THE

CLASSICAL JOURNAL.

N°. XIX.

SEPTEMBER, 1814.

CONJECTURES
ON THE CHRONOLOGY
OF THE
TRAVELS OF ST. PAUL.

Founded on the opinion of the BISHOP OF ST. DAVID'S, *that Felix was recalled in the year* 56.

THE opinion that St. Paul preached in Great Britain is grounded on the probability that Felix, the brother of Pallas, was recalled by Nero soon after his accession to the empire. Whoever peruses the account given by Tacitus of the first years of this emperor, cannot doubt, that, as soon as he suspected Agrippina of aiming at his subversion, he would take the best measures for self-preservation. Now it is clear, that, before the end of the 2nd year of his reign, suspicions of a very serious nature had arisen. These were certainly not without foundation. Therefore he removed from all places of trust and power his mother's friends. Felix was then governor of Judæa, and that with a powerful army; not only because such an army was necessary for the control of a province so turbulent, but, favored by Claudius, he was appointed with unusual powers, as the words of Suetonius seem to hint. Nero hesitated not at the murder of Britannicus: he could not scruple to remove the brother of Pallas, the peculiar favorite of Agrippina, from a place of such importance; an act of common prudence, which the most moderate governor would have done. That Felix was removed under circumstances of disgrace, and that his last efforts were to conciliate the Jews, the observation of

St. Luke proves. To please the Jews he left Paul, whom he deemed innocent, in close confinement. That, therefore, Felix was recalled about the end of the second year of Nero, none can doubt, unless we doubt that he was a tyrant. The greatest latitude which can be given, is, that this event did not take place until the next year; but this supposition will not materially alter the following calculations. Let it then be assumed that this event took place in Nero's second year, A. D. 56. Then St. Paul was seized at Jerusalem in the summer of 54, and his journies, with the dates of his epistles, must be regulated according to that epoch. There is indeed another date which may be ascertained with some degree of accuracy, the famine that prevailed in the time of Claudius. This is said to have happened in the year 42 by some chronologists, by others in 44; both probably are right; since it appears from Suetonius to have been of some continuance: "Provisions being scarce on account of the continued sterility of the earth," ob assiduas sterilitates. Suet in Vit. Claud. Chap. 18. This scarcity, therefore, being foretold, and coming on gradually, contributions would be sent to Jerusalem before the poor Christians there were severely affected by it. Hence we may conclude that they were carried to Jerusalem before the winter of 42. We have now two dates, 42 and 54. Between these took place the council at Jerusalem; the time of which may be ascertained from St. Paul's account of his travels in the epistle to the Galatians, where he says, that three years after his conversion he went to Jerusalem for 15 days, and saw Peter and James. "Then again after 14 years, I went to Jerusalem," to the council, as appears from what follows. Now here arises the question, whether these three years are part of the 14, or to be added to them. St. Paul's conversion could not have taken place before A. D. 34. From thence to 54, are 20 years, take 17 away, i. e. 14 + 3, and there are left only 3 years between the council and the arrest of St. Paul. But St. Luke's account of his travels during that interval renders this computation impossible. For in that period he is recorded to have travelled over Macedonia, Epirus, Illyricum, and Greece, staying 18 months at Corinth, and 2 years at Ephesus. Therefore the 3 years must be contained in the 14, which leaves 6 years for the travels of St. Paul after the council, and it must have been held in 48. From these dates the travels of the apostle may be arranged with some degree of probability. The chief difficulty lies in accounting for what Luke has omitted, his visit to Crete, and his acquaintance with Titus. The name of this early bishop is never given by St. Luke. But we learn from St. Paul's epistles, that he went with the apostle to Jerusalem, when he carried thither the contributions in 42, and from the epistle to himself, that the apostle left him in Crete. We find too from the last chapter

