants on the staff of the commanding officers. The "speculator" of S. Mark vi. 27 is rendered "hangman" in the Old English Bibles, but this meaning is too restricted,
for the execution of criminals was only a part of his many duties. The "speculator" of Herod Antipas was one of his bodyguard; and so the Revisers render it—"a soldier of his guard."

2. *The chiliarch in Gethsemane.* This was the Captain of the cohort that superintended the apprehension of Jesus by the apparitors of the Jews (see page 177).

3. *The chiliarch, Claudius Lysias* (see page 337, on the arrest of S. Paul).

4. *The chiliarchs of Rev. vi. 15 and xix. 18* have no special description; they are merely "chief captains," classed with kings and great men of the earth.

**Cavalry**

Niebuhr describes this as the least satisfactory portion of the army. It was badly officered, it being the custom to entrust a troop of horse to the command of any young Roman noble who chose to take up the profession of arms, usually after having gained experience as *contubernalis*, or comrade, under some superior officer; but this was not considered indispensable, for Augustus and Claudius conferred the command of a troop upon whom they chose, without regard to experience or military skill.

The cavalry was disposed on the right and left wing of the army: hence the word *ala*, as applied to the larger body or regiment of horse. The *ala* comprised ten *turma*, or troops, each containing about 30 horsemen. The number of mounted men attached to a legion varied so considerably, as circumstances required, that it is not possible to estimate it with any amount of accuracy.

The only occasion on which mention is made of cavalry in the New Testament is in Acts xxiii. 23, 32, *περίηδος*, where we read of the escort that took charge of S. Paul on the journey from Jerusalem to Cæsarea.
That escort consisted of:
200 legionary soldiers, heavy armed infantry.
70 horsemen, constituting two turmae or a squadron, as we should call it.
200 spearmen. The word translated "spearmen," δεξιολάβοι (or δεξιοβόλοι, as in the Alexandrian MS.), is a unique word in the N.T., and its exact meaning cannot be ascertained. Probably the English version "spearmen," and the Vulgate, lamellarii, come as close as possible to the true meaning. It has been variously explained as a kind of military lictor, who took prisoners in charge by the right hand—or those posted on the right hand and forming a flank guard—or those who carried a weapon in the right hand as distinguished from archers and pellastae who bore their bows and shields on the left. They were probably lancers, or light armed troops of some kind, forming a complement to the heavy armed legionaries and the cavalry; the three kinds of troops together providing security against every kind of attack.

The pay of the legionary soldiers, so Niebuhr informs us, amounted to 120 denarii yearly, or 1200 asses. Julius Cæsar doubled, and Augustus trebled it. Thus in our Lord's time, the soldiers, like the labourers in the vineyard, received "a penny a day."

The Praetorian Guards

These guards, who exercised so fatal an influence upon the fortunes of the Roman Empire, owed their origin to Augustus, who, having assumed, or had conferred upon him, all the principal offices of the State, proceeded to make his position secure by forming this band of life-guards as a protection to his person and for the maintenance of his power.

They consisted at first of 9 or 10 cohorts, with a thousand men in each, infantry and cavalry. These were known as the cohortes praetoria, and the men themselves as praetoriani.
Each private was regarded as equal in rank to the centurions of the regular army, and was possessed of other privileges, such as double pay, shorter service, and exemption from military duty outside Italy.

Of the 9 or 10 cohorts, Augustus posted 3 only in Rome, being cautious enough not to create the suspicion of a military despotism: the rest were dispersed in various parts of Italy. By degrees these were brought nearer to Rome: and at length Sejanus advised Tiberius to increase their number, and to quarter the whole force in the Praetorian Camp which had been built close to the walls of Servius Tullius on the northeast of the City. This camp was a strong citadel capable of sustaining a siege, and lay between the Porta Collina and the Porta Viminalis. The effect of this was to place the City at the mercy of the Praetorians, and eventually to give them the supreme power in the Empire. This was felt during the reign of Caius Caligula, who was kept on the throne by their means, and enabled to pursue his mad career with impunity, until the Praetorians themselves tired of him, and put him to death.

Then the Senate and the City Cohorts proposed to restore the Republic: but the Imperial Guard, having tasted the sweets of power, determined to maintain the Empire. They accordingly seized upon Claudius, who was in hiding, from fear of death, and proclaimed him Emperor. This was the first occasion of their actually appointing an emperor: it was the first occasion also on which they were rewarded by a donative. This latter custom now became established, and the price demanded for their services was so enormous that none but the wealthiest could afford to compete for their patronage.

Henceforth the Praetorians were the masters of the situation. They could name their price, and that price was continually on the rise. Claudius gave to each Praetorian the equivalent of £120 sterling: Marcus Aurelius presented each with £160. Galba, confident in the strength of the legions that he brought
from Spain, omitted the bribe to the cohorts; but the Praetorians quickly disposed of him: they stabbed him in the forum, and proclaimed Otho Emperor. In three months Vitellius was on the throne, and he put more than one hundred Praetorians to death. Afterwards, however, he used their services, and raised their numbers to 16,000. They continued to be the real sovereigns of the Empire, until their arrogance culminated in the scandal of a public auction. Having murdered the admirable Pertinax (A.D. 192), they bargained with Sulpicianus for the throne: and then, with the object of obtaining the highest price possible, they proclaimed from the ramparts that the crown was for sale. Julianus, hearing this, hastened to the camp to make his bid. Sulpicianus offered to give each man 20,000 sesterces or £160: but Julian offered 25,000 sesterces or £200 sterling. The Praetorians closed with this bid, and the Empire of the world was knocked down to Julian.

At the head of the Praetorian guards were two commandants, styled Praefecti Praetorio. The most noticeable of these were the following.

Sejanus received his appointment from Tiberius, whose private, personal friend he was. But he soon became possessed with the ambition to secure the supreme power: and this end he facilitated by persuading Tiberius to retire to Capreae, while he himself held the reins of power in the City. He increased his own influence by bringing the Cohorts to Rome, and settling them in the camp by the Viminal Gate. Thus strengthened, he was practically the ruler from A.D. 20 to 31. By degrees he removed out of his way most of the nearest relatives of the Emperor, till at length Antonia, the mother of Germanicus, exposed him; and Tiberius accused him of high treason. He was arrested in the Senate, and strangled by Macro, A.D. 31.

Macro became his successor, and six years afterwards suffocated the Emperor Tiberius.
**Roman Law in the New Testament**

_Burrus_ was the next Prætorian Prefect, and he appears to have been the sole prefect, the rule hitherto having been to appoint two together. He was the best of them all; a good soldier and an honest man: the friend of Seneca and the tutor of Nero. On the death of Claudius, it was Burrus who secured the succession to Nero, a handsome donative having been promised to each soldier. His rule was but short, for he died in A.D. 62, not without suspicion of poison. Our main interest in him lies in the fact that it may have been to him that Julius the centurion delivered S. Paul as a prisoner.

_Tigellinus_, the successor of Burrus, was one of the vilest men of the age of Nero, the panderer to his vices; and, like his master, a monster of cruelty. He managed to retain the confidence of Nero till the rebellion of Vindex and Galba brought the reign to an end and sent both monsters to their account.

**Weapons**

The various weapons, offensive and defensive, borne by the Roman soldiers, are brought together by S. Paul in the remarkable passage in _Eph. vi. 11–17_, which he wrote at Rome in the presence of the soldier that kept him, to whom he was chained; and in the daily sight of the movements of the Prætorian Guards. The tramp of the soldiers' feet, and the clash of their arms must have been familiar sounds during his two years' imprisonment. He indeed anticipated these incidents when he wrote to the Romans (xiii. 12) about the "armour of light," τὰ δύναμεν τοῦ φωτός; and to the Corinthians (2 Cor. vi. 7, x. 4), about the "weapons of our warfare."

And when he was actually in Rome he employs this imagery of the "whole armour of God," giving it a spiritual Christian significance. "Put on the whole armour of God," πανορμύνια. The word is found also in S. Luke xi. 22 in connection with the "strong man fully armed," καθωπλισμένος.
The panoply of Eph. vi. includes a complete suit of armour, both offensive and defensive; the various weapons enumerated being as follows:—

Defensive armour.

Θώραξ, the breastplate of righteousness, a coat of mail, a cuirass or corset, covering the breast and reaching nearly to the loins. The word is found in the parallel passage in 1 Thess. v. 8, "the breastplate of faith and love"; also in Rev. ix. 9, 17, breastplates of iron, and of fire.

Θυρεός, an oblong or oval shield, made of wood covered with bull’s hide, and protected by strong plates of brass. It was of large size, about 4 feet long and 2½ broad. This word represents the scutum of the Romans, and not the clipeus, which was a round shield made of brass and smaller in size. "Withal taking up" (R.V.) "above all taking" (A.V.) might perhaps be better rendered "over all" ἐπὶ πᾶσι, the large shield affording ample protection for the person.

Περιξωσάμενοι, "having girded your loins with truth." The Ζώνη, zona, was a belt or girdle encircling the body beneath the breastplate. The balteus was a shoulder-belt.

Περικεφαλαία, a helmet, galea, with a lofty crest, fitting close to the head. In 1 Thess. v. 8, "for a helmet, the hope of salvation."

Ὑποδησάμενοι: the ἵππος here meant was the sandal or caliga, the strong and heavy shoe, from which Caligula obtained his nickname. The legs were also protected by greaves. The shoes were studded with large nails; and an anecdote is given by Josephus (B.J. vi. 1, 8) of a centurion, who, during the Jewish War, slipped on the tessellated pavement of the Temple Court, and lost his life.

Offensive weapons.

Μάχαιρα represents the short double-edged blade of the Roman soldier, worn, like a dagger, by the side. The references to this weapon in the New Testament are too numerous for comment, or even quotation: they are
follows: Matt. x. 34, xxvi. 47, etc., Mark xiv. 43, etc., Luke xxi. 24, xii. 36, etc., John xviii. 10, 11. These are chiefly the apprehension in Gethsemane. Acts xii. 2 (S. James), xvi. 27 (the jailor), Rom. viii. 35, xiii. 4, Heb. iv. 12, xi. 34, 37, Rev. vi. 4 and xiii. 10, 14. The “Sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God,” the sword by which the Lord Jesus repelled Satan’s temptations in the wilderness. In ecclesiastical art S. Paul, as a martyr, is provided with a sword.

'Ρομφαία, a Thracian broad-sword, a sword of larger size than the Roman. It is the sword of Luke ii. 35, Rev. i. 16, ii. 12, 16, vi. 8, xix. 15, 21.

Τόπος and Ὁφγη are used for sheath in Matt. xxvi. 52, and John xviii. 11.

Δόγχη, the spear or lance by which the Saviour’s side was pierced by “Longinus,” John xix. 34. It was with such a spear, we may presume, that the δεξιόλαβοι of Acts xxiii. 23 were armed. In addition to this light lance, the legionary grasped the formidable pilum, a javelin six feet long with a heavy steel point, 18 inches in length, the use of which was to hurl at the foe when about to come to close quarters.

Βέλος. Eph. vi. 16. This also represents a missile; and would include arrows, darts, stones, and other projectiles, some of them, like the failarica, tipped with tow and pitch, and other inflammable materials: hence the “fiery darts of the evil one.”

The derivation, of course, is from Βάλλεσθαι, to be thrown. The corresponding word, telum, is the ordinary expression for what is projected from a bow, a sling, or a hand, whether the substance be stone, wood, iron or other material: from τηλον, from a distance: it is also used for any offensive weapon generally.

Other military terms employed in the N.T. may, in conclusion, be briefly set down. At the head of the legions were the eagles, the standards to which allusion is supposed to be made in Matt. xxiv. 15, 28, “the abomination of desolation,”
Mark xiii. 14, Luke xvii. 37. The bringing of these into Jerusalem by Pilate caused great commotion.

Agmen was an army on the march, with its van, centre and rear, known as primum, medium, and extremum. Compare the στρατευόμενοι of S. Luke iii. 14.

Acies was an army in battle array. See the mention of χάραξ in Luke xix. 43.

The camp (castra) is represented by στρατόπεδον in Luke xxi. 20. Josephus (Antiq. xviii. 6) uses this word for the Prætorium. See also στρατοπεδάρχης, the commandant of a camp, in Acts xxviii. 16.

A permanent camp was castra stativa.

The watches amongst the Jews and Greeks were three in number during the night. The Romans had four, as enumerated in Mark xiii. 35 (δρσ, ἡ μεσονυκτίον ἡ ἀλεκ τοροφωνίας ἡ πρω). The fourth watch is mentioned in Matt. xiv. 25: and the four are alluded to in Acts xii. 4, where S. Peter was put in custody of four quaternions of soldiers: i.e. one quaternion for each of the four watches: two soldiers guarding the prisoner, and two others stationed at the door. It was a body of four soldiers also who cast lots upon the Saviour's garments, S. John xix. 23.

Numerous other references to military terms will be found under στρατεύε and kindred words: and in such expressions as "fight the good fight," "endure hardness," and many more.

The Conversation on the Stairs

S. Paul was now in military custody, and in a few minutes would have been carried by the soldiers up the steps which led to the roof of the colonnade, and thence up the further flight which led to the Castle. But, always on the alert, he appeals to the tribune, and craves permission to address the people. Lysias, surprised that his prisoner spoke good Greek, replies, "Then you are not that Egyptian, who led out 4,000
sicarii into the wilderness?" That Egyptian, when his followers were dispersed, had escaped: and Lysias had assumed that he had now reappeared; and had identified him with this author of a new insurrection.

The case of this Egyptian impostor is of interest to us as one of those cases in which a discrepancy occurs between S. Luke and other contemporary historians, and in which certain modern writers quietly assume that S. Luke must necessarily be in the wrong. We have already referred to several of these instances, notably that of Cyrenius, and have justified the sacred historian. Here also we venture to prefer S. Luke's evidence to that of Josephus, in such points as those in which the two writers are irreconcilable.

Josephus gives two accounts of the transaction, viz. in Antiq. xx. 8, 6, and in B. J. ii. 13, 5. In the first he states that Felix slew 400, and took 200 prisoners, and dispersed the rest: in the second the number is put at 30,000. In S. Luke's account (Acts xxi. 38) the number is given as 4,000.

In a hasty comparison of these various numbers, there would appear to be a contradiction. And we, while we champion the accuracy of S. Luke, here and elsewhere, do not challenge the accuracy of Josephus. The discrepancy between the two historians is capable of explanation.

On the supposition that the whole statement in Acts xxi. 38 is inaccurate, we are to remember that S. Luke is not responsible; for the statement is not his, but Lysias's. S. Luke merely places on record what Lysias said.

But there is no need to assume an inaccuracy: for the 4,000 of S. Luke's account may have been the number of those whom the Egyptian "led out into the wilderness," while the 30,000 mentioned by Josephus were those men who were "led round about from the wilderness to the Mount of Olives," the numbers having in the meantime received considerable accessions.

Or again there may have been 30,000 in all, of whom
4,000 formed an organised force or body of sicarii or assassins, the rest being mere rabble.

The number 30,000 in any case seems unduly large when compared with the 600 killed and taken prisoners. If this be so, there is an inconsistency between Josephus's two accounts. This last point, however, need not be insisted upon, inasmuch as a transcriber of the MS. might easily have misread \( \Delta \), 30,000, for \( \Delta \), 4,000.

**The Speech from the Stairs**

After this conversation with the commandant, Paul is permitted to address the throng of Jews in the Court of the Gentiles. It was a somewhat irregular proceeding, and might have made matters worse: but Lysias was anxious to ascertain, as clearly as possible, what was the cause of the tumult, and whether the subject under dispute was one that came within his jurisdiction, or might be more appropriately transferred to the Jewish Council. He was also the more disposed to grant the request, now that he had learnt that his prisoner was a Roman citizen.

Accordingly S. Paul opens his lips and obtains immediate silence; for he not only speaks in Hebrew, but he begins by recounting his enthusiasm for the Law of Moses, and his persecution of the disciples of the new Faith. This puts him on good terms with his audience.

He himself calls this speech an "apology" or defence. It was not really a defence in law, for at present there was no formal charge laid against him: it was rather an informal address to the crowd. Yet, as between himself and the zealous Jews, his speech was a defence of his conduct in regard to the Gentiles, on the authority of the Lord speaking to him from heaven. The word ἀπολογία is used in its true technical sense in Acts xxv. 16, "opportunity to make his defence."
The Second Riot in the Temple

Paul’s speech, which we pass over as not being within our scheme, was heard in silence until he came to the word “Gentiles”; and then the riot broke out as violently as before. “The Accused was no longer defending himself, or explaining his conduct: he was merely repeating his offence.” This was the gist of the charge against him, viz. that he advocated the admission of the Gentiles to the privileges of the Jews. He was deliberately stating that his mission was to the Gentiles. They would not hear another word. A storm of voices burst forth on all sides, and the crowd began to shout, “Away with such a fellow from the earth: for it is not fit that he should live.” And then the sudden passionate changes by which an Oriental mob is liable to be swayed, showed themselves. From perfect silence they pass suddenly into savage outcries and mad violence. They threw off their garments, or rather, shook them violently; they cast dust into the air; they clenched their fists and stretched forth their hands toward the object of their hatred, as though they would tear him in pieces or beat him to death.

The whole business is again upset: the riot has broken out again worse than before. There is nothing to be done but to remove the prisoner out of the reach of the mob: and accordingly the order is given to bring him into the Castle.

Examination of the Accused

When the prisoner was safe in the Castle, Lysias orders him to be “examined.” He wishes to ascertain exactly what the accused had done. He had expected to gather this from the address which he had permitted to be delivered. But, unfortunately for him, S. Paul had spoken in Hebrew, a
language not understood by the chiliarch. It was necessary, as a preliminary step to the trial, that he should know the nature of the crime alleged against the accused. And this he proceeds to ascertain by means of the scourge—an illegal act at the commencement of a case, and especially in the case of an educated man, responsible in position, as being a citizen of a free city, and that a "no mean city," οἷκ ἀνήμον πόλεως πολίτης; for Tarsus, as the coins testify, was μητρόπολις and αὐτόνομος. A few questions to the accused himself would have put the commandant in possession of the necessary facts. However a centurion is somewhat too hastily told off to superintend the "examination," and soldiers are appointed to prepare the victim, and to inflict the torture. A further illegality is about to be perpetrated. They strip the prisoner, fasten his hands, and bend his body forward, προέτευν, binding or tying him up with the thongs, τοὺς ἰμάδους, so as to get him into a fit position to receive the lashes. But while this was going on, Paul said quietly to the centurion that stood by, the centurio supplicio praebitus, "Is it lawful for you to scourge a man that is a Roman, and uncondemned?"
The last word in this question, ἀκατάκριτος, is rightly translated "uncondemned" here and in xvi. 37, both in the A.V. and R.V.; but, as Professor Ramsay points out, this rendering "does not fairly represent Paul's meaning, for it suggests that it would have been allowable to condemn Paul, after fair trial, to be flogged. But formal trial would only aggravate the crime, as making it more deliberate. The crime might be palliated by pleading that it was done in ignorance; and Paul would naturally cut away the plea by saying that they had made no attempt to investigate the facts. Paul could not have used the exact words which Luke reports. No civis Romanus would claim his rights in Greek. Paul claimed them in the Roman tongue; and the phrase which he used was most probably re incognita, 'without investigating the case.'" Dean Alford, on this, quotes from Cicero, in Verr. i. 9,
“Causa cognita multi possunt absolvii; incognita quidem condemnari nemo potest.” The Porcian law, however, was sometimes evaded by the fiction that a condemned criminal had become the slave of punishment, servus pæne, and so might cease to be regarded as a Roman citizen.

In any case, to apply the flagellum horribile at the very outset was illegal: much more in the case of a Roman citizen. Such an one was under the protection of the Lex Valeria and the Lex Porcia, B.C. 256, which made it a highly penal offence to inflict stripes or torture on a citizen. “Porcia lex virgas ab omnium civium Romanorum corpore amovit. Facinus est vinciri civem Romanum; scelus verberari; prope parricidium necari.” So Cicero testifies. Hence, as before at Philippi, so here in Jerusalem, Paul pleads his citizenship.

The centurion immediately stays the proceedings, and hurries away to warn his commanding officer, who in his turn hastens to the barrack-room to make sure of the facts. He knew that to make such a claim falsely was a punishable offence, and that consequently the claim would not have been put forward without reason. He is therefore anxious to clear himself from blame by admitting Paul’s claim to Citizenship.
CHAPTER XIV

ROMAN CITIZENSHIP

The Roman divided mankind into Freemen and Slaves. The freemen might be Romans or foreigners, *cives* or *peregrini*. The latter designation included those subject to the government of Rome without being citizens. And beyond these limits were the *hostes*, foreigners independent of Rome, but in conflict with the Empire; and *barbari*, those outside the limits of civilisation and of the Roman world. Disregarding the hostis and the barbarus, the freeman was distinguished into those who were born free, and those who had become free: and these classes were liable to further distinctions, as illustrated in the following table, which shows the various kinds of *Status*, or position held by the subjects of the Empire.

```
                        Homo
                         |
                          |
                       Liber       Servus
                         |
                        |
                  Ingenuus            Libertinus
                         |
                    Civis   Latinus   Peregrinus   Civis   Latinus (Junianus)   Dedititius
```

The Slave

The *Status* of a freeman included what was technically known as *Caput*, which involved certain rights of liberty, citizenship and position in a family. But the slave was devoid of these rights, as expressed in the phrase *Nullum habet caput.*
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He was practically destitute of rights; any that he seemed to possess were his, rather by favour than by right. He was a chattel, and could not be the subject, but only the object, of rights. His master had rights in him: he had none in himself. Nor had a slave any right of action against another. Such property as he was allowed to possess was known as *peculium*, and was understood to be held with the master's consent: and it was with this amount that he usually purchased his freedom.

The rights of a master were practically absolute. The master was entitled to the whole services of the slave, and to any property acquired by his labour: he held over his slave the power of life and death. He could order him to fight in the arena with other gladiators or with wild beasts, until, in A.D. 61, the Lex Petronia deprived him of this power. The infliction of death, at will, was not regarded as murder until the time of Claudius. Vedius Pollio, in the reign of Augustus, cast a slave who had incurred his displeasure, into the ponds to feed the lampreys: and the only penalty he incurred for this murder was the destruction of his fish-ponds. On the other hand, murder by a slave was punished by the most severe measures. Pedanius Secundus, prefect of Rome, was killed by one of his slaves; and justice was not appeased till all his 400 slaves were executed with the murderer. The torture of the whip or the fetters was inflicted for slight offences, and most houses contained an *ergastulum*, or private prison, where the slaves worked in chains. The slave was merely property, and could be transferred by sale, gift, exchange or testament, exactly like any other property, and without regard to relationship, until Constantine forbade the separation of children and parents, wives and husbands. Slaves, however, could not contract legal marriage; and when they were allowed to cohabit, their union was called *contubernium*.

There were various *modes of becoming a slave*. Anciently
Roman Citizenship

it usually arose from capture in warfare, it being regarded as
more profitable to reserve your captive for use than to put
him to death: hence the name servus, as though servatus.
The offspring of a female slave followed the condition of the
mother, partus sequitur ventrem. These were by the jus
gentium; but by the jus civile a bankrupt debtor or a felon
could be condemned to slavery by judicial sentence.

On the other hand, a slave could become free, by Manumission.
And this might be formally executed per vindictam, a rod
being laid on the enfranchised slave by the lictor. Or the
slave could be set free by Testament, or by enrolment on the
census. Or the manumission might be informal, by declar-
ation in the presence of witnesses, or by the writing of a letter,
or the presentation of a dowry on marriage to a freeman.

The number of slaves in the Empire under Claudius or
Nero was enormous, and has been estimated as high as sixty
millions. In Rome the proportion was about three slaves to
two freemen. As the lower class of citizens could not afford
to keep slaves, it came about that many citizens possessed
households comprising hundreds of slaves, and some even
owned thousands. The disproportion in numbers between
the slaves and the free was a perpetual source of danger.