of that epistle, that Apollos was then in Crete, or very shortly expected there; and that the apostle intended to winter at Nicopolis. Now Apollos was not known to the church until after St Paul's visit to Jerusalem, subsequent to the council in 48, as appears from Acts 18th and 19th. Hence this epistle must have been written after the riot at Ephesus. As St. Paul went thence into Macedonia, and there met Titus returning from Corinth, see ii. Cor. ch. 7th, it follows that this epistle could not have been written during that excursion, and consequently not before St. Paul's first imprisonment, as he could not have gone to Crete and returned into Greece during that interval. Nicopolis was a name common to many cities. There were three in the circle of St. Paul's travels, one in Bithynia, one in Cilicia ad Issum, and the other in Epirus, opposite Actium, and built in memory of the victory off that place, and is thus noticed by Tacitus, lib. 5, ad finem. "Poppæus Sabinus . . . .dein Corinthense littus angustiasque Isthmi evadit, marique alio Nicopolim Romanam Coloniam ingressus ibi demum cognoscit. . . . nempe Pseudo-Drusum." Titus being in Crete, he could visit Nicopolis ad Issum, or Nicopolis Epirus with equal ease. It appears from the 2nd epistle to Timothy, which is allowed to have been written by St. Paul during his second imprisonment, that he was attended to Rome by Demas Crescens, Titus, Luke, and Tychicus, see ch. iv. 10, 11, and 12, and that Tychicus was with St. Paul when he wrote to Titus, whom he was to send for the purpose of fetching Titus. Hence at Nicopolis, Tychicus, Titus and the apostle would meet together. There is, therefore, a certain degree of probability that they continued with him until his arrival at Rome, whence Titus returned to Dalmatia, and from thence, perhaps, went southward to Crete.

This will render it probable that St. Paul's visit to Crete was a little while previous to his last imprisonment. With respect to Apollos, it is probable that he was an Ægyptian, since he could scarcely have been an inhabitant of Alexandria in the Sinus Issicus, which lies between Tarsus and Antioch, without being more completely acquainted with Christianity than he was. The Jews of Alexandria in Ægypt were all Hellenists, as is well known, and such Apollos seems to have been. Again it may be observed, that, when the epistle to the Romans was written, Aquila and Priscilla had returned to that city, see ver. 3, ch. xvi. Hence as they were banished by Claudius, their return must have been about the time of his death, and therefore this epistle written later than commentators usually imagine; most probably during St. Paul's last journey to Jerusalem. For it by no means follows that it was written at Corinth, because carried to Rome by an inhabitant of Cenchrea. Phœbe might have sailed from Asia Minor: the same, or similar business, calling her thither as to Rome. The

place, therefore, where it was written is uncertain. But the fact of Aquila and Priscilla being then at Rome marks the time pretty accurately; it may be added that St. Paul would scarcely have promised very long before-hand to come to Rome, without so doing. This will appear more probable from a comparison of his travels with their dates. And as he certainly visited Jerusalem five times after his conversion, as he set out from thence, and there ended his travels, we will make the intervals of these visits the different epochs of his life. This hypothesis and mode of arrangement will be found, it is hoped, as free from difficulty as any yet produced.

First interval, from A. D. 34 to 37.

St. Paul leaves Jerusalem for Damascus, converted on the road —Arabia—Damascus, escapes in a basket—Jerusalem, stays there 15 days, and sees Peter and James. This account we have from the epistle to the Galatians, and it requires no corroboration.

Second interval, from A. D. 37 to 42.

Jerusalem—Cæsarea—Tarsus, and other parts of Syria—Cilicia —Jerusalem, in the time of the famine. See Acts ix, and the epistle to the Galatians.

We have no further materials to fill up these five years. Nor is it necessary to suppose that St. Paul did not leave Asia Minor during the above period; on the contrary, as Titus, a native of Crete, accompanied St. Paul to Jerusalem with the contributions, it is at least probable, that St. Paul visited Crete for the first time about this period.

Third interval, from A. D. 42 to 48.

Jerusalem—Syria—Seleucia—sails to Cyprus—returns to Pamphylia—Lycaonia—stays a long time at Iconium—Attalia—Antioch—Jerusalem, to the council.

The time the apostle remained at Jerusalem and its neighbourhood is unknown, but six years will not be deemed too much for the conversion of these provinces of Asia Minor, together with the island of Cyprus. Nor do we here deny the probability of other excursions, not recorded in the scriptures.

Fourth interval, from A. D. 48 to 50.

Jerusalem—Syria—Cilicia—Lycaonia—Galatia—Mysia—Troas, leaves Asia for Europe—Samothracia—Macedonia, one week, Acts xvi.—Thessalonica, three weeks, Acts xvii.—Berœa, a short time—Athens, a short time—Corinth, 18 months—sails to Ephesus, leaves Aquila and Priscilla there—Cæsarea—Jerusalem, to keep the passover. See Acts xviii, ver. 22.

Soon after St. Paul left Ephesus, Apollos came there. So that his conversion may be dated A. D. 50.

Fifth interval, from A. D. 50 to 54.

Jerusalem—Antioch—Phrygia—Galatia—Ephesus, near two years, driven out by Demetrius about Pentecost, I. Cor. xvi. ver. 8. 52. Macedonia—Greece—Macedonia—Philippi, in April; see Acts xx. ver. 6.—Sails to Troas, 7 days—Assos—Mitylene—Samos—Miletus, where the Ephesian clergy meet him—Coos—Rhodes—Patara—Tyre, 7 days—Ptolemais—Cæsarea—Jerusalem by the day of Pentecost.