In the New Testament we meet with two definite instances
of slaves; in the Centurion’s servant, δοῦλος, at Capernaum
(Luke vii. 2); and in Onesimus (Phil. i. 16). The word
occurs in the feminine in Luke i. 38, 48 and in Acts ii. 18.
And the domestic servant, or household slave, οἰκέτης, is found

Δοῦλος is of frequent occurrence; and is used figuratively
in contrast with ἔλεος. It is found also, in a bad sense, as
slaves to sin: and in a good sense, as servants of Jesus
Christ. The references are too numerous to be given.
The Free Man

The Free man, or Liber, might be born free, ingenuus, or he might be made free, libertinus. The birth must be by justum matrimonium; and the freedom conferred by one of the forms of manumission already mentioned. Both classes were subject to further subdivision, as shown in our Table. Of these the Civis or Citizen was best off.

The Citizen

The Citizen was endowed with full privileges, including Libertas, Civitas and Familia.

The full Citizen, civis optimo jure, enjoyed the following privileges:—

His Political Rights consisted in the Jus Suffragii, the right of voting in the comitja, and the Jus Honorum, the eligibility to all public offices and magistracies. Also the Jus Provocationis, the right of appeal in all cases involving the Caput. His Civil Rights comprised Conubium (or Connubium) and Commercium. The Conubium was the power to contract a legal marriage, justa nuptia, or justum matrimonium, and with it, the acquisition of the patria potestas, and the extensive powers thereby conferred on the pater familias, who was lord of his family, with the power of life and death. The father could punish by the scourge and the prison, and send his children in chains to labour like convicts in the fields or sell them into slavery. The Conubium conferred also rights of succession or inheritance under the civil relationship called agnation or alliance through the male line.

By the Commercium the citizen was entitled to acquire, hold and transfer property of all kinds, and to make contracts according to the forms of Roman law.
Roman Citizenship

Such were some of the privileges belonging to Roman Citizenship.

Anciently all the inhabitants of Rome were citizens, and all others foreigners; and there were then only these two classes, cives and peregrini: but as the territories under Roman rule were more widely extended, it became necessary to recognise an intermediate class of persons, upon whom a limited citizenship was conferred, under the name of Latinitas. These Latini enjoyed the commercium without the rights resulting from conubium. This concession was indeed forced upon the Republic by the social war, B.C. 90, when all Italians acquired the rights of citizenship. Hence there resulted the threefold division indicated in our Table, of cives, Latini, and peregrini.

The peregrini were entitled only to the benefit of the jus gentium, or the natural principles of equity, and not to the protection of the Roman law. For this purpose the peregrini were anciently required to obtain a citizen as patron; but afterwards they were placed under the protection of the prætor peregrinus for civil purposes of justice.

The Dedititii were the worst off of all: they possessed freedom in the most restricted form, and were subject to perpetual disabilities. They were derived from vanquished enemies, and from manumitted slaves guilty of grave misconduct. They could never rise to the status of citizenship. This class was abolished by Justinian.

By degrees the citizenship became more and more easy of acquisition. Under Claudius it was freely sold; under Marcus Aurelius almost any applicant could obtain it without difficulty; and at length, under Caracalla, it was thrown open to all free men throughout the empire, not, however, for love of his subjects, but merely for the purpose of raising taxation on releases and heritages, which were paid only by citizens. Henceforth all freemen were simply citizens, and beyond them were only hostes and barbari.
S. Paul a Citizen

We are now in a position to consider S. Paul's claim, and to compare it with the citizenship of Claudius Lysias. The privilege was acquired in different ways: S. Paul's by birth, Lysias's by purchase.

S. Paul was *ingenuus*, born free, his father having been a citizen before him. It is not known how his father obtained this privilege. It was not on account of his being a citizen of Tarsus, for that would not have given the title. Tarsus was not a *colonia* or a *municipium*, which would have carried the citizenship with it. Tarsus was merely an *urbs libera*, a privilege which had been granted by Mark Antony, and which exempted it from the burden of military occupation, as well as conferring upon it the right of electing its own magistrates, but did not confer the *civitas*. Many conjectures have been made as to the mode of acquisition of the *civitas* by Paul's father; as that he had purchased the privilege, or had been rewarded with it for services during the civil wars. Other suppositions have been brought forward, but so destitute of foundation as to be unworthy of mention.

Lysias had bought the citizenship "with a great sum"—πολλαὶ κεφαλαίοι. He had expended considerable "capital" upon it. He might have bought it of Messalina, the wife of Claudius, who was accustomed to sell the privilege: or rather she made the grant in the name of the Emperor, and took a bribe. Dion Cassius tells us that the price at first was high, but that afterwards it became very moderate. If Lysias obtained it from her, it must have been some years before this, for she was executed A.D. 48.
Before the Sanhedrin

Lysias was in a difficulty. He had bound a Roman citizen—an offence in itself as Cicero (Verr. v. 66) had stated, facinus est vincire civem Romanum. This binding is to be taken of the binding "with two chains" of xxi. 33, and not with the tying up "with the thongs" of xxii. 25, for the latter was now past, and the ἂν δεκακώς indicates an action still continuing. Yet, though he had done the act which makes him feel afraid, he dare not set the prisoner free till he had ascertained the nature of the charge against him. He desires to know the certainty of the accusation, just as Pilate did when he asked, "What accusation bring ye against this man?" The two cases were parallel. Both were apparently questions of Jewish law. Lysias must either have a definite charge of some offence against the Roman law, or he must set Paul free. It seemed to him to be the business of the Sanhedrin. He therefore directs the chief priests to convene a Council and try the case themselves. Again like Pilate, "Take Him yourselves and judge Him according to your law."

That the chiliarch had the power to order the Council to assemble seems remarkable. But in the absence of the procurator, he represented him in Jerusalem: and the procurator did possess this power, as Josephus shows (Antiq. xx. 9, 1). After the death of Festus, during the interregnum while Albinus was on the way to his province, the high-priest Ananus, son of Annas, had summoned the Sanhedrists, and was deposed after a rule of only three months for having done this without previously obtaining the consent of the procurator.

The Council, however, was glad to meet and to take up the case of Paul. Accordingly on the next day Paul was unchained, and brought down, καταγαγὼν, from Antonia to the Council Chamber in the upper city near the bridge across the Tyropean
valley, leading from the western colonnade of the Temple Court. The Sanhedrin no longer held meetings in the Lishcath Haggazzith, which was within the sacred fence, beyond which the heathen soldiers would not have been allowed to pass. They were, however, present at this meeting, as we see from xxiii. 10.

We do not deal with the proceedings before the Jewish Council, in which Paul plays off the Pharisees against the Sadducees; we notice only the result, which issued in the intervention of the Roman guard. Such a difference of opinion arose between the representatives of the two sects, the Sadducees endeavouring to lay hold of Paul, and the Pharisees resisting capture, that there was a danger of his being torn in pieces between them. He had already been the cause of two riots; and now a third riot was imminent. Lysias thinks it expedient to resume possession of the author of these tumults, and accordingly orders the guard to go down, and bring him into the castle. Again the word "down," καταβας as in xxii. 30 and in xxiii. 15 and 20.

S. Paul is still in custody, detained by the Roman authorities. The prophecy of Agabus had come true. Paul had been bound, and was now in the hands of the Gentiles. He was in the barracks of Antonia amongst the heathen soldiers, to two of whom he was chained. After the exciting experiences of the last few days, what was to come next? He well knew the bigotry and persistence of his fellow Hebrews, and the dangers to which he was thereby exposed. What would be the end? Under these circumstances, how comforting the vision of the Lord! He was now assured that all that had happened should be for the furtherance of the Gospel. His present trials should pass away, and he should be allowed to bear witness to Jesus at Rome, and so to carry into effect the intention he had cherished for so many years. Thus comforted he could sleep in peace, though in captivity.
The Conspiracy

Their prey had escaped. But the Jews were determined not to be baulked. Hence, more than forty of them bound themselves under a curse neither to eat nor drink till they had killed Paul. Just such a foolish anathema as this had been pronounced by Saul (1 Sam. xiv. 24) nearly issuing in the death of Jonathan. And Josephus (Antiq. xv. 8) gives a similar instance of a rash row. Herod "the Great" had created great disaffection among his subjects by building a theatre at Jerusalem, and an amphitheatre close by, in which he displayed all the customary heathen sports of gladiators, wild beasts, chariot racing, and wrestling. On which account ten of the citizens of Jerusalem conspired together, as a matter of conscience, to stab him to death in the theatre. The plot, however, was detected, and the ten conspirators were led out to die, rejoicing in their deeds. The forty men made the chief-priests and elders accomplices in their proposed crime, for they not only obtained their sanction to the plot against Paul’s life, but persuaded them to lend a hand themselves. The priests were to profess a desire for more information in regard to Paul’s case; or, as might be said, a more exact diagnosis of the case, διαγινώσκειν ἀκριβίστερον; and then on the way down from Antonia to the Council Chamber, the conspirators were to assassinate the accused. Lysias would most likely have consented to this arrangement, for he was himself anxious to arrive at the real merits of the question, and he knew that the investigation on the previous day had been broken off tumultuously before a decision had been reached.

But fortunately the secret was discovered and the plot was revealed. Thus the assassins were unable to commit the crime they intended. We may assume that they did not starve to death under the terms of their curse. They
no doubt obtained dispensation from the priests, on the plea of impossibility of performance.

It was Paul's sister's son who divulged the plot. He was probably a student in the schools, and had heard of it from one of his fellow-students. But a plot laid by forty men, in which many more besides were involved, including the members of the Sanhedrin, could hardly be kept secret. It was necessary to take immediate action. Accordingly the young man gained access to his uncle, and gave information of the plot. Paul knew that his life was safe, at least till his arrival in Rome (v. 11), but reliance on God's promises did not prevent him from taking proper precautions. He therefore requests one of the centurions to take the lad to Lysias. The kind-hearted officer, with the view of encouraging the nervous youth, takes him by the hand, and listens to his tale. He then sends him away with the injunction to keep his counsel: and without a moment's delay, the chiliarch takes steps to frustrate the plans of the conspirators.

Transference to Cæsarea

The escort to Cæsarea is described on page 349. A body of 470 men seems a formidable guard for one prisoner: but there were many desperate men on the watch, and an ambuscade was to be feared. The garrison at Antonia was sufficiently large to spare this number. In a short time everything was ready, and at nine o'clock at night a start was made.

The distance from Jerusalem to Cæsarea is more than 60 miles. The route is elaborately described by Conybeare and Howson. The roads between the two towns would be familiar to the Roman legionaries, as being frequently traversed by them in the numerous marches rendered necessary by the transference of the procurators from their official residence at Cæsarea to the Jewish capital. These roads would be kept
in good order, and the guard accompanying S. Paul would be able to travel as quickly by night as by day. In three hours from the start the travellers would reach Gophna along the high table-land of Judæa. Here they would turn out of the great northern road which led to Damascus, and begin the descent of the hills of Ephraim, taking a westerly course. In the early morning they would be in sight of the cornfields of Sharon and in the afternoon would arrive at Antipatris, after a journey of about 38 miles. Gibbon states that the Roman soldier was trained to march nearly 20 miles in about six hours, with all his baggage, a weight which he remarks "would oppress the delicacy of a modern soldier." Eighteen hours would be a sufficient allowance of time for the march of nearly 38 miles, descending all the while.

The rest of the journey to Cæsarea, about 25 miles, would be accomplished without difficulty, the cavalry being no longer delayed by the slower movements of the infantry, whose instructions were to return to Jerusalem. The ride along the comparatively level plain of Sharon, diversified by slight rises and descents, would be a pleasant experience after the night-march over the hills of Ephraim.

Arrived at Cæsarea, the centurion in command of the squadron of cavalry handed over his prisoner to the procurator Felix, at the same time delivering the letter from Lysias.

Lysias's Letter to Felix

This letter, being official, was no doubt written in Latin, although Lysias's own language was Greek. He certainly spoke Greek (xxi. 37), and he was probably a Greek by nationality, for had he been a Latin-speaking person born in Italy, he would have been a Roman citizen by birth, as every native of Italy after b.c. 90 was invested with the privileges of citizenship. "Lysias" would have been his
Greek family name, and "Claudius" the Roman name assumed on acquiring his citizenship.

S. Luke seems to have obtained a copy of the original document, and to have rendered it into Greek, the word τίτος, "after this form," pointing rather to an almost verbatim record, than to the general meaning of the letter.

A letter of this kind, containing an official statement of the charges brought against a prisoner on relegating him to be tried by a superior magistrate, was known as an elogium: and it was customary to give such documents careful attention from the beginning of the case. Qui cum elogio mittuntur, ex integro audiendi sunt.

This elogium is addressed officially "to his Excellency the procurator Felix"; τῷ κρατίστῳ ἡγεμόνι Φήλληι—Κράτιστος is not a mere complimentary epithet, but a distinctive title, applicable to persons holding a high official position. By this title Tertullus also addressed Felix, and S. Paul, Festus (xxiv. 3, xxvi. 25). S. Luke employs the same designation in dedicating his Gospel to Theophilus, who is presumed to be a person of equestrian rank.

The document embodies a fair statement of the case, with the exception of v. 27, where Lysias represents himself as having rescued Paul from the Jews after he had learned that he was a Roman.

The words with which the Epistle begins and ends, χαίρεων and ἔρρωσον are quite in the Latin style, and stand for salve and vale. But the last word ἔρρωσον is not found in the two most ancient uncial MSS. (A and B).
CHAPTER XV

FELIX AND CRIMINAL PROCEDURE

TACITUS, with his usual felicity, sets the character of Felix before the world in a single sentence, "In the practice of all kinds of lust and cruelty, he exercised the power of a king with the temper of a slave"—Antonius Felix per omnem sævitiam et libidinem jus regium servili ingenio exercuit (Hist. v. 9).

The career of this man corresponded with his name. He was born under a lucky star. He ought to have been a happy man, for he was eminently a successful man. Born a slave, he rose to power, and married the daughter of a king. He married three wives, each one of royal birth: Trium reginarum maritum aut adulterum, as Suetonius remarks (Claud. 28). The name of one of his wives is unrecorded; the other two were both named Drusilla. There was the Drusilla of Acts xxiv. 24, who was the daughter, the sister and the wife of a king; the daughter of Agrippa I., the sister of Agrippa II., and the wife of Azizus, king of Emesa. It is almost past belief that a princess so connected could have condescended to a union with an enfranchised slave. The other Drusilla was a daughter of Juba, king of Mauritania, and a granddaughter of Antony and Cleopatra.

Antonius Felix, as Tacitus names him, was the freedman of the Emperor Claudius, and hence he is often spoken of as Claudius Felix, the name Antonius being probably adopted from Antonia the mother of Claudius.

Claudius, the timid old man, who had had greatness thrust
upon him by the Praetorians, on the death of Caligula, lived in his palace surrounded by freedmen and women. Amongst the former were Pallas and Narcissus, unscrupulous and rapacious men, who wielded immense power. Felix owed his advancement to his brother Pallas. Through him he gained first his freedom, then various appointments in the palace, then the command of a regiment of auxiliaries, and finally the procuratorship of Judæa.

In this latter capacity he ruled with vigour and ability, upon which qualities he was complimented by Tertullus: but his servile origin was perceptible in all his deeds. He cleared the country of many of the brigands by whom it was infested, prevailing in almost every case by treachery and fraud as well as by violence. His elevation came about in the following manner. A serious rupture had occurred between the Galileans and Samaritans owing to the massacre of some of the former on their way to Jerusalem. The procurator Cumanus sided with the Samaritans under the influence of a bribe, and in other ways acted with injustice and cruelty, so as to disgust both parties to the conflict. An appeal was made to Ummidius Quadratus, imperial legate of Syria, who sent Cumanus to Rome, where he was deposed. Felix, who had already been joint procurator, was appointed in his place (Antiq. xx. 6). This was in A.D. 52, about six years before S. Paul was sent to Cæsarea.

During the whole of his term of office, the province was in a disturbed condition, torn to pieces by false prophets, robbers, sicarii and other disorderly characters. In the suppression of these disorders he did good service. He subdued the robbers of Galilee; captured Eleazar, a notorious brigand, and sent him to Rome; dispersed the followers of the Egyptian fanatic to whom Lysias referred (Acts xxi. 38); and in other ways endeavoured to maintain order, justifying to some extent the complimentary address of Tertullus, "by thee we enjoy much peace, and by thy providence evils are corrected for this
nation," though S. Paul more wisely contented himself by saying, "I know that thou hast been of many years a judge unto this nation": for, in fact, Felix’s ruthless massacres of Galilæans, Samaritans and Jews had altogether failed to bring peace to the distracted land.

His treacherous murder of the high-priest Jonathan, to whom in some measure he owed his elevation, was on a par with the rest of his deeds. Angry at the expostulations and warnings of Jonathan, he bribed certain robbers to assassinate him in the Temple; and, as no punishment was exacted for this murder of the high-priest, great encouragement was given to criminals, and many other murders were committed with impunity.

At length retribution overtook this slave so unsuitably raised to eminence. At the very time when S. Paul was in bonds at Cæsarea, a furious dissension broke out between the Jewish and heathen populations there, about equal political rights to citizenship, both parties claiming the city as their own. This led as usual to a massacre. Felix was recalled, and was replaced by Festus. Again Pallas saved his brother. Felix was acquitted by Nero, but, as far as we know, never held office again. His last act in Judæa was to leave Paul in bonds.

Criminal Procedure

The Criminal Law of the Roman Empire is not easily accessible to the student. The Institutes of Gaius and of Justinian are occupied almost exclusively with the Civil Law. The chapter in Justinian, De Publicis Judiciis, gives very little information; and from Gaius we can learn nothing whatever on the subject. Lord Mackenzie (Studies in Roman Law, 7th Edn. page 408) writes: "The Criminal system of the Romans never attained to the same degree of maturity and perfection as their law of civil rights. Under the empire the
violence and jealousy of every bad prince, and the short-sighted policy of every weak one, led to numerous inconsistent ordinances, often dictated by mere caprice, which threw this branch of Roman jurisprudence into great confusion." Similarly Laboulaye in his "Essai sur les lois Criminelles des Romains," begins in this manner: "L'insuffisance des traités publiés jusqu'à ce jour sur la législation criminelle des Romains est la plainte commune de tous ceux qui se proposent d'écrire sur ce sujet intéressant, et malgré plus d'une louable tentative, cette plainte n'a malheureusement pas cessée d'être vraie."

Under these circumstances our knowledge of this branch of Roman law must be gathered from allusions in the writings of the historians, and especially from Cicero's orations; in particular that against Verres.

The Trial of S. Paul is related at greater length than that of our Lord, and it has more of the forms of judicial procedure. The two cases were vastly different. Our Lord was a provincial, unprotected by the privileges of citizenship. Pilate could deal with Him much as he pleased, and no one would complain, provided that he did not give too great cause of offence to the priestly parties at Jerusalem. But S. Paul was a Roman Citizen, and Felix would not feel himself at liberty to disregard the procedure customary in the provinces in regard to publica judicia. Hence we can trace the various stages in S. Paul's Trial, from the Arrest to the Appeal, with much more clearness than in our Lord's case. We see plainly that the Trial of S. Paul was conducted in due form, and is recorded with greater care, and more attention to details. We recognise at the same time several technical legal terms and phrases, the parallels to which are to be found in the Orations of Cicero.

The proceedings against S. Paul have been up to this point Jewish. There had been a hearing before the high-priest Ananias, and the Sanhedrin. If those present on this occasion had been able to control themselves, this hearing might have
become a legal trial, under Jewish rules, before the Sanhedrin. But that meeting ended in a riot, and Lysias was compelled to resume possession of the Accused. The subsequent conspiracy put the Jewish party entirely out of court, and the Roman authorities were now in charge of the case.

Henceforth the Trial is conducted under Roman rules of procedure. Felix has become the Quasitor; and the Quastio, or Inquiry affecting the Caput of this Roman Citizen, is in his hands.

Ananias, hitherto the Judge, has become the Prosecutor. Great latitude, in this respect, was allowed by Roman law. Anyone might take up the position of prosecutor. At Rome the prosecutor was required to obtain the sanction of the prætor. His application for this purpose was called postulatio, and must be published in the forum. His definition of the charge was made in writing, and was designated inscriptio. If several persons applied at the same time, a jury decided which of them should be the impeacher. This process was called divinatio.

These preliminary proceedings were not necessary in S. Paul's case, as their place was taken by the Elogium (page 372). This Elogium was delivered to the procurator Felix, who at once entered upon a brief examination, interrogatio, inquiring to which province he belonged. Felix was now in possession of the case, and had noted the name of the accused (nominis receptio). He commits the prisoner for trial, and appoints a day. "I will hear thy cause," said he, "when thine accusers also are come." The usual day of Trial at Rome was ten days after the registering of the name, except in such cases where the day was fixed by the special law regulating the quaestio. Also a prisoner sent with an elogium should be tried, if possible, within three days. The prosecutors, κατήγοροι, delatores, were in Jerusalem, and a longer period must elapse. It would take two days for the messenger to reach Jerusalem, and two days for the prosecutors to travel
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to Cæsarea. There had been consequently no time lost when the Trial began five days later.

Meanwhile S. Paul was detained in Herod's palace, one of the magnificent edifices with which Herod "the Great" had adorned Cæsarea. On the site of Strato's Tower, by the sea, Herod had created a splendid city, with a capacious harbour, and all the appurtenances of a Greek city. There the hated Gentile would find opportunity for trade in the port and the forum, and would be able to beguile his leisure by a promenade under the arches on the quay, or by attendance at the games instituted by Herod in the theatre and the amphitheatre. It was, indeed, a Greek city in appearance, and Roman by name. The conspicuous object visible from the sea, was the Temple of Cæsar, planted on a hill by the harbour, and adorned with two colossal statues, representing Cæsar and Rome. The city was so obviously Gentile and heathen, that the Greeks claimed it as their own, a claim which the Jews resisted, on the ground that its founder was a Jewish prince. There was also a dispute between the two nationalities about ἰσομορία, which culminated in a serious riot while S. Paul was in confinement there, and which was one of the circumstances that helped to bring about the great Jewish War, and the destruction of Jerusalem and the Dispersion of the People.

The praetorium or palace of Herod seems at the time of Paul's detention to have been devoted to public offices, as a kind of Government House: and the procurators were housed in another building. But nothing certain is known on this point. Some authors identify the two buildings. Whether the procurator resided in Herod's palace or not, there is no doubt whatever that S. Paul was detained, under the charge of the military, in one of the guard-rooms of Herod's praetorium.
The Trial

The superior magistrates at Rome sat in the Forum or Comitium, on their curule chairs inlaid with ivory, assisted by the lower magistrates seated on subsellia, or lower seats. The legal proceedings at Rome were imitated by the provincial magistrates, as far as circumstances would admit. Hence we may think of Felix proudly seated on his sella curulis in the Prætorium at Cæsarea, surrounded by the clerks and lictors, and other officials, and with the prosecutors and defendant and advocates before him. The prosecutors, κατήγοροι, were the high-priest Ananias and certain elders. They had provided themselves with an orator named Tertullus to plead before the court, on their behalf. Until the time of Diocletian there was no class of professional Counsel. A man might conduct his own case, whether as prosecutor or defendant; or he might place himself in the hands of an advocatus, or patronus. At S. Paul’s trial Ananias had engaged the assistance of Tertullus; while, on the other hand, S. Paul elected to defend himself.

It was customary for those who were ambitious to practise in the law-courts at Rome to attach themselves to some provincial governor, and to gain experience in his courts, to serve them when they embarked upon the severer contests at Rome, and entered into competition with men like Cicero. The services of such advocates were useful to the provincials, who would be imperfectly acquainted with the forms of Roman jurisprudence. The Latin language was usually employed in the pleadings before the provincial magistrates, even when the language spoken in the province was Greek. But Greek was not prohibited, and was not infrequently employed when all the parties to a suit spoke that language. In the trial of S. Paul before Felix, the proceedings were doubtless conducted in Latin, according to custom. His
prosecutors, being Jews, would know but little Greek, and probably no Latin at all. Hence it became a case of necessity for them to obtain the aid of a Latin-speaking pleader, which they did in the person of the ῥήτωρ, Tertullus. The name Tertullus is Roman: it is the diminutive of Tertius, formed like such names as Lucullus or Catullus. He may have been one of these young aspirants for forensic honours, who abounded in the provinces; and his speech was no doubt made in Latin.

Tertullus, on behalf of the prosecutors, opened the case with the process known as nominis or criminis delatio, described by S. Luke in the words ἐνεφάνωσεν τῷ ἡγεμόνι κατὰ τοῦ Παῦλου, "informed the governor against Paul": i.e. formally laid criminal information before the quaesitor Felix; with the name of the accused and the crime alleged against him.

The next step was to summon the prisoner before the Bar, as stated by S. Luke, κληθέντος δὲ αὐτοῦ, "and when he was called." This was the citatio, and was proclaimed by the prego, or crier. S. Luke does not state whether the formal charge, or inscriptio, was drawn up in writing and signed by the prosecutors (scriptorium) as was usual: but, as everything seems to have been done in due form, this document had no doubt been already handed in.

Tertullus now opens the case against the prisoner. He was evidently an experienced pleader, an orator forensis or causidicus, already ripe for the bar in the forum at Rome. His exordium is very judiciously directed towards gaining the attention and the good will of the judge by a little wise flattery, lauding his energy against the brigands, whereby, as he suggests, peace had been restored to the distracted province. He then introduces a word προνοιας, providentiae, applicable to the emperors and inscribed frequently on their coin; and he continues, "by thy providence evils are corrected" (Διορθωμάτα or κατορθωμάτα, reforms or worthy
deeds). This was the usual captatio benevolentiae, calculated to please the judge, on the principle that “Inter praecepta rhetorica est, judicem laudando, sibi benevolum reddere.” Felix, the enfranchised slave raised to undeserved eminence, must have experienced a pleasing sensation, as he sat in his curule chair and listened to this talented orator reminding him of his successful career during the past six years. He further assured the governor that he would not tediously prolong his speech, and craved his clemency while he concisely recited the facts of the case before him.

He then proceeds with the indictment, the accusatio, of which he puts in three counts:

1. that the accused was a public enemy throughout the empire;
2. a ringleader of the sect of the Nazarenes;
3. a profaner of the Temple.

Or putting it in three words, he was guilty of treason, heresy and sacrilege.

1. Treason. He was “a pestilent fellow, and a mover of insurrections among all the Jews throughout the world.” He was λοιμός, literally “a plague”; pestis (Beza) pestiferus, as the Vulgate renders it. He was a man who stirred up tumults, and organised seditious disturbances wherever he went, throughout the empire, κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην, the habitable earth. Wherever he went, Tertullus might have continued, his appearance was the signal for dissension, from the day when he escaped over the wall at Damascus to the day of his apprehension in the Temple. He had been driven out of Antioch, stoned at Lystra, imprisoned at Philippi, accused of treason at Thessalonica, expelled from the synagogue at Corinth, haled before the proconsul Gallio, the cause of a serious riot at Ephesus; and the moment he arrived at Jerusalem the disturbances had broken out afresh.

2. Heresy. He was “a ringleader of the sect of the
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Nazarenes,” ῥῆς τῶν Ναζωραίων αἰρέως. Tertullus employs the very word “heresy”; though that word had not yet acquired its ecclesiastical sense of error in doctrine. In this sense, however, S. Peter uses it in 2 S. Peter. ii. 1. It is to be observed that the advocate of the Jews speaks of Paul’s followers as “Nazarenes,” followers of Jesus of Nazareth: he could not consistently use the title of “Christian,” which had been conferred upon them at Antioch, as such a title involved Messianic hopes which they themselves cherished.

3. Sacrilege. He had “assayed to profane the Temple.” The 1st charge was an offence against the Roman Law, the law of the Empire: the 2nd, against the Jewish law, the Law of Moses. The 3rd was a violation of both. It was a breach of Roman Law, which protected the Jews in the exercise of their religion, having registered Judaism as a religio licita: a breach also of the Law of Moses, because he had (so they asserted) profaned the sacred precincts by introducing within their limits the Ephesian Trophimus.

These three charges are followed, in the A.V., by a complaint against Lysias of a violent and unwarrantable interference with the course of justice, and by an inconsequent suggestion that Lysias should be sent for, in order to give evidence. This complaint in verses 6–8, from “and would have judged” to “to come unto thee,” is omitted in the R.V., it being absent from the principal uncial MSS. Dean Alford, however, admits the interpolation against MS. evidence, though he places it in dark brackets. If the clause is allowed, the suggestion is that Lysias should be examined as a witness: if it be rejected, that the prisoner himself should be questioned. In verse 22 Felix remands the accused until the appearance of Lysias, and this provides a reason in favour of the genuineness of the passage.

At the conclusion of Tertullus’s speech for the prosecution, “the Jews joined in the charge, affirming that these things were so.” These were the prosecutors, the high-priest Ananias
and the elders. They were not witnesses. None were produced. On this we shall comment presently.

Two words are found in the MSS. for this action of the Jews; συνεπέθεντο, supported by all the uncial MSS. and adopted by the R.V. “joined in the charge”; and συνέθεντο, as in the A.V. “assented.” The former is the stronger word, and implies emphatic assent, unanimity in the impeachment.

**Defence**

The proceedings in Court, after the formal Citation of the accused, began with the *Allectatio*, an argumentative discussion between the parties concerned, the *accusator* and the *reus* (the prosecutor and the accused), or their advocate.

Tertullus having resumed his seat, Felix beckons to the prisoner to proceed with his defence, merely nods to him, as the word implies, *ναόρατος*.

S. Paul does not employ a *rei patronus*, or counsel for the defence, but conducts his own case. In the English law courts, a man may plead his own cause, or defend himself; but he may not depute this office to anyone else except to a barrister in the superior courts, or to a barrister or solicitor in the inferior courts. But at Roman law the parties to a suit could avail themselves of the assistance of anyone whom they chose to appoint. There was another correspondence between Roman and English law. The Roman advocates theoretically practised gratis; and any recognition made to them was a present or gratuity. The amount of this honorarium was afterwards limited to 10,000 sesterces or about £80. And so is it with ourselves; counsel cannot maintain an action for his fees, which are regarded as *quiddam honorarium*.

S. Paul now makes his defence, *ἀπολογία*. It is interesting to compare his *exordium* with that of Tertullus. Tertullus is complimentary to the governor to the verge of falsehood.
S. Paul does not descend to flattery. He merely states that he is glad to plead before one who, having held the office of procurator for so many years, would be well qualified by the experience thus gained, to deal with causes between Jew and Jew. Felix had been governor for six years, from A.D. 52 to 58.

The prisoner then answers each accusation separately; and, as we follow the points made in his speech, we see him to be as skilful a pleader as Tertullus himself.

1. **Answer to the 1st Count.** He had not been stirring up tumults in Jerusalem: there had been no time for such a purpose: he had only been a few days in the City; and he had been fully occupied all the time. Even now, it was only 12 days since he had arrived at Jerusalem. He had come up to worship at the Feast of Pentecost: he had not disputed in the Temple, nor had he stirred up a crowd, either in the synagogues or in the City.

The "12 days" may be reckoned as follows, and account must be taken of the "5 days" of v. 1. 1. The arrival in Jerusalem, xxi. 17. 2. Interview with S. James, "the day following." 3. The commencement of the Nazarite vow; "the next day." 4, 5, and 6, the observance of the vow. 7. Apprehension in the Temple, when the four men had almost completed their vow, xxi. 27. 8. The hearing before the Sanhedrin, xxii. 30, "on the morrow," followed by the comforting vision at night. 9. Departure from Jerusalem, on the night of the next day. 10. Arrival at Cesarea.

2. **Answer to the 2nd Count.** He was no heretic. He certainly did admit that he worshipped God after the Way which they called a sect, but he was as much entitled to the views he held as they were to theirs. They themselves had sects, those of the Pharisees, Sadducees, Essenes and Herodians: and there was more agreement between the Nazarenes and the Pharisees, than between the Pharisees themselves and the Sadducees. As for himself he held, in common with the Pharisees, the doctrine of the Resurrection, which was rejected by the Sadducees. The Nazarene sect is quite as
legal as any of the Jewish parties. Further, he accepted
the whole Scriptures, both Law and Prophets, whereas the
Sadducees reject the latter. Consequently he was more in
harmony with the Jewish religion than that sect of the
Sadducees with which they themselves were in corporate
communion.

S. Paul, in making the declaration λατρεύω τῷ πατρίῳ θεῷ,
shows himself to be a skilful advocate. He was appealing
to a principle admitted by Roman law. Each nation was
allowed full freedom to worship its own gods, even though
foreign cults might be prohibited. Paul therefore was within
his rights in worshipping his own ancestral or hereditary God,
the God of his fathers.

3. Answer to the 3rd Count. Paul repudiated also the sin
of sacrilege. He was in the Temple, not to profane it, but
to undergo the process of purification in connection with the
Nazarite vow, as was customary amongst pious Jews, as indeed
King Agrippa himself had done. He had no crowd with him,
he had created no tumult: he was quietly engaged in the rite
of purification in the chambers of the Nazarites.

In fact he was not responsible for the riot that ensued.
It had been stirred up by certain Jews from Asia. Where
are these men? They ought to be here as witnesses. They
are the real accusers. Why are they not produced?

If they cannot be produced, then let my accusers state what
wrong-doing was alleged against me, when before the Council.
My own conscience is clear, except in this one point, that
I regret having set the two parties at variance by introducing
the subject of the Resurrection of the dead. (So may verse
21 be understood.)

S. Paul was justified in his demand for witnesses. The
Roman law usually required at least two witnesses to prove
any fact: in some cases even five were necessary. But the
Sanhedrists wished to press the charge without any witnesses
at all. Surely the judge could not accept a charge so loosely
made.
Remand

S. Paul had stated his case so clearly, and had given such a complete answer to his adversary, that Felix must have become convinced of his innocence. The second charge had been clearly explained, and to the other two a categorical denial had been given, as being destitute of foundation, and unsupported by evidence. The case for the prosecution had broken down, and Felix ought to have pronounced sentence of acquittal, and have set the prisoner free.

Instead of adopting this course he determined upon a postponement of the trial; for he was unwilling to offend the priestly party, which wielded so much power in Jerusalem. He was well acquainted with Jewish doctrines and practices from his long experience in the province, and through the fact of his wife Drusilla being a Jewess. He also knew more about Christianity than those present in his court were aware: "he had more exact knowledge concerning the Way." Some of his own soldiers had embraced the Christian faith; there was Cornelius, a centurion of the Italian cohort, and doubtless others belonging to his band. With this "knowledge" in his mind, he would not allow himself to be misled by the false statements of the prosecutors; but, like Pilate, he could not act upon his convictions, from fear of the Jews. Hence the trial ends in a Remand instead of an Acquittal.

In the trials at Rome the Judge was assisted by a Jury (judices), who gave their verdict by means of tablets, marked "A.," "C.," and "N.L.:" i.e. Absolvo (not guilty), Condemno (guilty), and Non liguet (doubtful). The voting was originally open, but after the Lex Cassia (B.C. 137) by ballot. A majority of votes decided. In the provinces these judices were not always to be obtained, with the necessary qualification: and in such cases, as in the case of S. Paul, the governor pronounced his decision without assistance.
Felix and Criminal Procedure

When the Jury voted "N.L.," the Judge would pronounce the word "Amplius," i.e. "further" or "more fully," and the cause before him would be adjourned. This was called Amplitio, or Comperendinatio, the latter being an adjournment to the third day, the former an adjournment to any day fixed by the judex. Felix, then, when the hearing was concluded, remanded the prisoner; rem ampliavit, or rather, eos ampliavit, ἀνεβάλην δὲ αὐτοῖς, as S. Luke expresses it, assigning as his reason the absence of Lysias, whom he deemed to be a material witness: his real reason being the hope of a bribe, as stated in verse 26. "When Lysias the chief captain, shall come down, I will determine your matter."

S. Paul is then committed to the care of the centurion, in custodia militaris, but relaxed as far as possible, and with the permission of free access to his friends. It is a question with some as to whether this was not custodia libera, φυλακή ἀδερμός, which was the usual mode of detention pending the decision of the judge.

Among the "friends" of S. Paul at Cæsarea may have been Cornelius, of the Italian band, if he was still quartered there; Philip the Evangelist, with his four daughters (xxi. 8, 9), Aristarchus, who accompanied him to Rome (xxvii. 2), and Luke, his inseparable companion.

Before Drusilla

During S. Paul’s detention after remand, Felix sent for him several times, and conversed with him respecting his faith in Christ Jesus. One of these interviews is recorded by S. Luke.

Felix, having been absent from Cæsarea for a few days, returned thither with Drusilla, whom he regarded as his wife, though she was in reality the wife of Azizus, whom she had abandoned in order to live with Felix. It is difficult to understand what could have induced a Jewish princess to consort
with a manumitted slave; or why a mere child (she was only twenty) could feel any attraction towards an elderly man, who had wallowed for years in the filthy sty at Rome, when at its worst. This is attributed by Josephus (Antiq. xx. 7, 2) to the sorceries of Simon Magus, whom Felix had employed for the purpose.

Felix sends for his prisoner to one of the private apartments of the palace. This was not a legal hearing; merely a private interview. The object was principally to gratify the curiosity of Drusilla, and to afford her a momentary amusement. She may have wished to hear some authoritative exposition of the doctrines of Christianity from the lips of its protagonist, and to gain some idea of the various points on which that form of belief differed from the Law of Moses. Felix also may have desired to obtain further information concerning "the Way," with the aid of her more precise knowledge of the tenets of the Jewish religion, so as to be of some service to him, should he at any time decide to resume the Trial.

S. Paul might have declined to speak before this "Roman libertine and profligate Jewish princess," for this informal interview was no part of the Trial. But he welcomed the opportunity of testifying for the Faith, and used it nobly. And as he reasoned of righteousness, and temperance and the judgment to come he put both his hearers to shame.

When he reasoned of "righteousness" he hit Felix hard: when he spoke of "temperance," or self-control, he laid a heavy hand on the adulterous girl: and when he wound up with the "judgment to come," he dealt a blow at both.

The audience terminated with mixed feelings on the part of Felix: he was "terrified" (R.V.): he "trembled" (A.V.): for the judgment of the last day had never hitherto been taken into consideration by him. But his fears soon vanished, "like a dream when one awaketh," and cupidity resumed possession of his soul. He looked for a bribe, and, with this object in view, kept Paul in bonds.
Felix and Criminal Procedure

Yet the taking of a bribe was a serious offence in the eye of the law. The *lex Julia de repetundis*, enacted B.C. 59, forbade any magistrate or president of a criminal court to receive money or any article of value, to act in violation of his public duty. The prohibition is precise: the Digest specifies such offences as receiving a bribe for inflicting bonds, stripes or imprisonment; or for freeing a prisoner, or passing sentence of condemnation or acquittal. Any magistrate, so offending, was liable to punishment by deportation or exile. *Deportatio* was a severer form of banishment than *relegatio*. The latter involved banishment to an island at a certain distance from Rome or Italy, for a limited time or for life, but without loss of citizenship. *Deportatio* carried with it *capitis deminutio* and confiscation of property, unless the contrary was stated in the sentence (Digest 48). But as a coach and four (so it is said) can be driven through any Act of Parliament, so these severe penalties of the Roman Code were frequently evaded or even openly disregarded, especially in the provinces. Hence Felix seemed to dread no unpleasant results from keeping Paul unjustly in bondage, and letting fall hints that a bribe would be welcome. And, as no response was made to these hints during the remaining two years of his procuratorship, he left his prisoner in bonds.
CHAPTER XVI
FESTUS AND APPEAL

Of Festus himself but little is known. When we have put together the notices of him in Acts xxv. and xxvi. and in Josephus (Antiq. xx. 8, 10), we have said all that can be said.

The part he took in the Trial of S. Paul will appear presently in the account we shall give of that trial: we will now mention the two incidents to be gathered from Josephus.

The first of these deals with the sicarii. When Festus arrived in Judæa these assassins, who had latterly been growing in numbers, had become a terror to the people at large, and a serious hindrance to the government. They were armed, says Josephus, with short swords, curved like sickles, and small enough to be easily concealed under their cloaks. With these weapons they committed numerous murders. Their plan was to mingle with the crowds at the great feasts in Jerusalem, and to slay whom they would. They would also at times terrorise the villagers, setting the houses in a blaze when the loot had been secured, and stabbing to death all who ventured to resist. Festus, soon after he entered upon office, sent a force of infantry and cavalry against them and cleared the country.

The other incident was a dispute about the building of a wall. King Agrippa II., who occupied the Asmonæan Palace to the west of the Temple, had constructed a large dining-room which commanded a view of the Temple courts, and brought all the sacrifices and services under his observation. To obviate this, the authorities of the Temple erected a lofty
wall immediately to the west of the Holy Place, which effectually intercepted not only the view from Agrippa’s new dining-hall, but also the view from the western cloisters where the Roman sentinels were stationed. This act offended both the king and the procurator, and Festus ordered the removal of the wall. The Jews, however, obtained his consent to their sending messengers to Rome to protest against the enforced demolition of the wall; and Nero, under the influence of Poppaea, allowed it to remain.

Festus’s rule in Palestine was brief: in less than two years he died.

The Trial Resumed

Festus was a better man than the unprincipled Felix, and, as we gather from S. Luke’s narrative, really desired to do justice in the case of the prisoner whom Felix had left in bonds. He acts with great promptitude; and three days after arriving at Cæsarea to take up the duties of his “province,” he went to Jerusalem.

The word “province,” ἔπαρχεια, is here used in the colloquial sense, just as the title of “king” is applied to Antipas. Strictly speaking Judæa was not a province, but a procuratorship attached to the neighbouring province of Syria, of which, for certain purposes, it formed a part.

According to the usually received chronology, the arguments for which are given at length by Conybeare and Howson, Festus succeeded Felix in A.D. 60, and arrived on the spot in the August of that year. Immediately on taking up the government he resumes the trial, which had been adjourned by Felix.

Theoretically when a jury had voted Non liquet, and the Judge had pronounced the formula amplius, there must be a new trial. At the end of this second trial the jury were bound to come to a decision, they must either acquit or
condemn; they were not allowed to resort to the alternative verdict, *Non liquet*. We must consequently understand this trial before Festus, not merely as a resumption of the proceedings before Felix, but as commencing *de novo*, so that the new governor might be put into full possession of all the bearings of the case. Felix had "deferred them" *eos ampliavit*, and left the province. With the new procurator, the trial begins afresh.

Accordingly on his arrival in Jerusalem, criminal information is again laid against S. Paul; there is a renewal of the *nominis* and *criminis delatio*, the same word, *ἐνεφάνεσαν*, being used in xxv. 2 as in xxiv. 1, when the previous trial began. Two years had passed away, but the resentment of the Jews burned as fiercely as ever: and they were all of one mind now (*πᾶν τὸ πλήθος*; xxv. 24); the difference of opinion between the Pharisees and Sadducees had disappeared. With the change of governors the priestly party see their way to snatch an advantage from the inexperience of the new governor, and make an application for the removal of the trial to Jerusalem. Their real object was to assassinate their enemy during the journey.

Festus, however, refused the application, and directed the trial to be resumed at Cæsarea. He seems to have desired to do justice, and to have been doubtful whether there was any case against the prisoner; "If there is anything amiss in the man, let them accuse him."

Without further delay the second trial begins. The next day after his return to Cæsarea, he summons the parties before him, and the same charges are made. This time they are brought forward in a tumultuous manner, the accusers conducting their own case without professional aid, and seeking to overbear the judge by the vehemence of their accusations. Everything has now become irregular: the forms of Roman law are not observed, as at the previous trial: no witnesses are brought forward, no proof of the charges is adduced.
There is nothing before the Court but a number of allegations, unsubstantiated by evidence. The accused can only give a categorical denial to the three charges of heresy against the law of the Jews, of sacrilege against the Temple, and of treason against Cæsar.

With the view of finding a way out of the difficulty, the judge proposes to the accused the plan which the prosecutors had laid before him at Jerusalem, viz. to remove the cause to Jerusalem, and have it tried, as an ecclesiastical offence, before the Sanhedrin, in the presence of Festus, and under his protection.

But S. Paul's patience now begins to fail him. He had been two years in prison, he had already defended himself four times (xxii. 1, xxiii. 1, xxiv. 10, xxv. 8); he had passed through three riots and two conspiracies (xxi. 31, xxii. 22, xxiii. 10, 12, xxv. 3); he had been bound with chains, and tied with thongs for scourging; and now a proposal is made to him that he should be handed over to his bitterest enemies. Previous experience had taught him that he had more to hope for from Roman law than from Jewish ideas of justice, and he determined to lodge an appeal.

Appeal

This notice of appeal came as a surprise and an annoyance to Festus.

It was a surprise to him, for he could hardly have expected that the prisoner would have taken that course. It was a serious matter to appeal to Rome. The emperor then ruling was the notorious Nero, a man stained with crime, a conceited buffoon, from whom little in the way of an honest trial could be anticipated. Besides which the expenses of an appeal were enormous. The accused man was apparently unaware of the responsibility he was incurring by such a course.
Festus must have experienced some feeling of annoyance also. He had only just entered upon office: he had shown his desire to do justice, by the promptitude of his action. This was the first case he had undertaken. And now, upon the very first occasion of taking his seat upon the Bench, his jurisdiction is challenged, and an appeal is lodged against it.

But S. Paul well knew what he was about. He had had two years to think it over. His action was not precipitate. He had doubtless weighed all the circumstances carefully, and had come to a deliberate conclusion. He would take the risk of standing at “Caesar’s judgment seat,” though that Caesar was Nero: he would meet the expense of the appeal, great as the cost might be. And, behind all, there was the desire, so long cherished, of seeing Rome.

The expenses, however, were considerable: and the question as to how these were defrayed has been often discussed. It is usually assumed that S. Paul was not a man of means, as he worked for his livelihood as a tent-maker (Acts xviii. 3), a fact to which he made reference when addressing the Ephesian presbyters at Miletus (xx. 34), to which also he alluded in his epistles to Corinth and Thessalonica (1 Cor. iv. 12, 1 Thess. ii. 9, 2 Thess. iii. 8). We need not press these references as implying that this manual labour was a necessity, for it was customary amongst the Jews to learn some handicraft, there being a proverb amongst them to the effect that “He who teacheth not his son a trade, teacheth him to steal.”

However this may have been at this earlier period, there is no doubt that, at the time of his appeal, as Professor Ramsay points out (S. Paul the Traveller, p. 310), S. Paul must have been in the possession of considerable funds: not derived from the collection he had set on foot in the four provinces, for that was devoted to the definite purpose of aid for the poor saints at Jerusalem. The consideration with which he was treated at Caesarea by the two procurators, the princess, the
king and the queen, and the expectation of a bribe which Felix indulged, show that he was a man of position, and possessed of means. Professor Ramsay puts the case thus: "The minimum in the way of personal attendants that was allowable for a man of respectable position was two slaves; and, as we shall see, Paul was believed to be attended by two slaves to serve him. At Caesarea he was confined in the palace of Herod: but he had to live, to maintain two attendants, and to keep up a respectable appearance. Many comforts, which are almost necessities, would be given by the guards, so long as they were kept in good humour, and it is expensive to keep guards in good humour. In Rome he was able to hire a lodging for himself, and to live there, maintaining, of course, the soldier who guarded him. An appeal to the supreme court could not be made by everybody that chose. Such an appeal had to be permitted and sent forward by the provincial governor; and only a serious case would be entertained. But the case of a very poor man is never esteemed as serious; and there is little doubt that the citizen's right of appeal to the Emperor was hedged in by fees and pledges. In appealing to the Emperor, Paul was choosing undoubtedly an expensive line of trial."

Professor Ramsay, after discussing the question of the source of S. Paul's solvency at this period of his life, comes to the conclusion that it was in all probability derived from his hereditary property, accruing to him by Will, or inheritance.

S. Paul lodges his appeal formally. The single word *Appello* was sufficient: and he doubtless pronounced the phrase in the Latin tongue, *Caesarem appello*. S. Luke records the words in Greek, *Καίσαρα ἐπικαλοῦμαι*.

S. Paul gives reasons for his appeal. "I am standing before Caesar's judgment-seat, where I ought to be judged," and therefore I object to be sent to Jerusalem for trial, my case being now before the Roman court. "To the Jews have I
done no wrong”; they have consequently no right of trial. “If I have committed anything worthy of death, I refuse not to die: but if none of those things is true, whereof these accuse me, no man can give me up to them.” Failing to obtain justice in the provincial court at Cæsarea, I appeal to the Emperor at Rome.

On hearing this appeal, Festus “conferred with the council.” The συμβούλιον was a council of the chief men in the province, who acted as advisers to the governor. They were styled Consiliarii or Assessores. It was necessary, as a matter of form, to consult with this council, as there were a few cases, such as those persons who were taken in arms against the constituted authorities, in which the appeal could be refused. In S. Paul’s case, however, the question was quite clear. The conference accordingly was brief. The appeal was allowed, and the decision was communicated to the Appellant in the words, “Thou hast appealed unto Cæsar: unto Cæsar shalt thou go.”