He was therefore six weeks in coasting from Philippi to Cæsarea.

Our next attempt must be to try whether this arrangement will coincide with the probable time of writing the epistles. These then will be found to admit of the following dates. It appears that the first epistle to the Thessalonians was written from Corinth, see chap. iii. vv. 1 to 6. This point is generally agreed, and therefore, from the above date of the apostle's travels, this must have been in A. D. 49. The second epistle was written some time after the first, and from the same place, we may therefore place it in 50. The first to Timothy was also written from Corinth, and must of course be dated during St. Paul's long visit to that city, 49. The epistle to the Galatians is usually placed first, which seems erroneous, on the following account. It was evidently written after the council, because that is referred to, therefore it must have been written after St. Paul visited them returning from the council, the decrees of which were delivered to them, but these they *soon* disregarded. "I marvel that ye are so soon removed &c." Allowing, therefore, a reasonable time for this perversion, and for its coming to the knowledge of the apostle, we cannot place this epistle earlier than the end of 50. It does not appear from what city, but if the above date be accurate, St. Paul was then at Corinth. The first to the Corinthians was certainly written from Ephesus, as we learn from chap. xvi, and therefore it must have been during the apostle's long abode there from 50 to 52; say then 51. The second epistle was written some time after the first, in consequence of the report made by Titus of the effects which the first had on the Corinthians, see chap. ii. It is likely, therefore, to have been written from Macedonia, about the year 53. From what has already been said concerning the epistle to the Romans, its date must be fixed in the year 54, somewhat previous to the arrival of the apostle at Jerusalem. The epistles to the Ephesians, Philippians, and Colossians, were written from Rome during St. Paul's imprisonment, perhaps about A. D. 37; that to Philemon, being evidently the last, and

on the point of liberation, may be dated 58. Of the other epistles to Timothy and Titus, it is clear from the first chapter of the 1st to Timothy, compared with Acts, chap. xx. ver. 4, that the first was written from Corinth, and therefore about A. D. 49, as already observed. The 2nd epistle to Timothy was undoubtedly written during the apostle's last imprisonment, and therefore in the year 68. And as it would seem from what has been already noticed, that the epistle to Titus was written some time previous to this imprisonment, and that Titus accompanied St. Paul to Rome on that occasion, we may place it in A. D. 67. Now the learned Bishop of St. David's has satisfactorily shown that the apostle visited Britain. But from the epistle to Philemon it would appear, that it was not immediately after his first imprisonment. It is indeed most probable, that after his liberation, the apostle would visit the churches which he had first planted, and confirm them in the faith, that then he would perform his intention of visiting Spain, from whence he would easily obtain a passage to Britain, even if he did not pass through Gaul to Portus Iccius. For of those who doubt his arrival here, none dispute his visiting Spain; and as we are certain that this was not done previous to his first imprisonment, we have only to compute at what time afterwards. But if we are right in the conclusion drawn from the second epistle to Timothy, and that to Titus, that St. Paul's last travels were a repetition of his first, and that Titus accompanied him to Rome from Nicopolis Epiri, or ad Issum, we may conjecture that after his return from Britain, he visited the east, and Europe. On these grounds we may place his journey to this island in the year 60; and as it is probable that his stay here was short, there will be left full six years for his journey in the east, and return from thence.

To this scheme one objection presents itself, namely, that St. Paul's conversion could not be so early as 34. But if it were a year or two later, this will alter only the length of the interval between his conversion and the famine, and throw the date of the council so many years back. It might be also urged, that as the intention of Nero to recal Felix could not be instantly executed, we may defer that date one year, and the dates of the epistles would admit of a similar adjustment, none being dependent on a fixed era. For even the famine raging two years at least would allow of St. Paul's coming to Jerusalem in 43 or 44 with the contributions: this too would shorten the interval between the apostle's liberation from his first imprisonment and his martyrdom. But all this would affect the whole plan in so trifling a degree, as to render no single date improbable. Besides, as the time of the apostle's conversion must be a matter of conjecture, that conjecture, which produces an harmonious system of dates, must be more probable, than one which is irreconcileable with any.

* * *

HEBREW CRITICISM.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL.