**Appellatio and Provocatio**

“An appeal is an application to a superior judge to review the decision of an inferior one, on the ground that it is informal or erroneous; and the effect of the appeal is usually to suspend the execution of the judgment till it is confirmed by the superior court.”

This system involves a subordination of courts, a thing which did not exist under the Republic, the magistrates being independent of each other, as being theoretically delegates of the sovereign power of the people. Strictly speaking there was no Court of Appeal until the Empire was established. But this deficiency led to no inconvenience, a remedy having been supplied by the institution of the provocatio and appellatio, which were of the nature of appeals.
Festus and Appeal

Provocatio ad populum. After the expulsion of the kings, an appeal against the sentence of a criminal court could be made to the populus, or comitia; on which the case could be reheard, and a new judgment delivered. This was secured by the Valerian Law, b.c. 508, carried by P. Valerius Publicola, which conferred upon every citizen the right of appeal to the Comitia Centuriata from a sentence of death or scourging pronounced by a magistrate. This was a privilege highly valued, and has been compared by modern writers with the English Habeas Corpus Act. When, however, the Quaestiones Perpetuae, or Standing Commissions, were established, this privilege of appeal disappeared, the judices appointed for those Commissions being regarded as representatives of the comitia.

Another form of appeal was the Appellatio ad Tribunos. The Tribunes of the people were appointed after the secession to the Mons Sacer, b.c. 494, for the purpose of protecting the plebeians against any abuse of authority by a consul. Their persons were held to be inviolable, and amongst other privileges they were endued with the right of intercessio, or of interposing a veto upon the execution of the sentences of all other magistrates. For the purpose of affording such relief to suppliants without delay, the doors of the tribunes' houses stood open day and night. Resort to their intercession was not in reality an Appeal, although it went by the name of appellatio: its effect was purely negative, and it operated as an arrest of judgment.

Such a power of veto was inherent, as we have already said, in every magistrate, as each one was regarded as a distinct depository of the sovereign power. Any magistrate could intervene to forbid any judicial act of any other magistrate. The Tribunes possessed this power in an eminent degree, as a protection of the plebeians; and they had the right of veto, even over the highest magistrates of all, the Consuls and Praetors. This veto was called intercessio, and the formal
demand for it by a private person, *appellatio*: Their intervention, however, operated merely as a stay of execution, and did not lead to a re-hearing of the cause in question. It was an imperfect remedy which they were enabled to provide, but it appears to have been sufficient for all ordinary purposes.

The privilege of *Appellatio*, as well as that of *Provocatio*, was restricted after the establishment of the Standing Commissions.

Under the Empire a real appellate jurisdiction was gradually established. At first Augustus merely exercised the powers conferred upon him when invested with the various offices of State. As tribune for life he could veto the acts of any magistrate in Rome and Italy: as representative of the people he could hear appeals when made by way of *provocatio*. In the Imperial provinces he was supreme, the governors thereof being merely his deputies, whose acts he could repudiate when he thought fit, and whose judgments he could reverse. In the Senatorial provinces he was in possession of consular authority, which he could exercise in a manner similar to his powers in his own provinces. And thus, by virtue of the accumulation of all the offices of State in his one person, he was enabled, without altering any of the Republican forms of law, to effect all that could be transacted in a regularly constituted Court of Appeal.

Eventually this was erected into a system. Appeals were allowed from an inferior court or judge to a superior in various gradations; and from the provinces to the courts at Rome, and from them to the Emperor himself. And thus the Imperial Tribunal at Rome was constituted a supreme Court of Appeal from all other courts whether in Rome or in the provinces. The distinction between *Appellatio* and *Provocatio* disappeared, and the two words were used indiscriminately.

In S. Paul's case the appeal was not against the judgment
of the court below, for no sentence had been pronounced: his appeal was a demand for the transfer of the Trial itself to Rome. He had been brought up for trial four times, and had been detained as a prisoner for two years. There appeared to be no hope of obtaining justice from the provincial magistrate: he therefore appealed "to be kept for the decision of the Emperor."

When such an appeal was made, the prisoner must be forwarded in safe custody to Rome at the earliest convenient opportunity; and the letter sent with him, called *litera dimissoria* or *apostoli*, stated the simple fact of the claim made by the appellant. When the appeal was made to the Emperor, the letter was called *relatio*. The report thus sent included all the depositions necessary for the elucidation of the case.

**The Hearing Before Agrippa**

The Trial was at an end. The magic word *Appello* had brought about this result. That word had been spoken, and could not be recalled. It was beyond the power both of the judge and of the prisoner to revoke the choice that had been made by the accused. No further proceedings could be taken before Festus's Court, except to make the necessary arrangements for the despatch of the prisoner to Rome.

And Rome was the end and object of his desires. For many years the vision of the Imperial City had floated before his mind's eye. Ideal opportunities of usefulness in the cause of Christ would unfold themselves in that central city, to which all roads led, and which was the meeting-place of all the enterprise and intelligence of the world. At Ephesus he had matured his plans. He would pass through Greece; he would convey the alms of the four provinces to the poor saints at Jerusalem: and then, said he, "After I have been
there, I must also see Rome” (Acts xix. 21). This intention he shortly afterwards expressed to the Romans themselves, in a letter written from Corinth, in which he speaks of the longing to see them which he had cherished for many years (Rom. xv. 23). He was also encouraged in his determination by the promise of the Lord, in the vision at Jerusalem after the stormy scenes in the Temple (Acts xxiii. 11). And now, in the providence of God, events were shaping themselves towards the end he desired. At last he was to fulfil the purpose he had entertained so long. He was to go to Rome: not, as he had hoped, as a voluntary agent, for he was to be sent in bonds. Yet all the same he was to go to Rome.

But Festus was in a difficulty. He could not send a prisoner to the supreme Court of Appeal without specifying the crimes laid to his charge. These had to be duly set forth in the litera dimissoria forwarded with the prisoner. But, what exactly were these charges? He must have some certain thing to write to his lord the Emperor. But what could he write? The accusations made against Paul were so vague. It was difficult to lay his finger upon anything definite. Yet the official document, the relatio, as an elogium was called when sent to the Emperor, must be filled up. It seemed to him unreasonable (he might have said it was quite inadmissible) “in sending a prisoner, not withal to signify the charges against him.”

What was he to do? He was “perplexed.”

Then a happy thought struck him. King Agrippa and his sister Bernice were in Cæsarea, on a complimentary visit of congratulation to the newly arrived procurator. They could relieve him from his difficulty. They were Jews and would understand the technicalities of the Law of Moses, and the commentaries made by the Rabbis. More than this, Agrippa was an “expert in all the customs and questions among the Jews.” Soon after the death of his uncle, Herod of Chalcis, the Emperor Claudius conferred the principality of
Chalcis upon this Agrippa, with the ecclesiastical rights and privileges enjoyed by his uncle. Thus Agrippa had become president of the Temple at Jerusalem, with the care of its treasures, and the custody of the High Priest's vestments. To him also was committed the appointment of the High Priests. He had already exercised the power of appointment by raising Ishmael the son of Phabi, and Joseph Cabi the son of Simon to the high-priesthood; and he afterwards conferred this dignity upon four others.

Here was the man who could give him an authoritative opinion. He would lay the whole case before him. He would be able to elicit from this "expert" sufficient information to enable him to lay before the Appeal Court some definite accusation that the Court could entertain.

Agrippa, for his part, was willing enough. He agrees at once to the proposal, exclaiming "I was wishing to hear the man myself." He was so interested in the case as defined by Festus, that during the course of his address, he had conceived the desire to see this interesting prisoner and to hear him plead his own cause.

There was, of course, no obligation on S. Paul's part to fall in with this arrangement unless he chose, for the venue had been transferred to Rome, and nothing remained to be done in Caesarea. But S. Paul was recognised as a reasonable man, courteous to his judge, and willing to oblige. He had already consented to speak informally before Drusilla, and it was not anticipated that he would raise any difficulty about acting in the same way before her elder sister Bernice. What he might say would have no effect upon the case, which was already closed as far as the Court at Caesarea was concerned. But the consent of the accused might be taken for granted, and accordingly Festus replies, "To-morrow thou shalt hear him."

"So on the morrow," as S. Luke relates, "Paul was brought in," and set before a distinguished assembly consisting of all
the fashionable world of the provincial capital. Bernice was noted for her fondness for display, and she enters the "place of hearing" with great pomp. It was not a private interview like that before Felix and Drusilla, held in one of the apartments of the palace. There was a large concourse of people, chiliarchs, men of quality, and leaders of fashion of both nationalities. To accommodate this crowd of auditors, the meeting was probably held in the official hall of audience, the ἀκροατήριον, or auditorium: but it was none the more a Court of Justice. It was merely an informal hearing of the prisoner, with his own consent, partly with a view of assisting Festus to formulate a definite charge, partly also to please his distinguished guests.

Festus commences by explaining his anxiety to ascertain from the lips of his prisoner in the presence of one who, like King Agrippa, was an ecclesiastical expert, some definite charge which he might set down in the official report he was about to commit to writing for the purpose of forwarding it to his lord, the Emperor at Rome. In this opening speech Festus gives to Nero (xxv. 26) the title of κύριος, lord, or dominus, a title which Augustus and Tiberius had forbidden to be applied to them, but which Caligula and succeeding emperors had accepted.

Agrippa, on whose account this hearing had been arranged, now tells Paul he may speak for himself. This the Apostle proceeds to do. We need not discuss his speech, as it does not fall within our purview, being concerned with questions between himself and the Jews. In the course of his oration he comes to the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, that doctrine which always stirred the enthusiasm of the primitive Christians. He warms to his subject: he becomes more earnest: he is preparing to discuss the question of the resurrection as it bore upon Jesus Christ Himself, and upon the world at large, whether Jew or Gentile.

But he was not allowed to finish. Festus suddenly breaks
in upon his impassioned exhortation, by crying with a loud voice, "Paul, thou art mad; thy much learning doth turn thee to madness" (RV.), or, as it may be rendered, "Thy numerous books," τὰ πολλὰ γράμματα, "are driving thee mad" or "turning thy brain." S. Paul was a student as well as a writer; and in his possession were many rolls of MSS. in the Hebrew and the Greek languages. He was surrounded by these in his imprisonment, and his constant study of them, as Festus supposed, had unhinged his mind. But S. Paul replies calmly that he was merely speaking words of truth and soberness; and he appeals to Agrippa, as one who had himself been a student of the Law, as to whether the words he had just uttered were not borne out by the writings of the prophets. Agrippa's reply, or retort, has been considered on pages 138-140.

The interruption by Festus brings the meeting to an untimely close. By this time the aristocratic audience had heard and seen as much as they cared for: and they retired to discuss the events of the day, the general opinion being that the prisoner was innocent. Agrippa himself, whose advice had been sought, expressed this view to Festus, "This man might have been set at liberty, if he had not appealed unto Cæsar."

But there the difficulty lay. The appeal had been made; and the accused must be sent to Rome. However it was now clear that no criminal charge could be sustained against him: and we can well believe that the elogium or relatio forwarded to Nero by the hand of Julius would be of such a nature as to make the way plain for an acquittal by the Court of Appeal.
CHAPTER XVII

JULIUS AND ROME

Julius

It was about the end of August, A.D. 60, two months after the arrival of Festus in Palestine, that the voyage to Rome began. S. Paul and the other prisoners were placed in the charge of Julius, a centurion of "the Augustan band." What this band was we have endeavoured to show in chapter xiii., under the heading of "centurions." As to Julius himself we cannot help feeling some regret that so little is known concerning him, for we are attracted towards him by what is recorded in the last two chapters of the Acts. We experience a sense of gratitude as we read of his kind and courteous treatment of our Apostle. We presume that they may have established friendly relations with each other in the barracks at Cæsarea. The centurions in the New Testament might all be described, in our phraseology, as "officers and gentlemen": and Julius, belonging to the special corps of officer-couriers, was of a higher class than the ordinary centurion. S. Paul would feel himself safe in the care of such a man; and S. Luke, on every occasion of the mention of Julius, associates him with some pleasant incident.

At Sidon (v. 3) Julius gave Paul "leave to go unto his friends and refresh himself," ἐπιμελείας τοῖς ἑαυτῷ: to receive care and attention, either on account of sea-sickness, though only one day out, or for the purpose of obtaining such articles
as were necessary for a voyage the duration of which was uncertain.

At Fair Havens in Crete the centurion paid more attention to the master and owner of the ship than to the advice given by S. Paul, doubtless judging that questions of seamanship were more within the province of nautical men than of a learned rabbi (v. 11); but he afterwards regretted his decision, and when the storm predicted by S. Paul burst upon the vessel he placed himself in the hands of his prisoner, and henceforth followed his guidance, with the result that, in spite of the danger to which they were exposed, and though the ship, with all its cargo, became a total wreck, not a single life was lost; for all reached land in safety.

Julius held a responsible position on board. He was practically in command. The distinction between army and navy was not drawn so clearly as in modern times. Amongst the Romans the same officer might one day command a legion on land, and another day act as admiral in a naval engagement. A military officer in the position of Julius would take precedence of the captain of the vessel, and direct the voyage as he thought best. Hence, in the consultation at Fair Havens, the opinion of the centurion prevailed, and would have prevailed if it had been opposed to that of the seamen. When the sailors were about to abandon the vessel to its fate, the soldiers took the precaution of cutting the boat loose. And finally, when a proposal was made to put the prisoners to death, the centurion, principally from a friendly feeling towards S. Paul, prevented the plan from being carried into execution.

S. Paul was not the only prisoner on board; but, as Professor Ramsay points out, he was a prisoner of distinction—a Roman citizen, a man of means, a man of education and refinement, travelling with slaves in attendance on him. That these other prisoners were of a different class from S. Paul, we are entitled to infer from the expression used
by S. Luke. He describes them as ἐτέρων δεσμώτας. The inference is fair, though not absolutely essential.

S. Paul was accompanied by Luke and Aristarchus. Professor Ramsay asserts that these two went in the capacity of slaves. Dean Farrar regards them as passengers, paying their own expenses, and suggests that S. Luke might have obtained a free passage as a physician. But in all probability they also were prisoners, for we find Aristarchus described as "fellow-prisoner," συναίχμαλωτός, in one of the epistles written during the captivity at Rome (Col. iv. 10). Epaphras also is described by the same word in the Epistle to Philemon, another epistle of the captivity; he may therefore have been amongst the number of the prisoners under Julius's charge. Aristarchus was a Macedonian of Thessalonica, who was with S. Paul at Ephesus during the riot in the theatre, and travelled with him to Palestine (Acts xix. 29; xx. 4).

Besides these there were other prisoners; and as several soldiers would have been assigned to each prisoner for the purpose of relieving guard, there must have been a large detachment of soldiers on board. These, added to the sailors, and perhaps a few passengers, made up a total of 276 souls, over whom Julius was chief. No doubt he was glad to be relieved of his responsibilities when he handed over his prisoners to the authorities at Rome. We could have wished to be able to pursue his career further, but after this we hear no more of him.

**The Voyage**

The voyage itself does not fall within our scheme, full of interest though it be. An elaborate account of the voyage and the shipwreck will be found in Messrs. Conybeare and Howson's work (chap. xxi.), in compiling which they were assisted by the MSS. of a practical seaman, Admiral Sir
Charles Penrose. The subject has proved very attractive to writers and readers, and has received careful attention at the hands of Dean Farrar, Professor Ramsay, and many others. But the standard work on the subject is the *Voyage and Shipwreck of S. Paul*, by Mr. James Smith, first published in 1848, which has passed through several editions and is widely known throughout Europe and the United States.

The voyage to Italy was made in *three vessels*. In all probability Julius had no definite plan of route in view when he began the journey, but, according to the custom of the time, worked his way towards Italy as best he could. His route would be the more uncertain, as the season for navigation was drawing towards its close for the year. There were two main routes open to him, for both of which the season was already late. He could accomplish the journey wholly by sea, or he could travel partly by land. In the first case he would be dependent on the casual voyages of the merchant vessels engaged in the coasting trade along the shores of Palestine and Asia Minor; or, as happened eventually, he could put his prisoners on board one of the Alexandrian corn vessels on its way to Rome. In the other case he could journey by sea to Troas and Neapolis, and thence by the Via Egnatia, through Philippi and Thessalonica to Dyrrachium on the Adriatic. From this port he could cross the sea to Brundusium, a route so frequently used in those days, that it was regarded almost as a ferry. From Brundusium the Appian Way led through Beneventum, Capua, and Terracina to Rome.

The plan of the journey was necessarily left open, and its direction was determined by chance circumstances. The voyage was accomplished in three vessels.

1. A *ship of Adramyttium*. This was a coasting vessel belonging to Adramyttium in Mysia, near Troas, a port on the north of the *Ægean Sea*. It was probably homeward.
bound from Alexandria, and would trade on its way at the various ports in Syria and Asia Minor, at one of which a vessel might be found, sailing direct for Italy. Touching at Sidon, they sailed to the east and north of Cyprus, and along the coast of Cilicia and Pamphylia, to Myra, a city of Lycia.

2. *An Alexandrian corn-vessel.* At Myra the centurion found the very ship that was suitable for his purpose. It was one of the Alexandrian line, belonging to the Imperial Fleet, engaged in the duty of provisioning Rome with corn from Egypt. It was of considerable size, perhaps approaching one thousand tons, as we may judge from the number of persons on board, 276 in all. The season was now so late, that no delay could be permitted; accordingly the force under Julius's command, with the prisoners, were transferred to the vessel about to sail for Italy. The occasion was fortunate, but in the event proved disastrous. They were delayed by the contrary winds till the Day of Atonement was passed. It was now the end of September, and time to think of laying by for the winter; but, after taking counsel with the master and the owner, the centurion determined to press onwards: and, lured by a breeze from the south, they weighed anchor, and presently were caught by the Euraquilo, or E.N.E. wind, and were driven before the wind till the vessel became a total wreck, on the coast of Malta.

3. *The Twin Brothers.* This was another corn-vessel from Alexandria, with the sign of the Dios-curi, or Castor and Pollux, the patrons of sailors (see pp. 95 and 110). The winter was now past, and the voyage was quickly made. After making the usual circuit between Syracuse and Rhegium, a favouring south wind drove them in a direct course to their destination at Puteoli, early in the month of March.

Here, according to custom, they were welcomed by a large crowd on the pier, for the approach of the Alexandrian wheat-ships could always be seen from a great distance, as they alone were allowed to enter the bay with the topsail set. So Seneca
informs us (Ep. 77.) “Gratus illarum adspectus Campaniae est. Omnis in pilis Puteolorum turba constitit, et ex ipso genere velorum, Alexandrinas quamvis in magna turba navium intelligit, solis enim licet supparum (the topsail) intendere quod in alto omnes habent naves.”

Puteoli

Our interest in Puteoli consists in this, that it was the landing-place of S. Paul, on his arrival from Melita, after his shipwreck. He was on his way to Rome at a crisis in his fate, and was about to realise one of the aspirations of his life. This visit to Rome had been long in his mind, and in his letter to the brethren there three years previously (Rom. i. 10–15) he had expressed the earnest desire that he cherished, to see them and establish them in the faith. This was generally known, and the Christians in Italy were expecting his arrival amongst them. When therefore the Castor and Pollux was sighted with its topsail set, the brethren would have hastened to the pier and joined the crowd of idlers there, in the hope that the great Apostle might be on board. And he was on board; but when he came ashore, he was seen to be in chains—the “prisoner of the Lord.” A warm welcome was accorded him; and during the seven days of his stay amongst them, the opportunity was afforded them not only to minister to his sufferings, but to send forward to Rome notice of his arrival.

But there are other interests connected with Puteoli. Reminiscences of the Caesars abound in the neighbourhood.

Puteoli was an important port—the Liverpool of Italy, as it has been styled, disputing with Ostia the position as chief port in Italy. It was the emporium of the trade in wheat with Alexandria—the place where the Imperial corn fleet was accustomed to unload its stores of food, to contribute to the “panem et circenses” by which the Roman proletariat were
kept in good humour. At the promontory of Misenum, a few miles to the west across the bay, the Imperial fleet of the "Lower Sea" was stationed; the other fleet, that of the "Upper Sea," being stationed at Ravenna, on the Adriatic. The elder Pliny, admiral of the fleet at Misenum, a few years later lost his life during the eruption of Vesuvius.

Baiae, on the same promontory, was the fashionable seaside resort of the Roman nobles whose palaces stood along the shore, and even invaded the sea itself. It was an abode of extravagant luxury, and a den of hideous vice, against which even Horace protested.

Between Baiae and Puteoli were two famous sheets of water, joined by a short canal—the Lucrine Lake, renowned for its oysters, and the Lake of Avernus, an ancient crater formerly emitting sulphurous vapours poisonous to the animal creation.

Cume, with its legends of the Sibyl who offered her nine books for sale to Tarquin, was situated a few miles to the north-west. The Temple of Serapis, Pausilippos with Virgil's tomb, and other places of interest also are to be seen in the same neighbourhood.

But that which chiefly characterises Puteoli and the surrounding district from our point of view and gives it an interest in our eyes, is its association with contemporary Roman history.

Augustus, towards the end of his life, was seeking health from the sea breezes on board a vessel in the bay, when he was recognised (so Suetonius tells us) by the seamen of an Egyptian corn-ship on its way to the harbour. These men immediately offered worship to divus Augustus, praising him as the author of their prosperity. Augustus was immensely pleased at their adulation, and rewarded them handsomely. He had had much grief and trouble in his family, and this act of the sailors gave him some consolation. A short distance out at sea, due west of Baiae, lay the small island of Pandataria, to which he had banished his only child Julia, on account of
her dissolute conduct. At Nola, near Mount Vesuvius, he himself died.

_Tiberius_ also ended his life in this neighbourhood. The isle of Capreæ, off Surrentum at the opposite side of the Bay of Naples, was his refuge in his old age, and the scene of his nameless lusts. He died at a villa near Misenum, which had once belonged to Lucullus. (Schmitz.)

_Caligula_ (says Schmitz) "ordered a bridge to be built between Baiae and Puteoli, a distance of upwards of three miles, for no other purpose but that he might be able to boast of having walked over the sea as over dry land; because some astrologer had once declared that there was as little chance of Caligula's succeeding to the throne as there was of his walking across the bay."

_Nero_ too had much to do hereabouts. About two years before S. Paul passed through Puteoli, Nero had contrived the murder of his mother Agrippina, and he made the admiral of the fleet at Misenum his accomplice. The plot was arranged for her death by drowning in the bay near Baiae, and was very nearly successful, but she swam ashore, and took refuge in her villa on the Lucrine Lake. Poppæa, however, who had instigated the crime, pressed for its being carried into execution, and accordingly the order was given to assassinate Agrippina in her own house. Nero then exiled his wife Octavia to Pandataria, where she was soon put out of the way, enabling him to marry Poppæa, the wife of Otho, who was afterwards emperor. Nero was amusing himself at Naples when Galba was on the march towards Rome. Some years later, in A.D. 79, the great eruption of Vesuvius took place, and amongst those who perished in the catastrophe were Drusilla and the child she had by Felix.

Amidst these scenes and associations S. Paul moved, while on his way through Puteoli to his trial before the Emperor at Rome.
The Appian Way

The journey from Puteoli to Rome was made chiefly on the Appian Way. This road, which was amongst the earliest of those constructed by the Romans, was begun by Appius Claudius Cæcusc, who was censor in 313 B.C. It led from the Porta Capena at Rome, through the three taverns, Appii Forum and Terracina, to Capua; and was afterwards extended to Brundusium on the Adriatic, by way of Beneventum and Tarentum. The pavement throughout was wide enough to allow two chariots to drive abreast, and consisted of massive hexagonal blocks of basaltic lava joined together with such precision that no interstices appeared. This pavement lay upon a solid foundation of concrete; and the whole formed a road that almost seemed made for eternity, remains of it being still in existence in many places. Milestones marked the distances on the way, and posting-stations at intervals of twenty miles afforded facilities for rapid travelling.

From Puteoli to Capua, Julius must have conducted his prisoners along the Campanian Way. There was another road, along the shore, from Puteoli to Sinuessa, which was somewhat shorter; it passed by Lake Avernus, and through Cumæ, Linternum and Vulturnum. This road afforded a pleasant route to Sinuessa on the Appian Way, but it was not completed until the time of Domitian. There seems therefore no reason to doubt that the Appian Way was reached at Capua.

From this point to Rome it was an easy journey of less than one hundred and forty Roman miles; and Julius travelling in an official capacity, as one of the Emperor's special messengers, in charge of prisoners, would have every convenience placed at his disposal. The journey lay all the way along the broad Via Appia, with its smooth pavement and easy grades. The posting-stations also would be available when required, and
the mules on the Augustan Canal would be at his disposal on reaching Feronia, after leaving Terracina.

And so they went on their way from Capua across the River Vulturinus till they arrived at Sinuessa on the coast, twenty-six Roman miles from Capua. From Sinuessa the road passed through the Falernian Field, where grew the vines which produced the Falernian wine, celebrated by Horace as surpassing all other. Then over the Massican Hills and the Liris to Minturnæ, Formiæ and Terracina, all on the coast. At Terracina nearly half the journey was accomplished. The way now lay to the north-west across the Pontine Marshes to Feronia, where the Augusti fossa commenced its course of twenty miles between Feronia and Appii Forum. This was a canal excavated in the reign of Augustus for the drainage of the marshes, and would have afforded an agreeable variation of the route towards Rome. Whether Julius continued his march along the road, or put his prisoners on board the canal-barges we cannot say—the question was doubtful, and the brethren from Rome, taking this into consideration, awaited the Apostle at Appii Forum, where the journey by water came to an end.

This Market of Appius was a rough place, thronged by tavern-keepers and bargemen, not therefore a congenial resting-place for Christian people. But here, at the distance of forty-three Roman miles from the City, was a party of friends assembled to greet their Apostle, whose promise to pay them a visit was now on the point of fulfilment. A message from Puteoli, despatched during the week’s stay there, had apprised them of his approach.

Ten miles further, at Three Taverns, another group of sympathisers, probably in still larger numbers, was ready to accord him a second welcome. And these tokens of their love and respect went home to the heart of the prisoner, lightened his chains, and sent him on his way rejoicing. When he saw them, “he thanked God, and took courage.”
They were now thirty-three miles from Rome. The march across the Campagna afforded beautiful views of scenery, agreeably diversified and contrasted, the Alban hills on the right hand, and the level Campagna stretching to the Mediterranean on the left. They came to Lanuvium, the birthplace of Quirinius (page 19), to the right of which, amongst the hills, six or seven miles distant, was Velitri, the seat of the Octavian family from which Augustus sprang.

Two more stages, Aricia and Bovillae, and the centurion was in sight of Rome. But they were already surrounded by buildings. The Campagna was not then deserted, as in the present day, but covered with farms, and crowded with the villas of the Roman aristocracy. The tombs of Pompey, Cæcilia Metella, of the Scipios, of the Julian family, of which perhaps Julius was a member, and many more, bordered the road at intervals on each hand; the Claudian and other aqueducts stretched their arches across the plain; the Catacombs wound their devious way beneath the travellers' feet.

And so they came to Rome—an immense company. There was the escort of soldiers, there were the prisoners; and following in their train, the two parties of brethren who had journeyed to Appii Forum and Three Taverns to welcome the Apostle; and doubtless many more, perhaps even sympathisers from amongst the Pharisaic Jews, who had come from the City itself to meet him on the way. Thus did S. Paul, after years of waiting, arrive at Rome, a prisoner indeed, and in chains, yet accompanied by so large a company of friends that his entrance seemed more like the triumphal procession of a conqueror, than the delivery of a prisoner about to be tried for his life.
Arrival in Rome

Julius had received his instructions, and, of course, knew exactly what to do on reaching his destination—whither to conduct his prisoners, and to whom to give them up.

But we shall never know the certainty of the matter. The reading in Acts xxviii. 16, as given by the Revisers, is, “And when we entered into Rome, Paul was suffered to abide by himself with the soldier that guarded him.” The additional statement of the Textus Receptus, followed by the Authorised Version, “The centurion delivered the prisoners to the captain of the guard,” is not found in the best MSS. such as Μ, A, and B. It is omitted also in the Vulgate. Dean Alford puts this statement in his text, but brackets it; Professor Ramsay accepts it as authentic.

If we reject this clause, as we are entitled to do, we have no information whatever as to the place to which Julius conveyed his prisoners.

If we accept the clause, with H, L, P, we have to inquire into the meaning of the word στρατωτής, found only in this place. And the meaning we assign to this word will determine the destination of Julius and his escort.

If we render it by “captain of the praetorian guard” or “praetorian prefect,” which is the usual rendering, we have the choice of Nero’s palace, or of the Praetorian camp.

If, with Mommsen and Professor Ramsay, following an Old Latin Version, we translate it princeps peregrinorum, or general of the soldiers from abroad, we should halt at the camp on the Cœlian Hill.

It is impossible to decide with certainty.

Accepting the generally-received opinion that the strato-pedarch was “the chief of the camp,” as the word literally implies, i.e. the Præfect of the Praetorian guards, we may trace Julius’s course from the Appian Way, outside the walls,
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follow Professor Ramsay, we shall hold that the Stratopedarch was the Commanding Officer of these foreign troops.

S. Paul was now in Rome. The aspiration of his later life was realised, and the promise of the Lord Jesus Christ fulfilled. It was in the month of March, in the year of our Lord 61, in the seventh year of Nero, that these events were accomplished.

S. Paul's Lodging in Rome

It would appear, from an examination of the last sixteen verses of the Acts, that S. Paul occupied three different places of residence during his imprisonment at Rome, to none of which are we able to assign any definite situation in the city as the whole matter depends upon verse 16, with its doubtful clause about the Stratopedarch.

These three residences appear to have been as follows:—

I. First, there was the official place for the reception of prisoners brought from abroad. The position of this office cannot be determined until we have ascertained the exact meaning of the word Stratopedarch, by which the official is described to whom the prisoners were delivered. This we have already discussed, and have left the matter in doubt, though with a leaning towards Professor Ramsay's opinion that the Stratopedarch was the Princeps Peregrinorum; in which case S. Paul's first residence would be the place of detention attached to the Camp of the Foreign Service Corps on the Caelian Hill.

In this place, we may presume, he was permitted by the official in charge to receive the first deputation from the Jews. According to his usual practice, expressed several times in his Epistle to the Romans, "to the Jew first, and also to the Greek," he addressed himself in the first instance to the Jews. He called together "the chief of the Jews," i.e. a few of the leading members of the colony of Israelites from across the
Tiber, in which district, the "Trastevere," about 60,000 were dwelling at this time, Claudius's ineffectual edict of expulsion having expired.

We assume that this meeting was held in S. Paul's place of detention, because it was summoned so soon after his arrival in Rome. In all probability more than the "three days" of verse 17 would be required to complete the legal preliminaries for his release from actual imprisonment, so as to set him free to seek a lodging for himself. It would have been but a small number who would have been admitted to the barracks in response to his summons.

At the very outset S. Paul would be anxious to come to an understanding as to the relation between Christianity and Judaism in Rome, and to clear himself of the suspicion of disloyalty to his own people which had been created by his appeal to Cæsar.

Accordingly, in the discussion of this matter, S. Paul explains that, in spite of his devotion to the Law of Moses, and his reverence for the customs of their forefathers, he had been delivered by the Jews into the hands of the Romans—that the Roman judges would have set him free, but for the persistent opposition of the Jews, which compelled him to appeal to Cæsar against his will. He also wished them to know that the cause of his detention was the pertinacity with which he clung to the Messianic promises contained in the Word of God.

The reply of the deputies is cautious and diplomatic. Evidently they were responsible persons unwilling to commit themselves and those whom they represented to any definite course of action.

Their answer is to the effect that they had heard nothing prejudicial against Paul either by letter, or by word of mouth: but that they would like to have some definite information concerning the tenets of the sect or heresy of Christians, since they had heard many things spoken against it.
It was indeed true that the Christians had been accused of atheism and of abominable practices at their feasts (ἀθειώτης, Ὠνεστεία δεῖπνα and ὸλιποδέους μῦξεις: Euseb: Hist. Eccl. v. 1); but these leaders of the Jews ought to have been acquainted with the doctrines of the Christians, seeing that a considerable number of them were residents of Rome at this time.

A day was appointed for a larger meeting to consider the question.

II. When the day arrived, S. Paul had apparently obtained his release from the guard-house, and was now in a lodging. Both the English Versions have interpolated the pronoun “his.” But the meeting assembled εἰς τὴν Ἑβιαν—i.e. in a place where S. Paul was a guest, as he had been with Mnason of Cyprus, on his arrival at Jerusalem, where the same word is used (Ἑβισθωμυ, Acts xxi. 16). This was apparently, not the μῆναμα of verse 30, but the residence of one of the Christians of Rome, perhaps Aquila, as suggested by Olshausen. The same word is used in Philem. 22 : Ἐροῦμαζε ὑμοί Ἑβιαν.

In this place the second and larger meeting was held. Those who assembled were obviously of a different class from those who composed the previous deputation. They were less cautious. We perceive no trace of the non-committal language of the more select meeting, but we find conduct such as S. Paul was so familiar with in the various Jewish audiences he had addressed in Asia Minor and in Greece. He reasoned with them a whole day, from morning till evening, and with the usual result: “some believed the things which were spoken, and some disbelieved,” and they had “much disputing among themselves.” And S. Paul felt impelled to the same action as at Corinth (xviii. 6); he turned to the Gentiles, “Be it known therefore unto you, that this salvation of God is sent unto the Gentiles; they will also hear.”

III. For the third residence of S. Paul, a different designation is adopted: instead of Ἑβια we have μῆναμα, the one implying the home of a friend with whom he was staying
as a guest, the other a hired dwelling, not necessarily a whole house, for which he was paying rent. This “hired dwelling” must have been somewhere near the barracks, for the convenience of the legionary soldiers who relieved guard over the prisoner. The locality of this dwelling we are, unfortunately, unable to indicate, since we are ignorant of the position of the barracks to which these legionaries were attached.

Here he had every opportunity of free action afforded him consistent with his safe custody. He had permission to receive all who came to visit him, whether personal friends, or outsiders who came for consultation. No restriction was placed upon his missionary enthusiasm. He was allowed freely to preach the kingdom of God, and to teach the things concerning the Lord Jesus Christ. His friends had access to him, and could be sent upon commissions: his amanuensis could write at his dictation; and he was able to supervise S. Luke in the composition of the Acts of the Apostles.

Who were his intimate friends during the two years of his detention can be gathered from the mention made of them in the Epistles of the first Captivity—those to the Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, and Philemon. These Epistles are so short that no special references need be given.

S. Paul’s friends at this period of his life, upon whom he bestows endearing epithets, were: Luke, the historian and physician; Timothy, the amanuensis; Aristarchus, the fellow-prisoner, συναξιομάλωτος; Tychicus, the faithful minister; Epaphroditus, the fellow-soldier; Epaphras, the fellow-servant; Mark, the cousin of Barnabas; Demas, the fellow-worker; and Onesimus, the child begotten in his bonds.

Those two years of imprisonment were busy years, filled to the brim with missionary labours. And yet all the while he was in military custody, under the surveillance of the
soldiers who guarded him throughout the day, to whose wrist he was coupled by a light chain. At night, according to custom, the watch was doubled: "nox custodiam geminat." This apparent severity was necessary, in order to secure his safe custody, and thereby to ensure his appearance in the Basilica, when summoned to answer to his Appeal before Nero. Every indulgence was accorded him: but he was not allowed to go abroad into the City; and hence, much as he might have desired, he was unable to preach Christ in any of the seven synagogues at Rome.

The allusions to his captive condition are frequent in the four Epistles written at this time, in which he speaks of himself as the prisoner of Jesus Christ and an ambassador in a chain, and asks his converts to remember his bonds, which were manifest "throughout the whole Praetorian guard" (Eph. iii. 1; iv. 1; vi. 20; Phil. i. 7, 13, 14; Col. iv. 3, 4, 18; and Philem. 1, 9, 10).

And so, as we finish reading the Acts of the Apostles, we grieve to leave S. Paul in bonds. We are anxious to know the result of his imprisonment. Was he acquitted and set free? Was he condemned and put to death? We have been deeply interested in the narrative, and just as the interest is at its height the Book suddenly comes to an end, and we are left in the dark as to the fate of the Apostle. It is as though the last chapter of a thrilling story were lost. The end of this Book, if it be indeed the end, is most unsatisfactory.

We have suggested an explanation of this difficulty at the beginning of chapter xiii.
CHAPTER XVIII

NERO AND TRIAL ON APPEAL

Nero

Dean Farrar gives this estimate of the character of Nero: "Incurably vicious, incurably frivolous, with no result of all his education beyond a smattering of ridiculous or unworthy accomplishments, his selfishness had been so inflamed by unlimited autocracy that there was not a single crime of which he was incapable, or a single degradation to which he could not sink. The world never entrusted its imperial absolutism to a more despicable specimen of humanity. He was a tenth-rate actor entrusted with irresponsible power. In every noble mind he inspired a horror only alleviated by contempt."

Nero had the misfortune to be the offspring of two of the worst characters of a degenerate age. His father, Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus, was conspicuous among the Roman nobles for the vileness of his life. His mother, Agrippina, sister of the mad Caligula, appeared to be capable of any crime. The father had himself said that from him and Agrippina a monster only could be born. And a monster Nero was from the beginning. In his youth he had the advantage of training at the hands of the honest Burrus and the philosophic Seneca, the effects of which were apparent during the first five years of his reign—the "Golden Quinquennium," as it has been called; but the good tendencies of his early education were very soon overpowered by the moral weakness and sensuality inherited from his parents.
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His mother, Agrippina, the daughter of the virtuous Germanicus, had married the elderly Claudius, and soon persuaded him to set aside his own son Britannicus, and to adopt her son by Ahenobarbus. This was in A.D. 50. Four years afterwards she murdered her husband, and, by the aid of Burrus, secured the succession to her son. But Nero, even at the tender age of seventeen, could experience no emotions of gratitude, and before the first quinquennium had expired he had fallen into the toils of Poppæa, and, at her instigation, had contrived the murder of his mother. Such was the man: and so he remained till the end came.

Nero was born at Antium, on the coast of Latium, in December, A.D. 37. His name, originally L. Domitius Ahenobarbus, was changed on his adoption by Claudius, to Nero Claudius Cæsar Drusus Germanicus. His relation to the family of the Cæsars will be seen in the genealogy given on page 43.

He commenced his career of crime and folly immediately on mounting the throne. In the year of his accession he removed Britannicus, the son of Claudius, by poison. Soon after S. Paul's arrival in Rome Burrus died, poisoned, as was suspected, by Nero. Seneca also was disgraced and driven from the Court. These two wise ministers were succeeded by Tigellinus; and everything changed for the worse. Then came, in rapid succession, crime upon crime, and folly upon folly—the banishment and death of his wife Octavia, the daughter of Claudius—his marriage to Poppæa the wife of Otho, whom he afterwards killed by a kick, in a violent fit of passion—the assassination of numbers of the Roman patricians—the proposal of marriage to Antonia, another of Claudius's daughters, and her execution on refusal of the alliance—the marriage with Messalina, after the murder of her husband—the removal in various ways of all who competed with him successfully in contests on the stage, or in the arena—arbitrary and illegal confiscations of property, and frequent capital
sentences passed on innocent persons. These and other atrocities make the record of Nero's reign a task which one shrinks from undertaking. Truly his life reads more like an extract from the pages of the Newgate Calendar than the narration of a sober historian.

Two events in his reign bring Nero into contact with Christianity. The trials of S. Paul will be considered in this chapter. The other event was the great conflagration which broke out in Rome in the year 64.

It will always be a question whether this calamity was the work of the Emperor, or not. He was at Antium when the fire began, but he returned at once to Rome on receiving the news, and apparently busied himself in the endeavour to extinguish the flames. It is, however, an undoubted fact that suspicion was directed at him from the beginning. It was said that slaves of his were seen in the act of rekindling the flames when they were dying down, and that a fresh outburst was originated in the garden of Tigellinus. His own conduct in rejoicing at the splendour of the scene, and comparing it with the siege and capture of Troy, was calculated to arouse suspicion of his complicity.

He may not have originated the fire: it is very probable that he wilfully extended it, when it was about to subside. However this may be, it is certain that he appropriated a great part of the desolated area, and covered its site with his "Golden House" extending for more than a mile in length from the Palatine across the valley to the Esquiline.

In order to divert suspicion from himself, the fire was attributed to the Christians, who were apprehended in large numbers and subjected to the most cruel tortures. They were crucified like their Master: they were worried by dogs while clad in the skins of wild beasts: and, worst horror of all, they were arrayed in robes of inflammable materials (the tunica molesta of Juvenal, Seneca and Martial), and stationed at intervals in the gardens of Nero, to illuminate the darkness of
the night, and amuse the gay crowds, amongst whom the Emperor himself, in the guise of a charioteer, was driving about in triumph (Tacitus, Ann. xv. 44). Could fiendish cruelty further go?

Nero next gave play to his histrionic tastes. He determined to excel all others in every accomplishment. His petty vanity was fired with the ambition of gaining prizes in the amphitheatre, as a chariot-driver, a musician, an actor, a poet. He degraded his office as emperor by exhibiting himself publicly on the stage. His tour through Greece in the year 67 was the culminating point of this feature in his career, and on his return he exhibited to the wondering Romans the trophies of his æsthetic victories, in the numerous crowns which had been conferred upon him as prizes.

We cannot wonder that his subjects began to tire of his excesses. They lost reverence for his office, and became inspired by a contempt for his person. Lampoons and satires are found in the pages of contemporary authors, and graffiti were scratched upon the walls of the public buildings.

The persecution of the Christians had been followed the next year by the conspiracy of Piso, which was divulged by the freedman Milichus, and then suppressed. A number of noble Romans were involved in the plot and were put to death; amongst them were Piso himself, and Seneca the brother of Gallio, and his nephew Lucan the poet. There had already been a serious insurrection in Britain, and a war with Parthia; and now followed the outbreak of the great war with the Jews; and finally, none too soon, the revolt of the troops in Spain and Gaul under Vindex, with the object of placing Galba, the governor of Hispania Tarraconensis, on the Imperial throne. Nero was at the time amusing himself at Naples, and paid little attention to the serious aspect of affairs: but on his return to Rome, where the people were starving, and the Prætorians were becoming partisans of Galba, Nero perceived that his folly had lost him an empire. With his usual
perversity he began to devise all kinds of mad schemes—a general massacre in the city, another conflagration, the earning a livelihood by his “divine voice,” flight into Egypt, and many more—one after the other, without any relation to the exigencies of the case. At length, finding himself forsaken by his courtiers, deserted by the Praetorians, and robbed of his possessions, he determined upon flight; and, at the house of the freedman Phaon, a few miles from Rome, after several abortive attempts upon his life, which he was too cowardly to carry through, he stabbed himself in the throat with the aid of Epaphroditus, his secretary, just in time to escape arrest by the centurion sent from Rome. Inflated with contemptible vanity even in the hour of death, his last words were, “Qualis artifex pereo”—“What an artist to perish!” (June 9th, A.D. 68).

The Delay of the Trial

S. Paul remained in bonds for two whole years. There must have been some cause for this long delay, but we have no information on the subject, and are reduced to speculation. It may have been that the Sanhedrists, as prosecutors, had become hopeless of securing the condemnation of their enemy, and were endeavouring, as the next best alternative, to defer the trial to the latest possible moment. Every one of S. Paul's judges, save only the Sanhedrin, had pronounced him innocent. Lysias in his elogium had declared that nothing was laid to his charge worthy of death or bonds. Felix was so convinced of his innocence that he would have freed him, if the prisoner would have offered him a bribe. Festus and Agrippa agreed that he might have been set at liberty if he had not appealed unto Cæsar. Julius and Publius and the various Praetorians to whom he was chained had no doubt borne testimony in his favour. There was really no one against him but the Jews, and no definite charge
of which the Roman law could take cognisance—nothing but small differences of interpretation of certain passages of Scripture. They could see that clearly now, and they despaired of success. Perhaps they had abandoned the prosecution—not formally it may be, but virtually. And in the absence of prosecutors no trial could be held.

Or difficulties may have arisen in the matter of witnesses. It would be a costly matter to bring the witnesses from Palestine to Rome, and provide their expenses for an indefinite period.

Or the delay may have been due to Nero himself. The best part of Nero's reign had now passed, and he addicted himself more and more to self-indulgence: his conduct was daily becoming more and more frivolous and contemptible; and he may not have chosen to trouble himself about so small a matter.

Whatever the cause were, the trial was delayed for two years. Indeed, we are not absolutely certain that there was any trial at all. Our only authority is that of Eusebius, who in his Ecclesiastical History (ii. 22) states that "after defending himself successfully, it is currently reported that the Apostle again went forth to preach the Gospel, and afterwards came to Rome a second time." S. Paul himself says nothing definite about a trial on this occasion, but speaks of his approaching release; and it may be just possible that the Jews, losing all heart, might have abandoned the prosecution; in which case the accused would be released.

The balance of probability is in favour of a trial having taken place.

Two passages in the Epistle to the Philippians (i. 12–14, 25; ii. 23, 24), taken together, seem to point to a trial in progress and nearing the end.

In Phil. i. 12, 13, he says, "I would have you know, brethren, that the things which happened unto me have fallen out rather unto the progress of the Gospel; so that my bonds
became manifest in Christ throughout the whole Prætorian guard, and to all the rest; and that most of the brethren in the Lord, being confident through my bonds, are more abundantly bold to speak the word of God without fear” (R.V.). This passage is usually understood to refer to his imprisonment, and to the successful preaching of the Gospel in his bonds, so that many had become converts to the faith, even amongst the Prætorian guard. But Mommsen has suggested a different explanation. He interprets the word “Prætorium” here as the Imperial Court of Justice. The prisoner was no longer occupying his own hired dwelling; he had been removed to the barrack attached to the palace, and was being detained there during the intervals of the trial: and when he was before his judges, his bonds were publicly displayed in the Supreme Court of Appeal. The close of the trial was at hand; an acquittal seemed almost certain; and the brethren were so encouraged by the turn that events had taken that they had become bold in speaking the word of God. The issue was not yet certain; S. Paul would wait to see how it would go with him (ii. 23); but he was so confident of a happy termination of his long imprisonment that he expected to see the Philippian brethren shortly (v. 24), and abide with them. The prospect is so cheering (for he appears to have loved the Philippians above all others), that he repeats the word with emphasis—μενω καὶ συμπαραμενω (i. 25). The same hope is expressed in his letter to Philemon, “Prepare me also a lodging; for I hope that through your prayers I shall be granted unto you.”

The Trial

We may fairly assume a trial. There is a difference of opinion in regard to the date. All, however, are agreed that it took place before the great fire in Rome, which broke out in July, A.D. 64. Professor Ramsay dates the trial at the end
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of 61; Messrs. Conybeare and Howson in the spring of 63; Dean Farrar about the beginning of 64.

We will, then, assume that there was a trial: that S. Paul was brought from his hired dwelling, and lodged in the barracks on the Palatine near the Palace of Nero, that on the day appointed he was produced by his guards in court, and placed before the judges. It was the practice of Tiberius and Claudius, after the ancient custom, to hear and decide such causes in the Forum; but Nero appears to have sat for the purpose in his own palace. The ancient courts of justice were open to the sky, and even at a later date the aisles only were roofed in, while the central portion or nave was still open. In memory of this, the ceiling of Nero's Court of Justice was decorated with stars, as though the court were still held under the canopy of heaven. At the further end of this hall the Emperor took his seat, attended by his assessors, who, as appointed by Augustus, were twenty in number selected from the senators. The Bench, if we may so call it, was separated from the general public by a chancel or railing, within which the judges sat in an apse, attended by the officers of the court.

Before this tribunal the prisoner is placed, and his bonds become manifest in the whole Prætorium (Phil. i. 13).