YOUR correspondent T. Y. justly observes, "that to read the Hebrew text of the Old Testament with ease and intelligibility requires long initiation in any form:" he adds, "but especially without the reading points." This I most readily grant him to be equally just as to *ease* in reading, but the *intelligibility* of the Masoretic reading is a point very far from being so clear. The *Reader*, undoubtedly, is not very much *obstructed* in the understanding of what he reads by the points, because, although they very frequently *quiescate* several of the letters, yet he sees what these quiescent letters are, and is at little difficulty in discerning the root. Very different, however, is the case with the *hearer*—there may be a ע, an א, a ה, a ו, or a י, which he hears nothing about, and which may most materially affect the meaning of the word;—a prefix or a postfix alters the complexion most effectually—so that for a person to be enabled to understand Hebrew by hearing it read masoretically, it would indeed require a very "long initiation;" and after all his labor, he would be initiated into a harsh, guttural, and unpleasant language, in every respect, with innumerable trifling rules about pronunciation, which serve only to incumber and deform it. T. Y.'s plan is certainly superior in many respects, but in the following pages I submit one for your consideration, which, if you think proper to lay before your readers, is likewise "respectfully at your service."

One of the great disadvantages attending the reading Hebrew as it is at present done, either with or without the points, is the confusion of the root by mixing it in the pronunciation so much with the affixes, (unless when it is the simple root itself), that one has very little chance of being guided to the root by hearing the word pronounced; and even upon *seeing* it, the difficulty is increased by the syllables being so run one into another, a prefix joined to the first letter of the root, &c. The inconvenience of the quiescent letters to a hearer, and even to a reader, who is apt to forget that they have any thing to do with the word when he does not sound them, has already been stated. These inconveniences might, in a great measure, be removed by attending to the following rules:—

1st. Instead of any of the Hebrew letters being quiescent, which seems to be so incompatible with the simplicity of a primitive language, let every letter have a full and perfect sound. What these sounds ought probably to be, we shall afterwards consider.

2d. Every consonant in a word (excepting perhaps some post-fixes, &c. such as תי, &c.) to have a short vowel sound following it—without which, indeed, it cannot be pronounced, but also not to be varied even in the case of a *vowel* following it.

3d. The pronunciation of the word not to be altered by the addition of any letters—these affixes to be pronounced distinct from the original word.

As to the first rule we have laid down, very few observations are necessary. It must readily occur to every one, that leaving letters unarticulated seems to be very distant from the ideas of simplicity we naturally attach to the parent language. There are not many different opinions, I believe, about the articulation of most of the characters in this alphabet—it is concerning א, ה, ו, י, ע, by some considered vowels, and by others consonants, that there is the greatest difference of opinion; nor is it likely that the learned can ever nearly agree concerning these. It is not my intention to take up your time with any lengthened disquisition on them, which would answer no good purpose; but to state, that, from the Greek characters given by the LXX. for them, as well as a variety of other reasons, א might with propriety be pronounced as the English A, although a little varied, sometimes approaching Æ very nearly, and sometimes the French A.—ה as H, with a short vowel following, generally A, often Æ.—ו as oo in English, in *wood, good,* &c.; but when forming part of the root, as V or W, with a vowel sound following it, which will be found to be the same as if a vowel followed the oo pronunciation—*wau* and *ooau* differ but very inconsiderably, as I or EE English, generally with a vowel, as A, following, which will give it exactly the sound of Y, and when very strongly pronounced, J. At the end or middle of words, when it is no part of the root, to lose the other vowel. I shall trouble you with only two or three examples from the LXX. favoring these hypotheses—הין, Hëin, not Hin—דביר Dabëir—קנז Keooz (easily shortened into Kooz)—ימם contracted for ימים yamëim or jamëim—אלי Eloi. As to the much contested sound of ע, I could produce innumerable instances (principally proper names, which may be supposed to have been more widely known than any others,) in which the Masorites have placed the sound of Hholem *near* this letter, although not immediately upon it, as if they had been afraid to expunge it altogether—such as פרעה, which they point thus, פָּרְעֹה Phare*oh*, which has a near resemblance to, certainly the proper method, *Phurōah*.—ירבעם Jeroboam—בועז Boaz, &c. &c.—עולם Gnolam for Oülam—שמעַ Shemoang for Shemao, &c.—as also a number of examples, such as עלות, עבד, עמר, &c. in which they give it its proper sound; and, as from our own language we know, that

there is no letter we are more liable to aspirate than O, at the beginning of words, we may readily suppose they might aspirate, perhaps strongly, some of them, for instance, Gomorrah, Homer, or as the LXX. have it, *ΓΟΜΟΡ*.

The second rule I have laid down is justified by very many instances, in which the Masorites have followed it, as well as the LXX. from whom I have given a few examples above, in proof of the sound of the vowels, and which also corroborate this. That they (the Masorites, at least) did not *generally* follow it, is no proof that the system is incorrect, it only shows how the language had been corrupted by the period in which they lived.