As we have seen, in chapter xvi., there existed no Court of Appeal under the Republic, all the magistrates being supreme and mutually independent. Under the Empire this system, or want of system, was entirely changed. Augustus, having united in his person the highest offices of the State, had become supreme in the administration of justice. There was now one official superior to all others, to whom an appeal could be made from the rest. As perpetual consul, the Emperor dominated the senate, which usually passed without discussion whatever measures he proposed. In virtue of his proconsular power he possessed supreme criminal jurisdiction; while the tribunical authority residing in him conferred upon him the
right to arrest at will all criminal proceedings. It was this last privilege upon which his authority as Supreme Judge in the Court of Appeal mainly rested. It raised him from the position of chief magistrate of the Republic to that of its sovereign. He became possessed of the power, under the old right of tribunical “intercession,” of interposing with a veto against the execution of the sentences of other magistrates—a power which he eventually enhanced into the right to pardon the criminal, or to revise his sentence, either by way of diminishing or increasing his penalty.

Thus the Emperor was constituted the supreme judicial power in the State. He was in all things sovereign—supreme in legal causes, as previously in military.

The proceedings in criminal causes, says Laboulaye (Les lois criminelles des Romains), were very similar to the forms followed in civil causes. And both suffered considerable modifications under the Empire. The old special Commission, or Quaestio, for each particular case had given way in certain classes of offences, such as treason, bribery and forgery, under the system of Questiones Perpetuae; and by the side of these Standing Commissions, there were established under the Empire new jurisdictions, or extraordinary tribunals which were destined eventually to supplant the republican institutions. These were known as Cognitiones Extraordinariae, and were not special for each class of crime, as under the Standing Commissions, but were of a general nature, with rules common to all criminal proceedings, and with abbreviated forms of procedure.

Thus in the preliminary proceedings before the prætor when the cause was in jure, the postulatio and divinatio disappeared (page 377), and the subsequent forms, the nominis delatio, inscriptio, subscriptio and nominis receptio, were so considerably curtailed that they were accomplished very quickly. The Standing Commissions, however, continued till the reign of Domitian, by which time they had become gradually superseded by the Cognitiones Extraordinariae.
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These preliminaries had already been completed in S. Paul's case. He was already in a state of accusation, in reatu. The proceedings in jure were represented by the Literæ dimissoriae forwarded by Festus, in which the offences of which he was accused were detailed. The case was now in judicio, before the judge, i.e. the Emperor himself, on appeal. And Nero most probably presided in person, for he was usually careful about appeals from the provinces.

We can give nothing but a hypothetical account of this trial, for we have no facts upon which to rely. We do not know what witnesses were produced, or whether there were any witnesses at all, after so long a delay. Neither do we know whether the prosecutors employed an advocate as upon the previous occasion, when Tertullus pleaded their cause. This is, however, exceedingly probable, as the case before the Emperor himself was of more importance than when it was before the provincial governor. We cannot say whether S. Paul pleaded for himself or not: though it is almost certain that he would answer for himself as he had done before the Sanhedrin, and before Felix, Festus and Agrippa.

The charges were heresy, sacrilege and treason: all of which he could easily rebut, as he had rebutted them at Cæsarea (see chapter xv.).

When the pleadings were concluded and the witnesses had undergone examination, it was usual for the crier to announce that the proceedings were terminated, by proclaiming the solemn word Dixerunt. Then the jury (judices) voted, by depositing their wooden tablets, coated with wax, in the urn. The sentence, which was decided by the votes of the majority, was announced by the judge in the words, non fecisse videtur (not guilty), or fecisse videtur (guilty), or amplius (a new trial). After the sentence of acquittal or condemnation, the proceedings were brought to an end by the crier reciting the word Ilicet. i.e. Ite licet.

This procedure was subjected to considerable changes under
the Imperial regime. And Suetonius (*Nero*, 15) informs us that it was Nero's practice to decide each count in an indictment by itself, after he had heard the pleadings and the evidence. We can easily understand that it might have been at this stage that S. Paul wrote hopefully to the Philippians. He may have been already acquitted on one or two counts, and may have been expecting a similar result on the third.

The votes of the assessors were not taken in the ancient manner, by ballot, in trials on appeal before Nero. It was his custom to receive from each of his assessors a written opinion; and on the next day, without consulting his assessors, as his predecessors had done, he would deliver his judgment in person from the tribunal. In this case, he pronounced the accused innocent. And S. Paul was once more free.

**Second Imprisonment at Rome**

The journeys of S. Paul between his two imprisonments must be conjectured from the casual mention of certain places in the Pastoral Epistles, such as Crete, Miletum, Nicopolis, and others. These have already been noticed on pages 97 and 98.

With regard to the second imprisonment, we have very little information. Our materials for the record consist of a few hints in the Second Epistle to Timothy, and a brief reference made by Clement of Rome and Eusebius. Yet from these scanty materials elaborate narratives have been constructed, depending almost entirely upon imagination and a balance of probabilities.

In what follows we shall not be able to avoid speculation altogether; but we shall endeavour to keep as closely as possible to that which is authentic.

The great Fire at Rome in July, 64, exerted an evil influence over the fortunes of the infant Church of Christ. Nero made it the excuse for a savage attack upon the Christians. Their
religion was branded as a “detestable superstition,” and they themselves were accused of atheism and of abominable practices. S. Paul had fortunately been set free from his first imprisonment, and had left Rome before the Fire broke out; but the persecution of the brethren raged fiercely for several years. No Christian was safe in any part of the Roman dominions.

Thus it came about that S. Paul was again apprehended. Where this misfortune overtook him we cannot say. It may have been at Troas, where he had left the cloak and the books with Carpus (2 Tim. iv. 13). Perhaps he was seized here, and hurried away without leaving him time to possess himself of these useful articles. More likely he was arrested at Nicopolis in Epirus, where he had proposed to spend the winter (Titus iii. 12). Or he may even have reached Rome itself in the course of his travels and have been arrested there. It is impossible to say. We have no hint afforded us. But at this time any provincial official could have easily formulated some serious charge against S. Paul, seeing that the Christians were still under persecution, and that the Apostle himself, by his incessant activity, was perpetually stirring up opposition.

Neither do we know the offences with which he was charged. There appear, however, to have been two counts in his indictment (2 Tim. iv. 16), such as complicity with the incendiaries at Rome, and the usual charge of treason, so frequently brought against troublesome persons at this period; or, maybe, the general accusation of belonging to that sect of Christians, which professed a “detestable superstition.”

All this is uncertain. What we do know is that the conditions of his detention at Rome on this occasion were very different from those of the previous imprisonment. Then he was treated with kindness and courtesy, allowed to dwell in his own apartments, and permitted free access
to his friends. Now all this was changed. He was in more strict confinement, perhaps in a dungeon. His friends found it a matter of difficulty to gain access to him. Thus Onesiphorus had to search diligently before he found him (2 Tim. i. 16). He was being treated with great harshness. And this treatment must indeed have been severe, or he would not have complained over and over again about “suffering hardship,” as he does in writing to Timothy (2 Tim. i. 8, 12, 16; ii. 3, 9). He had become inured to hardship (2 Cor. xi. 23–28), and would not have complained about a trifle. There was no kindly Julius or courteous Burrus to lighten the weight of his chain; he was now being dealt with as a criminal, a felon, a malefactor (κακοδρυγός, 2 Tim. ii. 9). All his surroundings were different—more painful and hard to bear. This can be readily seen by a comparison of the Epistle to Philippi, in which he writes in a cheerful strain, and the second Epistle to Timothy, which is pessimistic throughout, so far as this world was concerned.

Finally, he had no hope of release. He could not ask his friends to prepare him a lodging, or express any hope of seeing them again, as he had done a few years before; he never expected to leave his dungeon, except to die, for his course was now finished (2 Tim. iv. 7).

And, as though to heap trouble upon trouble, he was alone. There was no one to cheer and comfort him, except Luke only (ib. 11). Some of his friends had deserted him through fear of persecution, such as Phygelius and Hermogenes; Demas had gone back to the world; and, worst of all, Alexander had turned traitor, and borne evidence against him (2 Tim. i. 15; iv. 10, 14). Others had been despatched to various places, on missionary business—to Galatia, to Dalmatia, to Ephesus (ib. 10, 12). There were some friends still left to him—Eubulus, Pudens, Linus, and Claudia (ib. 21), of whom we would fain speak more particularly, as the last
two were apparently connected with our own island of Britain. These were some comfort to him. But the only one who was closely associated with him, and perhaps shared his imprisonment, was his inseparable companion and friend, his trustworthy amanuensis and devoted physician, the evangelist and historian, S. Luke.

The Trial

"At my first defence," he writes, in 2 Timothy iv. 16, "no one took my part, but all forsook me." From this statement we gather that the Trial was in two stages, and that there was some considerable interval between these two stages, enabling him to give the directions to which we have just alluded.

There are two modes of accounting for this.

If S. Paul were tried under the ancient rules, which were still legally valid, though they had of late fallen almost into disuse, the meaning of this "first defence"—πρώτη ἀπολογία—would be that he had been duly tried, but had been remanded. A majority of the iudices had voted N.L., non liquet, the presiding judge had pronounced the word "Amplius," and an adjournment, ampliatio, had taken place (see page 387). In this case the "first defence" would have been the Prima Actio, and he was now lying in prison awaiting the Secunda Actio.

It is, however, more likely that there were two counts in the indictment, and that each count, according to the practice followed by Nero, and presumably by his officials, had been tried separately. Under this presumption, S. Paul had successfully defended himself against the first count, and was now remanded to prison while preparations were being made for his trial under the second.

We do not know what these counts were. Conybeare and Howson suggest that they were (1) Complicity with the
incendiaries of Rome, (2) Treason. Professor Ramsay regards this as a plausible conjecture.

The First Charge. Obviously false as this charge was, for S. Paul had left Rome before the fire broke out, it was one which brought him into serious danger, and caused his friends such apprehension that there was no one to stand by him: “No one took my part, but all forsook me.” He stood alone in the Basilica before his judges, and defended himself in the presence of the crowds of Gentiles (2 Tim. iv. 17) there assembled, and thronging the nave and the galleries over the aisles. As on his previous trials, so on this trial also, he probably engaged no advocate, but pleaded his own cause, for which duty he was quite as competent as any practised patronus.

And he cleared himself of the charge, and was acquitted on that count. He was “delivered out of the mouth of the lion.” The “lion” was, of course, the judge of the court, either Nero or one of his delegates: or the phrase may be a general expression indicating deliverance from extreme peril.

He had indeed been in the greater danger, for he had been betrayed by a false friend. Alexander the coppersmith or brassfounder had borne testimony against him, either as a witness, or even as an informer or delator. The latter had, from the time of Tiberius onward, become almost a regular profession at Rome; and crowds of informers were always ready to testify against any accused person whom the Emperor desired to remove. This Alexander (who may be the Alexander of Ephesus mentioned in Acts xix. 33) had apparently, in conjunction with Hymenæus, become heretical and made “shipwreck concerning the faith”; for which cause S. Paul had delivered them both unto Satan—had, in fact, excommunicated them (1 Tim. i. 20). Perhaps Alexander had exacted his revenge when S. Paul was brought before his judges. His treachery, however, was in vain. The accused was acquitted on the first count, and remanded to prison.
Nero and Trial on Appeal

The Second Charge. We must assume this to be Treason, or Majestas, a charge which seldom ended in acquittal. From his prison S. Paul is a second time brought forth and placed before the Tribunal, to be tried for his life. Once more his voice is heard in the crowded Judgment Hall defending his conduct in the presence of the Roman people, thousands of whom, having no settled employment, had nothing better to do, in order to pass the time, than to attend the Courts of Justice or to frequent the public baths. Of the incidents of this Trial we are entirely ignorant; the result alone is known—the Accused was pronounced guilty, and was condemned to die.

We may now discuss the question as to who was his judge: and the answer to this question depends, to some extent, upon the date of the Trial. The dates assigned by various writers are A.D. 66, 67, or 68. It could not have been later than this, for the ancient Fathers are unanimous in declaring that the great Apostle was martyred in the reign of Nero. Eusebius gives the year 67, and Jerome the year that Nero died, i.e. A.D. 68.

When, therefore, we discuss the question whether Nero tried the case in person, we have to bear in mind Nero's visit to Greece, which happened in the year 67. Consequently, if the trial took place in A.D. 66 as some suppose, Nero might have presided at the trial, for he had not yet started on his journey to Greece. If in 67, he could not have been the judge, for he was then exhibiting his aesthetic talents in Greece. If in 68, he had returned to Rome. But in the last year, the insurrection of Vindex had broken out in Gaul, and the sovereignty of the world had been offered to Galba. Nero would be busily occupied in the endeavour to safeguard his throne, and would have no time to spare for smaller matters. We are consequently justified in assuming that Nero did not try the case in person. He had grown more and more self-indulgent and irresponsible, and had latterly neglected affairs of state
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and other matters of importance while engaged in following the whim of the moment.

Thus, in all probability, S. Paul was tried, as Clement of Rome says, "before the presiding magistrates," i.e. before the City Praefect—μαρτυρήσας ἐπὶ τῶν ἥγουμένων.

The Prefectus Urbi was one of the new magistrates appointed by Augustus when he reformed the municipal arrangements of Rome, which had become antiquated, having existed since the time of Servius Tullius. He included the whole inhabited district around the ancient city, and divided it into fourteen regions, over each of which he placed a minor magistrate; the Prefectus Urbi being the chief over all. Other municipal officials were appointed at the same time. And by these means the City of Rome, which till then had been without police protection, became a safe place of residence. Augustus respected all the Republican magistrates and tribunals, but by the side of them he set up new institutions, exceptional at first, but afterwards destined to supersede the ancient institutions, and leave them an empty name. And thus, although the pretors and ædiles continued to be appointed as of old, their powers were gradually transferred to the new magistracy. The same transformation overtook the Courts of Justice. The quastiones perpetuae were continued in name under Augustus and his successors, while in reality the cognitiones extraordinariae took their place.

In this way the Prefectus Urbi had become a most important magistrate, and had acquired powers which had previously belonged to the consul, the prætor, and the ædiles. In all probability the presiding magistrate at this second trial of S. Paul was the City Praefect, and not the Emperor himself.
The Martyrdom of S. Paul

Medieval legends make the Tullianum of the Mamertine prison, under the Capitoline Hill, the place of S. Paul's detention. This would be of extreme interest, if only it were authentic; but we have no hint of this in any ancient writing. It is also difficult to understand how S. Paul's friends could have gained access to him in a dungeon so strictly guarded. And, if he were there, the fact would have been known, and Onesiphorus's diligent search would have been unnecessary.

This prison is of extraordinary antiquity, reaching back undoubtedly to the time of Servius Tullius, to whom the Robur Tullianum is attributed. It must have been of much greater extent than the remains now shown beneath the Church of St. Joseph on the Capitoline Hill. It was the place of confinement of many famous prisoners, such as Manlius, Syphax, Perseus, Jugurtha, Catiline and Sejanus. The antiquarians have devoted much time and care to the examination of these chambers, and have published elaborate descriptions of them.

The medieval legends have embellished the story of S. Paul's imprisonment here with many fantastic details, which need not be repeated now. But if this were indeed the dungeon in which S. Paul was thrust, as into a condemned cell, we need not wonder that he should ask Timothy to bring him the cloak from Troas; for the cold in winter-time in that subterranean chamber is extreme. The ἄφελόνης or ἄφελόνης (Vulgate penula) was a thick travelling cloak with a hood, which would afford him warmth. It had doubtless served him well in his travels by land and by sea; and he may have made it himself from the rough cloth woven from the long hair of the Cilician goats, in the days when he was a "tent-maker." It would also be a satisfaction to have the close companionship of S. Luke, who was not only a tried friend but a learned physician.
From his place of incarceration, wherever it may have been, he was led forth to die. One bright day in May or June he saw the sunshine once more. If S. Peter were his companion in misfortune, as the legend runs, the two great Apostles bade each other farewell for a brief space; and then, the one to the Vatican mount, the other to Aquæ Salviæ, went, each on his separate way, to the martyr's crown—"the crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, should give them at that day."

Out of the city by the gate in the wall of Servius Tullius the detachment of guards led their prisoner. They marched along the Via Ostiensis a short distance, to the place where the wall of Aurelius afterwards enclosed the city, and where the Porta Ostiensis stood, now called the Porta San Paolo in memory of the martyr. And there, overlooking the present gate, S. Paul would see, as he passed, that which our own eyes have beheld, for it stands there still, close by the English Cemetery—the pyramid of Caius Cestius, which had been raised over his sepulchre more than half a century previously. At the distance of about two miles from Rome they branched off to the left, and presently reached the Aquæ Salviiæ, where a small space of level sward lay enclosed in an amphitheatre of low hills. This, if we accept the tradition, was the place of martyrdom of the great Apostle of the Gentiles.

Under the Empire it was usual, in the case of certain criminals whose execution in Rome itself might create disturbance, to convey them some short distance beyond the walls to some retired spot, where the execution could be carried out without interruption. In the days of the Republic capital punishment was effected by the lictor's axe. Under Nero the headsman's sword took the place of the axe. And thus, by the sword, which is his emblem, S. Paul was decapitated. The spot is now named Tre Fontane, from the three springs which bubble up beneath the earth, and is marked by the three churches of the Abbadia delle Tre Fontane—a
column of white marble indicating the place where the actual martyrdom is said to have occurred. Not far away there now stands a magnificent Basilica, San Paolo fuori le mura, the grandest church in or near Rome—all alone in a malarious region, once crowded with human habitations. The body of S. Paul was taken up by loving disciples, and conveyed to the labyrinthine Catacombs, and laid to rest, In Pace, amongst the relics of the saints who had preceded him to Paradise. And there it lay till it found a more splendid sepulchre in the Basilica called by his name.

The life of incessant activity was closed, the busy brain was still, the loving heart had ceased to beat—the greatest missionary Bishop who ever evangelised the world had gone to his reward—but a few days before the Emperor, in whose name he was condemned to die, had terminated his ill-spent life.

But his influence remains. As long as the world lasts his memory will be revered by generation after generation. His was indeed a great name: for to him, more than to our Lord Himself, are due the formal expression of those doctrines of the Church of Christ Jesus in which we believe, and by believing which we are saved.
CHAPTER XIX

TITUS AND JERUSALEM

Three Short Reigns

With Nero the line of the Cæsars came to an end. The race had, in fact, been long extinct, and the line had been carried on by adoption. Though all the Emperors had been several times married, there were no descendants left, and not even an adopted son to lay claim to the throne. Henceforth the Prætorian Guards at Rome, or else the legions in the provinces, nominated the Emperor; and the servile senate registered the decrees of the military forces.

After Nero the deluge! Vindex, Galba, Rufus, Otho, Vitellius, Sabinus, Cæcina, Vespasian, Titus, were thrown up by the flood, in Spain and Gaul, in Syria and Palestine, and in Rome itself; and of these, Galba was the first to reach the highest place. He was seventy-three years of age when proclaimed by the Prætorians and recognised by the senate. His intentions were good: his desire was to effect some reform in the corrupt manners inherited from such rulers as Caligula and Nero; but his age was against him, and he could make no headway against the general unwillingness to reform.

At this time Otho, who had some years previously abandoned his wife Poppæa to the embraces of Nero, was the leading spirit in the City. He had gained over the Prætorians to his side, and, with their aid, caused himself to be proclaimed Emperor. Otho had fully expected that Galba would adopt him as his successor; but when that honour was conferred upon Piso, Otho determined to seize the throne at
once. At the head of the Praetorians he marched into Rome, and met Galba in the Forum. Galba and his adopted son were cut down by the troops, and Otho assumed the purple. But Vitellius had already been proclaimed by the legions on the Rhine, and a war to the death ensued between the two rivals. The crisis came in the Battle of Bedriacum, near Cremona, in North Italy, April, 69; and Vitellius was seated on the throne. He was utterly unfit for such an eminent position; he had no interest in governing an empire: everything was left to the guards, who enriched themselves while the Emperor was indulging his gross and vulgar tastes—“his beastly gluttony” as Niebuhr phrases it. The revolt against him was general—the legions of Moesia and Pannonia; of Syria, Judæa and Parthia rejected his rule; and the way was thrown open for the elevation of a wiser and more able sovereign. Vitellius’s army was defeated near Cremona, and Vitellius himself perished in the tumults which broke out in Rome.

Thus in eighteen months three emperors rose and fell; “they passed like phantoms across the stage,” and made a speedy exit. In 7 months, 3 months, and 8 months, their brief tale was told, and their voice was silenced in death. It was magnificent to be the master of the world, but was it worth while to climb so high a pinnacle only to be cast the next moment into the depths, and to be trampled under foot?

**The Flavian Emperors**

While these “three military chiefs,” as Suetonius styles them, were playing at empire in Rome, Vespasian was engaged in conducting the campaign against the Jews. He had been urged to assume the sovereignty; and on the death of Galba had seriously debated the question in his own mind. The brutal excesses of Vitellius had disgusted all the world, and Vespasian was hailed as the deliverer. He was proclaimed emperor at Alexandria; and leaving his son Titus to
carry on the Jewish war, he proceeded to Rome, where, however, he did not arrive until the summer of A.D. 70.

Vespasian founded a kind of dynasty, for he transmitted his sceptre to two of his sons in succession; and the emperors who came afterwards adopted and continued his policy. He was simple and severe in his manners, and endeavoured to bring back the more austere virtues of the ancient Romans. He checked the luxurious habits of the times; and both in the army and the State restored order and discipline. He reformed the senate, improved the administration of justice, and put an end to the system of delation for high treason which had grown to enormous proportions since the reign of Tiberius. In many ways his rule proved beneficial; and when he died, at the age of seventy, A.D. 79, it was felt that the empire had sustained a loss.

**Titus: A.D. 79-81**

The reign of Titus was brief: but he had been the guiding spirit in the government during the later years of his father. His place in history depends upon the part he took in the siege of Jerusalem, at the very commencement of his father’s rule. He had been at once created “Cæsar,” and designated as successor to the throne. He was born at Rome in December, A.D. 40, and was educated at the Court of Nero with Claudius’s son Britannicus. He gained considerable experience as military tribune in the campaigns in Germany and Britain, and held the command of a legion during the Jewish war. He was serving in this capacity under his father, when Galba was slain in the Forum, and Vespasian began to entertain the idea of grasping the supreme power. He was left in Judæa in sole command to bring to an end the war with the Jews, which he accomplished successfully by the capture of Jerusalem after a long siege. For this exploit the father and son were awarded a joint triumph.
Titus and Jerusalem

From this time forward he took up his residence in Rome, where he held the reins of government in his father's name. At this time he was very unpopular, it may be undeservedly, as bearing the blame of deeds done on behalf of Vespasian. It would appear, however, that he was much given to the pursuit of pleasure; and the guilt of certain assassinations was laid to his charge. He caused also much scandal by his entanglement with Bernice, whom he would have married but for the indignant protests of the Roman people.

On the death of Vespasian his conduct changed entirely, to the great delight of the Romans; and his unpopularity passed away. He was generous to a fault, and dispersed with open hand the hoards accumulated by his father. At the inauguration of the Colosseum, which had been constructed by Vespasian, he held a succession of games and shows, lasting for a hundred days. It was a vast building, holding 87,000 people; and on this occasion, amongst other exhibitions, no fewer than 5,000 wild beasts were slain in the arena. He is remembered also to this day by the Baths and the Arch which go by his name.

His reign was only too brief. It was signalised, like that of Augustus, by uninterrupted peace abroad, and contentment at home. His people conferred on him the affectionate title of "love and delight of the human race" (amor et deliciae generis humani).

Two calamities occurred during his reign. The first was the eruption of Mount Vesuvius, during which the three towns of Herculanum, Stabiae, and Pompeii were destroyed by lava and ashes from the volcano. This was in August, A.D. 79. In the next year there was a conflagration at Rome, lasting for three days, and followed by a pestilence. On both these occasions numbers of unfortunate persons were rendered homeless, and Titus impoverished himself in the effort to afford them relief.

He died, beloved by all, September 13th, A.D. 81, not
without the usual suspicion that his successor had hastened his end.

The Jewish War

This is related at very great length and with many circumstantial details by Josephus in his book of The Wars of the Jews; and there is an excellent summary, also at great length, by Dean Milman, in his History of the Jews, vol. ii. The exigencies of our space, however, limit us to the briefest account of this momentous war.

Ever since their subjugation by the Romans, the Jews had been in an inflammable condition, ready to take fire on every occasion of offence, and prone to revolt. Several times during the rule of Pontius Pilate, numbers of Jews, Samaritans, and Galilæans had been put to the sword. Palestine was esteemed as a most difficult province to govern, its inhabitants being so intractable, and in their religious views so intolerant and exclusive. During Festus’s procuratorship he had managed to keep them tolerably quiet; but on his death all went astray, as we shall presently relate.

The Procurators of Judæa

We are about to speak of the last two procurators of Judæa; and it will be convenient at this point to insert a list of those officials by whom Judæa had been governed, from the deposition of Archelaus (p. 122) to the time of the Jewish war.

The office of procurator is described on page 188, and a general account of the earlier holders of this office will be found on page 190.
LIST OF THE PROCURATORS

[Sabinus: see p. 120.]

1. Coponius . . . . A.D. 6
2. Marcus Ambivius . . . . "10
3. Annius Rufus . . . . "13
4. Valerius Gratus . . . . "14
5. Pontius Pilate . . . . "25
6. Marcellus . . . . "36
7. Marullus . . . . "37
8. "King" Agrippa . . . . "41
9. Cuspius Fadus . . . . "44
10. Tiberius Alexander . . . . "46
11. Ventidius Cumanus . . . . "49
12. Antonius Felix . . . . "53
13. Porcius Festus . . . . "60
15. Gessius Florus . . . . "65

Albinus and Florus

Albinus and Florus were the last two procurators of Judæa, and the worst. Albinus was distinguished for his rapacity: he plundered the provincials and burdened them with excessive taxation. Such robbers as were suffering imprisonment he would set free for a bribe, and those who were fomenting sedition were granted licence for their plots, providing they feed the procurator, who was thus himself, so to speak, the captain of a band of robbers.

Bad as Albinus was, he seemed (so Josephus writes, B. J. ii. 14) to be a most excellent ruler by comparison with his successor Gessius Florus, whose rapacity was so high-handed that he scorned to rob individuals, but would despoil whole cities, and ruin entire districts. Indeed it was understood
that any violent man might have his sanction for wholesale robbery provided he shared the spoil with the governor. Florus, in fact, became so involved in criminal practices that he dreaded punishment; and, with the view of concealing his own iniquities, he deliberately provoked the Jews to rebellion, in the hope that the report of his own wrong-doing would be silenced in the din of war. To this, more than to any other cause, the war in Judæa was due.

When Cestius Gallus, the imperial legate of Syria, came to Jerusalem a few days before the Passover, the three million people who then crowded the holy city appealed to him for protection. But Gallus was in league with Florus, and gave the Jews no relief. Florus, thus encouraged in his misgovernment, indulged in worse acts of oppression. He received a bribe of eight talents from a Jew of Caesarea to protect his countrymen from the Greeks; but he did absolutely nothing in return; and when complaint was made, he merely imprisoned the complainants. He next demanded seventeen talents from the Temple treasury; and when this was refused, he scourged and crucified a number of citizens of Jerusalem, amongst whom were several freemen of the first rank. In that one day he slew in all 3,600 Jews. Bernice was at the time in Jerusalem, and appealed to Florus to stay his hand; but the massacre continued under her own eyes; and, had she not taken refuge in flight, surrounded by her guards, she would have fallen herself.

Other massacres were perpetrated in all parts of Palestine. Twenty thousand Jews fell at Caesarea, 13,000 at Scythopolis, 50,000 at Alexandria, 10,000 at Damascus, and multitudes of others at Ptolemais, Ascalon, Joppa and elsewhere. The whole land was deluged with blood. The Jews retorted and laid waste a number of cities in Syria, Gaulonitis and Pææa. The carnage on both sides was appalling.

These were the signs of the coming troubles, of which the Lord Jesus Christ warned His disciples, when He beheld the
sun setting on the doomed city, on the Tuesday before the Crucifixion, "When ye shall hear of wars and tumults, be not terrified: for these things must needs come to pass first; but the end is not immediately" (S. Luke xxi. 9).

In the heathen world also, as Suetonius (Vesp. 5) observes, strange portents were being displayed—storms, comets, earthquakes, unnatural births, and other strange and marvellous phenomena. Josephus too is very explicit in enumerating similar prodigies. A comet, sword-shaped, blazed for a whole year in the sky. A great light, bright as the midday sun, shone at midnight around the altar and the Temple. The eastern gate of the inner court of the Temple, which was of such immense weight that it required the force of twenty men to close it, suddenly flew open in the night. A few days later, at sunset, chariots and troops of armed soldiers appeared in the sky encircling the fated city. At the Feast of Pentecost, as the priests went on duty to the Temple by night, they were terrified by the trembling of the earth, amidst which manifestation was heard the sound of a multitude as though in motion, and crying one to the other, "Let us remove hence." A prophet of woe appeared also in the person of Jesus the son of Ananus, four years before the war began, while still the City was in peace and security. For more than seven years, this man, heedless of scourging and imprisonment, cried aloud in Temple and in street, "A voice from the east! a voice from the west! a voice from the four winds! a voice against Jerusalem and the Temple! a voice against this whole people!" So he cried for all those years, "Woe! woe to Jerusalem!" and at last, "Woe! woe to myself!" as a stone from a balista struck him to the ground (Joseph., B. J. vi. 5, 3).

The doom of the Jewish nation was drawing every day nearer and nearer. The people seemed determined on their own destruction. They refused to pay the Roman tribute; they demolished the cloisters by which the troops quartered in the Castle of Antonia were able to command the Temple
and its courts; and they cast off every shred of allegiance to Florus.

Agrippa made two ineffectual attempts at pacifying the insurgents. Standing with his sister Bernice by his side, he assembled an immense number before the Xystus, and in a long harangue pointed out the impossibility of releasing themselves from the Roman yoke, and dwelt on the horrors of a hopeless war, and the imminent peril of losing their City and Temple, which hitherto the Romans had respected and protected. Agrippa's exhortations and tears produced but a transient effect. Shortly after, the infatuated populace assailed him with stones, and drove him from the City. He retired to his own kingdom and left the city and the people to their fate. Shortly afterwards he was still further alienated from the Jewish policy, when the Zealots gave battle to his army and burnt his palace to the ground. There were now, to the delight of Florus, (who was fomenting the insurrection by all means in his power), two parties in Jerusalem, arrayed against each other. The rebellion spread all over Palestine, and massacres became the order of the day, Greeks and Jews slaughtering each other wherever they met. It was a war of races. Even in Alexandria the Jews rose against the Greeks, but were most cruelly put down by Tiberius Alexander, one of themselves, and formerly procurator of Judæa. He set on foot a general slaughter. The houses were set on fire; the carnage was awful; and, at its close, 50,000 corpses encumbered the streets in the Jewish quarter.

Cestius Gallus

The revolt had gone beyond the power of Florus to quell, and Cestius Gallus, the legate of Syria, now appeared upon the scene. He marched into Palestine at the head of an army of 23,000 men; and after various operations at Ptolemais, Cæsarea, and Joppa, and other towns near the
coast, he advanced against Jerusalem, and fixed his camp on Scopos, the hill on the north of the city. Three days later he assaulted the outer wall, and drove the insurgents back. He led the army through the new suburb of Bezetha; and, if he had pressed the assault with vigour, he could have captured the city and brought the war to a close. But, whether through his own irresolution, or through the plots of Florus, who wished the war to continue, he drew off his troops. This afforded so great encouragement to the besieged that they flew upon the retreating army with such fury that the Romans abandoned their catapults and battering rams, and cast away everything that would hinder their flight. The Jews pursued the Roman army to Bethoron, and even to Antipatris, and before they returned in triumph, had slain nearly 6,000 men, and secured an immense booty. The Romans had not sustained so disastrous and disgraceful a defeat since the day when Varus lost his legions in the forests of Germany.

Vespasian

The news of this disaster reached the Emperor Nero during his progress through Greece. He pretended to treat the revolt with contempt; but, all the same, he had the good sense to estimate the gravity of the situation. His most distinguished general was selected; and to his hands the conduct of the war was committed. This was Vespasian. He was out of favour at this time, on account of his having fallen asleep during a musical recital at which Nero had been exercising his “divine voice” for the delectation of his admiring courtiers. But the occasion was urgent. The Emperor was reconciled to the general, and Vespasian was sent to Palestine.

With his usual promptitude Vespasian at once commissioned his son Titus to proceed to Alexandria, and to transfer the 5th and 10th legions from Egypt to Judæa. He himself went
overland to Syria. His plan of campaign was to march southwards from Antioch, capturing the towns on his way, and driving the whole population before him towards Jerusalem, like a flock of sheep, in the hope that scarcity of food would compel submission. This policy he carried out with relentless persistency, without haste, but without delay. He arrived in Palestine in the spring of A.D. 67.

Eleazar, the son of Simon, had now taken the lead at Jerusalem. He had possessed himself of Cestius's military chest and of the other spoils taken from the defeated Roman army: he had also seized the public treasury in the city. Thus he was amply supplied with the "sinews of war." He proceeded to appoint rulers and generals all over the country.

The chief command in Galilee was assigned to Flavius Josephus, the Jewish historian.

Josephus gives a long account of himself in his "Life," in which two striking coincidences with the New Testament may be noticed. He informs us that at the age of 14 he had become so expert in questions concerning the Law of Moses, that the high priests and nobles were accustomed to consult him on difficult points. This looks remarkably like what S. Luke records of our Lord (ii. 41–51). The other point of comparison is with the shipwreck of S. Paul. Josephus relates how, at the age of 26, when on a voyage to Rome, his ship foundered in the Adriatic with 600 on board, of whom 80 were picked up by another vessel and landed at Puteoli. Josephus appears to have acted with promptitude, and to have displayed considerable military genius. He speedily collected 100,000 men, whom he exercised and drilled after the manner of the Roman legions. His great exploit was the defence of Jotapata, in Upper Galilee, which gave an enormous amount of trouble to the Romans, absorbing the whole energies of a large army, under two of their ablest generals, Vespasian and Titus, for two months. During the siege Vespasian himself was wounded in the heel by a javelin. The narrative is
found in Josephus (B. J. iii. 7 and 8), and is of extreme interest, not only in itself as the story of a siege, but as giving a detailed description of the organisation of a Roman army, and of the various manoeuvres customary at a siege, as well as of the various military engines employed on such occasions. It is a story of thrilling interest, but too long to relate here. For forty-seven days the town defied the force of the besiegers, but was at length betrayed by a deserter. Josephus himself had disappeared. Long search was made for him in vain. He had found refuge in the shaft of a dry well from which a long cavern led off. In this place he lay hid for several days with forty of the leading citizens of Jotapata. The striking, tragic events in this hiding-place before his surrender to Vespasian are graphically told by himself (B. J. iii. 8). On coming into the presence of Vespasian, he announced himself as the messenger of Jehovah commissioned to foretell his elevation to empire. "Send me not to Nero," he exclaimed, "bind me, and keep me thyself, O Cæsar! for ere long thou shalt be sovereign lord of earth and sea, and of all the human race." Thus did he contrive to disarm the resentment of his conqueror, and procure for himself safety and honourable treatment.

After this, events marched with greater rapidity. Numerous sieges, assaults, captures of towns, and massacres of populations, followed each other with great rapidity. Joppa, Tiberias, Tarichea, Gamala, Gischala and other towns, chiefly in Galilee, fell one after the other; and the way was laid open for an advance upon Jerusalem.

Still, the actual siege of the City was delayed for some time. Events were hastening towards a crisis at Rome. The world was in rebellion against Nero; and one after the other "three military chieftains," as Suetonius styles them, assumed the purple. Vespasian, mindful of the prophecy of Josephus, kept these events in view, and held back his army, in case of its being needed in Rome. The army required some period
of repose after the many engagements in which it had taken part. And Jerusalem itself was hastening headlong to its own ruin, through the factions by which it was distracted. Vespasian was urged to strike the final blow: but he refused, for he judged it better to let the Jews tear each other to pieces, rather than to unite the factions in one by an assault from without. Presently the time arrived for which Vespasian had been waiting. Otho and Vitellius were contending for the sovereignty: and on the death of the latter, Vespasian was acknowledged at Rome, and hailed as Emperor by the whole world. Titus was left in command in Judæa, with orders to reduce Jerusalem.

These were the preliminaries to the siege of Jerusalem: this was the beginning of the end. "But the end is not immediately." These were the signs to which the Lord directed the attention of His disciples. During the maladministration of Albinus and Florus, the mutterings of discontent and rebellion spread from mouth to mouth. "Nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom." Josephus narrates the pitiful story of the slaughter of Jews by Greeks, by Syrians, by Egyptians, by Romans: he tells us also of "earthquakes" in Jerusalem, of the "famines and pestilences" which followed in the wake of the war; of "terrors and great signs from heaven." In his book we read of the party spirit which arrayed the various factions against each other, and of the animosity which led "parents, and brethren, and kinsfolk and friends" to betray one another, even to death. We read also of the "many false prophets" and false Messiahs that arose, and led many astray. Thus does the Jewish historian, with flowing pen, comment, so to say, upon our Lord’s prophecies, and with minute particularity show how they were fulfilled to the letter. And our own historian takes up the tale in the Acts of the Apostles, and relates the fulfilment of these other words of the Master, "Before all these things, they shall lay their hands on you, and shall persecute you,
delivering you up to the synagogues and prisons, bringing you before kings and governors for My name's sake." Almost every chapter in the Acts is a comment upon this wondrous prophecy. Well was it for the disciples of the Lord that they took heed to His warning, "Let them that are in Judea flee unto the mountains: and let them that are in the midst of her depart out; and let not them that are in the country enter therein: for these are days of vengeance." The Christian brethren found a safe refuge at Pella, beyond Jordan, confident in the Saviour's promise, "Not a hair of your head shall perish." But Josephus himself testifies against his own nation that no less than 250,000 Jews fell by the sword before the siege began, from the first massacre at Jerusalem by Florus to those who fell near the Jordan. Surely no more striking testimony than this could be given to the completeness with which the Lord's prediction was fulfilled, "Verily I say unto you, this generation shall not pass away, till all things be accomplished."

The Siege of Jerusalem

And now the end was at hand. It was in the month of April, in the year 70, that the actual siege began. The Passover was approaching, and the doomed City was crowded, not only by the devout from Palestine itself, but by pilgrims from distant countries, numbering in all, as Josephus estimates, no less than three million souls.

Vespasian had departed for Italy, and Titus was in sole command. Advancing from Egypt at the head of four legions, amongst which was the twelfth, burning to avenge the disgrace it had sustained under Cestius Gallus, he repaired to Cæsarea, where he had appointed to meet the allies. Then the march upon Jerusalem began. Through Samaria, and along the passes which led to the higher ground on which the City stood, a vast host of 80,000 legionaries and allies
slowly moved forward—first the auxiliary contingents contributed by the Syrian kings, then the engineers, the baggage, strongly guarded; then came Titus himself, surrounded by spearmen and cavalry. These were followed by the engines of war, and by the tribunes and commanders of the cohorts—the ensigns, the eagles, the trumpeters; the main body of the army, the camp attendants, and last of all the mercenaries. The camp was pitched at Gaboth Saul within four miles from Jerusalem, and on Scopus, less than a mile from the City (Jos., B. J. v. 2).

Then was "Jerusalem compassed with armies," and her desolation was at hand. Then did "they see the abomination of desolation standing where he ought not." Then was the last opportunity for flight for the disciples of the Lord (S. Matt. xxiv.; Mark xiii.; Luke xxi.).

It was the "day of vengeance." But the people were blind with fanaticism and mutual hatred. Three parties divided the City between them, each strongly fortified against the other and against the invading army. Eleazar, the son of Simon, had seized upon the Temple proper, within the Court of the Priests, and lay there with 2,400 of the Zealots. John of Gischala, with other Zealots, held the porticoes and cloisters of the Outer Court, with 6,000 men under his command. Simon, the son of Gioras, occupied the Upper City, with 15,000 men. John was between two fires, attacked from the north by Eleazar, and from the west by Simon.

The sacrifices continued to be offered in the Court of the Priests, though the pavements were slippery with human blood, and the worshippers were being momentarily struck down by the scorpions, the catapults, and the balistae, which never ceased discharging their death-dealing missiles: "for," says Josephus, "this internal sedition did not cease, even when the Romans were encamped near their very walls. They never suffered anything that was worse from the
Titus and Jerusalem

Romans than they made each other suffer, so that we may justly ascribe our misfortunes to our own people."

This siege by Titus was the most terrible that the City had ever sustained. It began at the end of March, A.D. 70, when the Roman camp was pitched on Scopus; and lasted for 143 days. The City was taken stage by stage; first the walls, then the Castle of Antonia, next the Temple, and finally the City itself.

The Walls

Without the loss of a moment Titus began at once to reconnoitre, followed by a detachment of 600 cavalry, and was unexpectedly surrounded by the enemy and nearly captured, to the delight of the insurgents who boasted amongst themselves that they had put Cæsar to flight. The main body of the besiegers was posted on the north-west by the lofty towers of Psephinus and Hippicus, at the distance of a quarter of a mile from the exterior wall, which Agrippa had recently built. The tenth legion encamped opposite the Mount of Olives, and thus the whole of the north of Jerusalem was commanded by the Romans.

Three walls protected Jerusalem—not surrounding the City, as though by concentric circles, but dividing it into four distinct districts. The new suburb of Bezetha lay to the north; the Lower City was protected by a second wall; while Mount Moriah and Mount Zion confronted each other across the Tyropœan Valley, each strongly fortified by walls and precipices. The whole circuit was about four miles in extent, enclosed by Agrippa's wall on the north, and by the ancient wall on the south.

The First Wall, reckoning from the outside as seen by the besiegers, was that of Agrippa. It was the last built, and enclosed the new suburb of Bezetha. It was of immense strength, founded on colossal blocks of stone, and would
have presented an impassable barrier to the invading army had it been completed as designed by Agrippa; but this had been prevented by order from Rome. It extended from the tower of Hippicus on the west, and after running northwards for a short distance to the tower of Psephinus, it turned abruptly to the east until it reached the Kedron Valley: thence due south till it joined the ancient wall of the Temple.

This wall was taken on the fifteenth day of the siege. The Roman soldiers had built lofty towers, from the summit of which they discharged various missiles which greatly disconcerted the defenders. And all the while the battering rams were kept at work, especially one which the Jews had surnamed "Nico the Victorious." At length it was determined to abandon this line of defence. The Jews retreated to the second wall, and the enemy, passing through the breach made by Nico, threw open the gates, and took possession of the extensive district known as Bezetha and the Camp of the Assyrians (Josephus, B. J. v. 7, 1–2).

The Second Wall now confronted them. It began at a point in the ancient wall by the gate of Gennath, between the towers of Mariamne and Phasael, which the elder Herod had built and named after his wife and his brother, and ran in an irregular north-easterly direction to the tower of Antonia.

This wall had to be taken twice. Titus captured it on the 20th day of the siege, and entered the Lower City. He magnanimously proclaimed his desire to spare the City, and gave orders not to burn the houses or to massacre the inhabitants. This was regarded as a sign of weakness; and the Jews, greatly encouraged, fell upon the Romans in the narrow streets of the City, and forced them beyond the wall. Four days afterwards the wall was taken for the second time.

The Third Wall, the ancient wall, enclosing Zion and Moriah, the City of David and the City of Solomon, now lay across the path of the besiegers. This wall, starting from the
tower of Hippicus, ran southwards and then eastwards along
the steep hill overlooking the Valley of Hinnom, to the village
of Siloam, where it turned due north till it came to the
Temple. Here it availed itself of the south and west walls of
the Temple, finally running due west across the Tyropean
valley and rejoining Hippicus.

Meanwhile the condition of the besieged within the Temple
and the Upper City was growing daily more terrible. Pesti-
ience and famine and mutual assassinations amongst the
fanatical parties were ravaging the City, and the streets were
choked with corpses. Outside the wall the Romans seized
upon all fugitives, and upon those unfortunates who wandered
forth in search of food, and crucified them by hundreds at a
time—in such multitudes, that, as Josephus observes (B. J. v.
11, 1) "room was wanting for the crosses, and crosses for the
bodies."

Thus retribution overtook those men who cried before
Pilate "Crucify Him! Crucify Him!" Their own impreca-
tion descended upon them—"His blood be upon us, and on
our children" (S. Matt. xxvii. 25). Then came upon them,
according to the Lord's solemn warning, "great tribulation,
such as hath not been from the beginning of the world until
now, no, nor ever shall be."

In spite of all the terrible sufferings endured within the
Temple precincts and the City at large—sufferings un-
precedented in the history of the world; in spite also of
the offers of mercy made by Titus, and repeated time after
time, the besieged persisted obstinately in their resistance, and
refused to give up one inch of ground.

Accordingly Titus convened a council of war, and after the
situation had been discussed, it was determined to surround
the whole City, and to starve out those who were holding it
against the besiegers. The whole army was employed in
digging a trench around the City. Then was fulfilled to the
letter the prophecy of the Lord, uttered with tears in His eyes,
when He beheld the City, "The days shall come upon thee, when thine enemies shall cast up a bank about thee, and compass thee round, and keep thee in on every side, and shall dash thee to the ground, and thy children within thee" (S. Luke xix. 43, 44). The "bank" (R.V.) or "trench" (A.V.) was the ἀρμόδιος: a military palisade or rampart, formed from the earth thrown out of the ditch, and set with sharp stakes. This military work was begun on the 44th day of the siege and was completed in three days. It began in the north, within the second wall; and, running eastward to the Kedron Valley, it turned south along the brook under the Mount of Olives, until it reached the village of Siloam. From this point it passed into the Valley of Hinnom, and kept first a westerly course and then due north until it reached the point from which it started, in the north-west by the "Camp of the Assyrians," where Titus had pitched his camp. This trench and bank, in fact, completely encircled the ancient wall of the City. It was nearly five miles in length, and was provided with thirteen towers for the accommodation of the besieging forces. All egress from the City was now cut off. The horrors of famine increased in intensity: and the fanatics who held the City and the Temple massacred all who proposed submission, and even put to death the High-Priest Matthias, and the surviving members of the Sanhedrin.

Antonia and the Temple

On the 5th of July the Castle of Antonia was captured, and the approaches thence to the Temple were levelled with the ground, in order to provide space for the military engines to attack the Temple. Meanwhile the famishing people within resorted to every horrible expedient to obtain anything that might serve for food. And Josephus relates how a wealthy woman named Mary, who had taken refuge in the city, and had been plundered by the fanatical bands who ruled
within, ruthlessly murdered her own child, dressed it for food, and consumed it.

The Romans were now in possession of the Court of the Gentiles, and the final assault was to be made on the Temple. Titus was greatly impressed with the splendour of the building, and gave orders for its preservation: but a lighted firebrand, recklessly cast by a soldier, caused a fire to burst forth, and presently amidst the confusion other blazing brands were flung about, and the whole edifice perished in the flames. The carnage was frightful, and all the courts were heaped up with slain. The whole Roman army entered into the sacred Court of the Temple, and ranged their standards in the Holy Place. "The abomination of desolation stood where it ought not." It was "standing in the Holy Place" (S. Mark xiii. 14; Matt. xxiv. 15). The plunder that fell to the victors was enormous: its value was incalculable. The whole Temple was overthrown, and the sorrowful prophecy of the Saviour was fulfilled with the strictest literality—"There shall not be left here one stone upon another that shall not be thrown down." This was on the 10th of August, A.D. 70.

The Upper City

Simon and John were still holding the Upper City, i.e. the City of David on Mount Zion, to the south-west of the Temple, overhanging the Tyropoean Valley. It was now the middle of August. The heat was intense, and the stench rising from the heaps of decomposing corpses in every street and house was spreading contagion in all directions. Meanwhile Acra and Ophel, situated respectively to the north and south of the Temple, were given over to pillage and the flames. On the 20th of August mounds were raised against the formidable defences of Zion at two spots; and by the 7th of September everything was ready for the assault. The valour and endurance of the insurgents was now broken.
down; and when an effective breach was made, they fled in every direction, and hurried to places of concealment.

John and Simon, after a vain attempt at escape, took refuge in the subterranean caverns, but presently both of them fell into the hands of the Romans. John of Gischala, pressed by hunger, surrendered. His life was spared, but he was condemned to perpetual imprisonment. Simon, son of Gioras, lay hid for a month, and then gave himself up. Titus ordered him to be reserved for his Triumph at Rome, when, according to custom, he was executed in the Forum.

Jerusalem was then levelled with the ground. All its impregnable fortifications were destroyed; and nothing was left standing except the three massive towers of Phasaelis, Mariamne, and Hippicus, which were reserved as a monument of the enormous strength of the defences beaten down by the might of Rome. There was also a small portion of the western wall left as a defence for the camp. The ruin of the City was complete; the Saviour's prophecy was fulfilled, "Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles." "Your house is left unto you desolate" (S. Luke xxii. 24; Matt. xxiii. 38).