But I have still one proof to bring forward in favor of their suppositions, and I venture to assert, the *only proof*, that, in a case of this kind, can be at all relied upon with any degree of certainty, that is, the application of it to the HEBREW POETRY.

That many parts of the Sacred Books are poetical, no one will, I presume, attempt to deny; but, certainly, when read by either of the plans at present in use, with or without the points, they have neither the *sound* nor the *measure* of poetry. That we can ever attain the true ancient pronunciation, and therefore the full beauties of the language, is undoubtedly a vain hope; but, however far the following specimens may be from the *sound*, it must appear evident, that by this plan the *metre* has been *nearly* attained: at least, that those parts of Scripture, which to the eye have the appearance, and from the subjects and style, have these two essential qualities, of poetry in an eminent degree, by this method of reading, are found to have a very essential part of poetry likewise, —*metre*.

Moses' Song, Deuteronomy 32 Chap. Verses 1, 2, & 3.

Masoretically.		Without the Points.	
האזינו השמים ואדברה		האזינו השמים ואדברה	verses of 14 ft.
Haasinu hashamaim veadabberah	13	Ha-asëïnu hashamaim vaadabarah	
ותשמע הארץ אמרי-פי		וישמע הארץ אמרי-פי	
Vetishma haaretz imre phi	9	Vetheshamaō ha-aretz amarëï phai	
יערף כמטר לקחי		יערף כמטר לקחי	
Iaaroph kammatar likchi	8	Yaōroph ke-matar lekohi	9
תזל כטל אמרתי		תזל כטל אמרתי	
Tizzal kattal imrathi	7	Thizal ki-tal amarathai	
כשעירם עלי דשא		כשעירם עלי דשא	
Kisheōirim ōlei deshea		Kisheōirim ōlei deshea	11
וכרביבים עלי עשב		וכרביבים עלי עשב	
Vekirbibim ale-eseb	8	Ve-ki-rebëïbim ōlei ōsheb	
כי שם יהוה אקרא		כי שם יהוה אקרא	
Ki shem Jehovah ekra	7	Kai shem Jehovah ækarea	10
הבו גדל לאלהינו		הבו גדל לאלהינו	
Habu godel lelohenu	8	Habu gadol lo-elohëïnu	

Moses' Song, Exodus, Chap. xv. *Verses* 1, 2, 3, 4, 5.

אשירה ליהוה כי־גאה גאה
סוס ורכבו רמה בים
עזי וזמרת יה ויהי־לי לישועה
זה אלי ואנוהו
אלהי אבי וארממנהו
יהוה איש מלחמה יהוה שמו
מרכבת פרעה וחילו ירה בים
ומבחר שלשיו טבעו בים־סוף

Ashëïrah la-Jehovah kai goœah goœah	16
Sous verocabu ramah be-yom	10
Ozi vezimarath jah vajehi li leisuōah	16
Zeah Eloi ve-anavehu	10
Elohei Abei ve-aromamenehu	14
Jehovah aish milehamah Jehovah sheimu	
Merecaboth Phareōah veheïlu jarah beyom	16
Umibehar thalishëïu tubaōu beyom-suph	

The Song of Deborah and Barak, Judges, Chap. v. *Ver.* 1, 2, 3, 4.

בפרע פרעות בישראל
בהתנדב עם ברכו יהוה
שמעו מלכים האזינו רזנים
אנכי ליהוה אנכי אשירה
אזמר ליהוה אלהי ישראל
יהוה בצאתך משעיר
בצעדך משדה אדום
ארץ רעשה גם־שמים נטפו

Bepheraō pheraōuth be-ishar-el	12
Behithnadab ōm baracau Jehovah	
Shimeōu melakim ha-azinu rozenim	14
Anoki la-jehovah anoki asheïrah	
Azamer la jehovah elohei ishar-el	
Jehovah betzeatheka misheōir	12
Bezaodeka meshedeah ædeum	
Arez raōshah gam thamaim nataphu.	

One of the Songs of David, as in 2 Samuel, Chap. xxii. *Ver.* 2 & 3.

יהוה סלעי ומצדתי ומפלטי־לי
אלהי צורי אחסה־בו
מגני וקרן ישעימשגבי ומנוסי
משעי מחמס תשעני

Jehovah salaoi umazadthi umephalati lei	18
Elohei zuri æhezah bou	11
Magani vekaren isheōi meshagabi umenusi	18
Mesheōi mehamas thesheōni.	11