The wretched captives were put to the sword till the soldiers were glutted with slaughter, and the stench from the corpses was insufferable. The rest were penned up in the Court of the Women, while a selection was made of such captives as, by their eminent position, or the beauty of their persons, were suitable to adorn the Conqueror's triumph. The rest were ruthlessly doomed to the mines, or reserved for sports in the arena, to be "butchered to make a Roman holiday." The destruction of the City and the Temple, and the ruin of the whole Jewish nation, were complete. It seemed, says Renan, as though the nation had appointed for itself "a rendezvous of extermination." If we can rely upon the calculations of Josephus, there perished 1,356,460 in all, viz.:
Numbers slain under Gessius Florus and Cestius Gallus 129,500
During the War in Galilee and Judæa under Vespasian 118,300
In Jerusalem itself 1,100,000
After the destruction of Jerusalem 8,660

1,356,460

Prisoners taken in Jerusalem 97,000
Other prisoners 4,700

1,458,160

These were indeed "days of vengeance," when the woes denounced against God's ancient people overtook them, when there was "great distress upon the land, and wrath unto this people. They shall fall" (said the Lord) "by the edge of the sword, and shall be led captive into all the nations" (S. Luke xxi. 22-24). Then for the second time were the vials of God's wrath poured forth on the devoted City; for the second time her people lamented: "Zion is a wilderness, Jerusalem a desolation. Our holy and our beautiful house, where our fathers praised Thee, is burned with fire; and all our pleasant things are laid waste" (Isa. lxiv. 10, 11).
CHAPTER XX

DOMITIAN AND PATMOS

Domitian, A.D. 81–96

Domitian was the brother of Titus, but of a character quite the reverse. No one would have thought of styling him "the delight of mankind" at any time of his life. His innate cruelty of disposition manifested itself from the very beginning. He was barely twenty years old when Vitellius was slain; but he seized upon the government in his father's name, and was guilty of atrocities in making the post secure. His father and brother were well aware of the faults of his character, but treated him with great magnanimity, though they felt it necessary to keep him as much as possible in the background.

His rule was signalised by reverses in the wars with Germany and Dacia; in spite of which he decreed himself a triumph, and assumed the title of "Dacicus." A successful war was waged against the Britons by Agricola, who was, however, summoned to Rome before the conquest was complete, the Emperor being jealous of his success.

The last three years of his reign were the worst. All the bad points in his character developed themselves to excess. He encouraged the informers, and reduced the delationes to a system. These delators were more dangerous than those of Tiberius's time, as being better educated, and moving in higher society. They were made the means of keeping the Prætorians in good humour by an increase of pay, and the people also by public games and donations, the funds for
which were obtained by the confiscation of the property of the wealthy, against whom the informers were always prepared with false accusations of high treason.

It was at this time also that the persecution of the Christians, known as the Second Persecution, broke out. Search was made for the descendants of David in Jerusalem; and two of the grandsons of S. Jude were apprehended and examined. But it was so obvious that they were men devoid of ambition—mere hard-working peasants, with rough hands—that they were acquitted of all blame. It was said also that S. John was summoned to Rome, and condemned to death by being cast into a cauldron of boiling oil, beside the Latin gate at Rome: but, like the three royal princes in Nebuchadnezzar's furnace, he escaped unscathed.

Domitian claimed also divine honours, and ordered worship to be offered him in his temples under the title of Dominus et Deus.

At length his extravagances and cruelties became intolerable, and a plot was arranged for his assassination, which was carried into effect in September, A.D. 96.

His reign was not wholly disastrous. He himself had some taste for literary pursuits, and he gave encouragement to poets, historians, and orators. His reign was adorned by such men as Tacitus, Pliny the younger, Quintilian, Statius, and Juvenal.

**Patmos**

S. John the Apostle appears in the earlier chapters of the Acts in connection with S. Peter, and was doubtless present at the Council of Jerusalem (Acts xv.). After this there is a long gap in his history, which can only be filled by tradition and conjecture. He probably remained in Jerusalem till "the days of vengeance" were at hand, when, at the head of the Christians, he fled to Pella. Afterwards we find him at Rome and at Ephesus. At Rome occurred the quasi-martyr-
dom in the boiling oil, followed after some uncertain interval by his residence at Patmos.

Two questions in regard to Patmos have been the subject of discussion—the date of his stay there, and the cause of it. Until the fourth century there was no question as to the date. The earlier writers—Irenæus, Eusebius, Tertullian—place it towards the close of the century, in the reign of Domitian. Later writers ascribe the banishment of the Apostle to Claudius or to Nero. And it is to the time of Nero that most modern authors assign the writing of the Apocalypse, and consequently the dwelling in Patmos.

It has also been supposed that his residence in Patmos was voluntary, that, in fact, he had retired thither for the purpose of receiving from above the vision of "the Word of God, and the testimony of Jesus."

Tertullian, however, speaks of him as having been banished to an island, after the Roman custom: "Relegatur ad insulam." Relegatio was the lighter form of banishment, and did not usually involve the loss of property. Deportatio, on the contrary, carried with it confiscation of property, unless the sentence excluded that penalty.

It is not necessary to assume that the relegation to Patmos was by the express sentence of Domitian; it would seem more likely that S. John was condemned by the magistrates of Ephesus, where he had for some years past fixed his residence, or by the proconsul of the province of Asia. He may have had the lighter sentence of relegation instead of death, through the influence of the enlightened officials, the Asiarchs, who had befriended S. Paul during the riot at Ephesus.

Eusebius, quoting from Irenæus (Iren. adv. Hær. v. 30, 3) assigns as the date of this punishment "the end of the Domitian government," πρὸς τῷ τέλει τῆς Δομετίανοῦ ἀρχῆς, an expression which has been understood of "Domitian Nero," though upon very slender reasons, Nero belonging
to the noble and ancient family of the Domitii; Eusebius continues that after the accession of Nerva, S. John returned to Ephesus, and lived there until the time of Trajan. If this statement be accepted, the banishment to Patmos would have taken place about A.D. 94, the release in 96, and the death of the Apostle some time after A.D. 98.

Patmos owes its fame solely to its connection with the Apocalypse. "It is one of those places," says Dean Stanley, "which present an entire blank for centuries, and then by one single incident acquire an absolutely universal celebrity."

The island of Patmos, unlike Pandataria, would not have been a suitable place of banishment for a dangerous political prisoner, as it was provided with an excellent harbour, and lay in the direct track of vessels sailing between the ports of Asia Minor and Greece. Escape thence would be easy. But it would serve the purpose of the magistrates in the case of an honourable man like the Apostle John.

It was but ten miles in length from north to south, and consisted of three solid masses of volcanic rock, united by narrow necks, and rising in its highest point to 800 feet. Its outline is remarkably complex; and "its rocky hills are broken into innumerable crags, its shore indented with innumerable bays." Dean Stanley, in his *Sermons in the East*, assumes that the physical features of this remarkable island suggested much of the imagery of the Apocalypse. He writes, "The stern, rugged barrenness of its broken promontories well suit the historical fact of the relegation of the condemned Christian to its shores, as of a convict to his prison. He stood on the heights of Patmos in the centre of a world of his own. The view from the topmost peak, or from any lofty elevation in the island, unfolds an unusual sweep, such as well became the Apocalypse, the *unveiling* of the future to the eyes of the solitary seer. Above, there was always the broad heaven of a Grecian sky, sometimes bright with its 'white cloud' (Rev. xiv. 14), sometimes torn with 'lightnings and thunder-
ings' and darkened by 'great hail,' or cheered with 'a rainbow like unto an emerald' (Rev. iv. 3; viii. 7; xi. 19; xvi. 21). Over the high tops of Samos and Naxos rise the mountains of Asia Minor, amongst which would lie to the north the circle of the seven churches to which his addresses were to be sent. Around him stood the mountains and islands of the Archipelago: 'every mountain and island shall be moved out of their places'; 'every island fled away, and the mountains were not found' (Rev. vi. 14; xvi. 20). When he looked around, above or below, the 'sea' would always occupy the foremost place. He saw 'the things that are in the heavens, and in the earth, and in the sea' (Rev. v. 13; x. 6; xiv. 7). The voices of heaven were like the sound of the waves beating on the shore, as 'the sound of many waters' (Rev. xiv. 2; xix. 6); 'the millstone was cast into the sea' (Rev. xviii. 21). The sea was to 'give up the dead which were in it' (Rev. xx. 13; cf. vii. 1-3; x. 2, 5, 8; xvi. 3).

S. John was the youngest of the Apostles, and he outlived them all. He survived until the end of the century. With him the Apostolic Age closes.

His eagle eye took in, with comprehensive gaze, the things which had been, as well as those which should surely come to pass. In his Gospel he is the historian of the past. In his Apocalypse he is the prophet of the future. He set down with ink and pen the noble life of Him who was at once both God and man; and, in his last words, he teaches mankind to look forward hopefully to the final triumph of good over evil, amidst the glories of the new heaven and the new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness.
CHAPTER XXI

LATINISMS IN THE GREEK NEW TESTAMENT

Bearing in mind the dominance of the Roman arms throughout the civilised world during the first century of the Christian Era, we should naturally expect that the language spoken by the conquerors would have produced a marked effect upon the languages of the various subject nations; and amongst them upon the Greek language: and we should naturally look for signs of this influence in the Greek of the New Testament. These signs are indeed to be found, but are not so obvious as might have been reasonably anticipated. Wherever Greek was spoken, as Cicero remarked, it held its own, and Latin was powerless to displace it. In fact, Greek may be said to have exerted a more powerful influence over Latin than Latin over Greek. “The Latin colouring of Greek,” says Winer, “is not very marked before the time of the Byzantine writers, even in translations of Latin authors.”

In the New Testament the influence of Latin is almost entirely confined to words and phrases: and these occur chiefly in the Gospels and Acts.

The Latin words in the N.T. are nearly all of them substantives, with the exception of the proper names, which are mostly adjectives; such as Augustus, Justus, Niger, Quartus, Secundus, and Tertius; also the substantives Aquila, Forum, and Taberna.

The substantives are usually the names of such things as had been brought from Italy, and which the provincials had found it convenient to adopt: such as the following:—

Military terms: centurio, custodia, flagellum, legio, praetorium, sicarius, speculator.
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Money, weights, and measures: denarius, as, mina, quadrans: libra, mille, modius, sextarius.

Articles of dress: linteum, pænula, semicinctium, sudarium. Also Census, colonia, libertinus, titulus.

Other words: macellum, membrana, rheda.

Latin Constructions

Besides these words (a complete list of which will be found on page 472), Winer and Blass, in their Grammars of the New Testament, have pointed out other Latinisms, which we have collected in the following list:

Latinising terminations to Greek patronymics, such as Ἡρωδιανός, Matt. xxii. 16, Mark iii. 6, xii. 13. Χριστιανός, Acts xi. 26, xxvi. 28, i Pet. iv. 16. These are instead of such forms as Ἰταλικός (Acts x. i.) or Ναζωραῖος (Matt. ii. 23, Acts ii. 22, xxiv. 5), and are formed on the model of Pompeiani or Caesariani.

In S. John we frequently find ἰδοὺ and even ὦ joined with a nominative, like ece and en in Latin.

Blass gives instances of adjectival predicates in the neuter singular, agreeing with a feminine subject, in imitation of the Latin satis: such as ἀρκετὸν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἡ κακία αὐτῆς, Matt. vi. 34; and ἰκανὸν τῷ τοιούτῳ ἡ ἐπτυμία αὐτῆς, 2 Cor. ii. 6. Compare also Luke xxii. 38, ἰδοὺ μάχαραι δὲ δῶ—ἰκανὸν ἐστιν. See also Matt. vi. 25, Luke xii. 23, Gal. vi. 3.

In S. Mark xv. 15, τῷ ὀχλῷ τὸ ἰκανὸν ποιήσας is equivalent to populo satisfacere.

Δαβύντες τὸ ἰκανόν, Acts xvii. 9, is a technical law-term, satisdatione accepta: see page 312—“having taken security or bail.”

The unclassical use of κελεύειν, with the passive infinitive and accusative, instead of the infinitive active, under the influence of the Latin jubere (the tense of the infinitive being usually the aorist). Examples are frequent, such as
Latinisms in the Greek New Testament 471

S. Matt. xviii. 25, ἐκέλευσεν αὐτὸν πραθῆναι—Acts xxv. 6, ἐκέλευσε τὸν Παύλον ἀχθῆναι, Jussit Paulum adduci—Acts xxiii. 3, κελεύεις με τύπτεσθαι; also Mark vi. 27.

S. Mark v. 23, ἐσχάτως ἔχειν, in extremis esse; a later phrase for ἄκακος or ποιηρῶς ἔχειν.

S. Matt. x. 19, δοθήσεται ὑμῖν τι λαλήσετε, quod dicatis.

S. Luke xvii. 8, ἐτοίμασον τί δειπνήσω, para quod (not quid) comedam; where a Greek writer would have employed ὅ τί, as in Acts ix. 6. The form is equivalent to our “what.” The same construction appears in S. Matt. xv. 32, and S. Mark vi. 36, τί φάγωσιν οὐκ ἔχουσιν. Non habent quid (or quid) comedant.

S. Matt. xii. 14, συμβούλιον ἔλαβον: consilium faciebant; cceperunt consilium.


S. Luke xiv. 18, ἔκει με παραγιμένον: habe me excusatam.

S. John xi. 18, ἀπὸ with a genitive, ὅς ἀπὸ σταδίων δεκατέντε: similar to Cesar, B. G. 2, 7, a millibus passuum duobus. (In Luke xxiv. 13, σταδίον is in the accusative).

S. John xii. 1, πρὸ ἐς ἡμερῶν τοῦ πάσχα: “six days before the Passover.” Similar to Ante diem tertium Calendas.

Rev. xv. 2, τὸς νικῶτας ἐκ τοῦ θηρίου. This expression, νικῶν ἐκ τινος, is a Latinism, like victoriam ferre ex aliquo (Liv. 8, 8).

It is sometimes asserted that these Latinisms occur more frequently in S. Mark than in the other Evangelists, on account of his Gospel having been written for the Romans: but an examination of our list of words and phrases will not bear out this assumption.

The word “Latin” is found only in S. Luke xxiii. 38, Ἐρομαϊκὸς γράμμασιν; and S. John xix. 20, Ἐρομαύτη.

Ἐρομαῖος appears in S. John xi. 48: Acts ii. 10, xvi. 21, etc.
LATIN WORDS

Ἀκύλας . Aquila . Acts xviii. 2, 18, 26; Rom. xvi. 3; 1 Cor. xvi. 19; 2 Tim. iv. 19.

Δηνάριον . denarius . Matt. xviii. 28, xx. 2, 9, 10, 13, 19; Mark vi. 37, xii. 15, xiv. 5; Luke vii. 41, x. 35, xx. 24; John vi. 7, xii. 5; Rev. vi. 6.

Ἰονίας . Justus . Acts i. 23, xviii. 7; Col. iv. 11.
Κεντυρίων . centurio . Mark xv. 39, 44, 45.
Κῆνσος . census . Matt. xvii. 25, xxii. 17, 19; Mark xii. 14.
Κοδράντης . quadrans . Matt. v. 26; Mark xii. 42.
Κοῦλαρος . Quartus . Rom. xvi. 23.
Κουστωδία . custodia . Matt. xxvii. 65, 66, xxviii. 11.
Λέγεων . legio . Matt. xxvi. 53; Mark v. 9, 15; Luke viii. 30.
Λύντιον . lintum . John xiii. 4, 5.
Μάκελλον . macellum . 1 Cor. x. 25.
Μεμβράνα . membrana . 2 Tim. iv. 13.
Μίλιον . mille . Matt. v. 41.
Μόδιος . modius . Matt. v. 15; Mark iv. 21; Luke xi. 33.
Σεστῆς . sextarius . Mark vii. 4, 8.
Πραιτόριον . pretorium . Matt. xxvii. 27; Mark xv. 16; John xviii. 28, 33, xix. 9; Acts xxiii. 35; Phil. i. 13.


Σπεκουλάτωρ . speculator . Mark vi. 27.
Ταβέρνη . taberna . Acts xxviii. 15.
Τέρτιος . Tertius . Rom. xvi. 22.
Φαινόμης . penula . 2 Tim. iv. 13.
Φαγέλλων . flagellum . Matt. xxvii. 26; Mark xv. 15; John ii. 15.
Φόρον . forum . Acts xxviii. 15.
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Æmilius Paulus, 90, 92
Æratium, 149, 58
Africa, 99
Agabus, 242, 345
Agmen, 355
'Agýrasos, 314
'Agriob, 146
Agrippa I., 133, 113, 328, 338
Agrippa II., 136, 113, 401, 450
Agrippina, 241, 411, 423
Ahenobarbus, 422
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Εὐγάθερος, 145, 153
Egypt, 101, 62

Egyptian assassin, 356, 111
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Flavian Emperors, 443
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Judges, 211, 386, 431
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— trium liberorum, 271
— vitae et necis, 183, 282
Kakwnis, 205
Kakwnis, 434
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Kefalaioun, 147, 171
Keramaelhē, 157
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Littere dimissoriae, 399
Aδθαρον, 235
Livia, 51, 142, 163
Locusta, 242
Λύγον, 354
Luke, 406
Luke's Greek, 39, 405
Lusitania, 98
Lycia, 89, 61
Lysanias, 131
Lysias, 335, 371
Maccabeus, 76
Macedonia, 90, 61
Machærus, 123, 127
Μάχαγα, 353, 180
Macro, 144, 351
Magic, 259
Majestas, 208, 437
Malchus, 180
Malichus, 115
Malthace, 112
Mandata, 36
Manetho, 103, 3
Maniple, 177
Manumission, 363
Manus, 266, 274
Marianne, 112, 116, 458
Marriage, 265
Marsus, 321
Mattathias, 76
Mauritania, 99, 242
Melita, 295
Mersari, 156
Messalina, 241, 366
Metellus, 92
Military colonies, 340, 57
Mina, 167
Minutæ majestatis, 209
Minutum, 165
Misenum, 410
Μλωνυς, 419
Mithridates, 71
Mnason, 326
Money-changers, 154
Moriah, 457
Mummius, 93, 302
Municipia, 303
Mustaceuni, 269
Myra, 90
Nabatæans, 317, 123, 127
Narcissus, 374
Nazarenes, 382
Nazarite vow, 328
Νεωκρος, 314
Nero, 422, 411, 437
Nico, 458
Nicomedes, 81, 87, 320
Nomen, 277
Nominis delatio, 204, 211, 380, 392,
430
Nominis receptio, 211, 377, 430
Νημψα, 158
Non liquet, 211, 386
Numidia, 99
Numismata, 158
Nummularius, 157
Obverse, 162
Octavia, 107, 49, 411
Octavianus, 47, 107
Οἰκήτης, 363
Οἰκονόμος, 315
Οἰκομενή, 36
 Onesiphorus, 434
Onias, 248
Ophel, 461
Orator forensis, 380
Orbi, 271
Otho, 442

Παγίδεω, 146
Παυδαγωγός, 283
Palestine, 75
Pallas, 374
Paludamentum, 232
Pamphylia, 89, 61
Pandataria, 51, 410
Pannonia, 95
Πανοσία, 352
Paphos, 251
Paranymphi, 269
Patara, 90
Paterfamilias, 273
Patmos, 466
Patria potestas, 274
Patronus, 379
Paul’s nephew, 370
Paul’s sister, 326
Pedanius Secundus, 362
Pella, 455
Per as et libram, 274
Perduellio, 208
Peregrinus, 361, 346, 365, 415, 417
Perga, 89
Pergamus, 80
Περικεφαλαία, 353
Persecution of Christians, 424, 465
Petronius, 111
Phasael, 115, 458
Φελόνιος, 439
Phenice, 60
Philip, 129, 159
Philippi, 91, 300, 308
Φωσ, 147
Φραγκόλωγος, 231
Phrygia, 88, 61
Pilate, 194, 160
Pirates, 83, 72, 85
Pliny, 82
Polemo, 263, 135, 321

Politarchs, 311
Pompey, 78, 71, 86, 106, 114, 165, 320
Pontarch, 81
Pontifex Maximus, 50, 163
Pontus, 81, 61
Poppae, 411, 423
Πορφύρος, 233
Portitores, 151
Portorium, 149
Postulatio, 211, 377, 439
Pounds (parable), 167, 121
Preco, 380
Prefectus Augustalis, 111
Prefectus Urbii, 438
Prejudicium, 182
Pretorian guards, 349, 58, 416, 428, 442
Pretorium, 202, 217, 429
Pretors (Philippi), 308
Πράκτωρ, 315
Prima Actio, 435
Princeps Peregrinorum, 346, 355, 415, 417
Princeps Senatus, 50
Proconsuls, 55, 252
Procurator, 188, 190, 447
Prodigies, 449
Professio, 37
Πρώτη, 39, 301, 324
Πρώτη διοδογυία, 435
Πρώτος, 307
Πρώτος, 295
Province, 52
Provinces, 60, 65
Provocatio, 396
Psaphinus, 457
Ptolemaeus Apion, 53, 101, 320
Ptolemy I, etc., 103
Ptolemy Philadelphus, 247
Publicani, 151
Publius, 296
Pupillus, 284
Puteoli, 409
Python, 258

Quadrant, 165
Quadrius, 374
Quaesitor, 377
Questor, 58, 189
Questio, 210, 377, 430
Questiones perpetue, 210, 397, 430
Quaternio, 355
Quirinius, 19

'Ραβδονυξος, 309, 57
Rationarium, 25
Re-cognitio cause, 188, 206
Registration, 33
Re-incognita, 359
Relatio, 399, 403
Relegatio, 389, 466
Religio licita, 246, 382
Remand, 386
Rescripta, 36
'Ρυγων, 380
Retribution, 238, 459
Reus, 383
Rex amicus, 30, 320
Rex socius, 30, 319
Riot in Temple, 330, 358
'Ρομαίος, 471
Rome, 326, 368, 399
'Ρομφαία, 354
Rufus, 160

Sacra privata, 278, 275
Salamis, 251
Salome, 128, 130
Salve, 372
Samaria, 60
Sampsigeranus, 321
Sanhedrin, 174, 183, 376
Satisdatio, 312
Saul and Paul, 253
Scaurus, 74
Scopos, 451, 456
Scourging, 230, 359
Scythia, 61, 63
Sejanus, 351, 144, 163, 195, 249
Seleucidae, 70
Seleucus Nicator, 67
Sella curulis, 379
Senatorial provinces, 293, 54
Seneca, 290
Sergius Paulus, 253
Sestertius, 166
Shekel, 167, 170
Sicarii, 356, 390
Sicily, 95, 52
Siege of Jerusalem, 455
Silver, 171
Simon of Cyrene, 100
Simon Magus, 258, 388

Simon son of Gioras, 456, 462
Slave, 361
Societas, 150
Sosthenes, 289
Spain, 96, 62
Speculator, 347, 124
Σειρα, 176
Sponsalia, 267
Star of Magi, 14
Stater, 167
Status, 361, 279
Status permutatio, 278
Stipendium, 149, 58
Στραγγύα (temple), 178, 332
Στραγγύα (Philippi), 301, 308
Στρατευματα, 222
Στρατουμενοι, 221, 347
Stratopedarch, 346, 355, 415
Subscriptio, 211, 380
Subsellia, 379
Sui juris, 275
Συμβωλον, 396
Superstition, 257
Sword, 180
Syracuse, 95, 62
Syria, 65, 61
Syrian legates, 72, 27
Syrophenician, 75, 60

Talent, 168
Tarsus, 85, 107, 303, 366
Tarracnonensis, 98
Taurus, 84, 66
Taxing, 21
Τελώνη, 148, 151
Τελῶνον, 148
Τέλος, 148
Temple, building, 9
Temple courts, 331
Temple guard, 178, 332
Temple prefect, 177
Tertullus, 379
Tetrarchs, 294
Θήκη, 181, 354
Thessalonica, 310, 91, 303
Θωραξ, 353
Three Taverns, 413
Θυρεός, 353
Tiberias, 123, 146
Tiberius, 142, 44, 160, 162
Tiberius Alexander, 450
Tiberius's fiftteenth year, 12