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FORWARD

It is the position of the writer that the imprisonment epistles of Paul were written by the apostle some time during his three year stay in Ephesus. Though this view is comparatively new and has few adherents among New Testament students, yet in recent years it has been gaining more and more consideration and appreciation among those who critically study the situation.

The credit for espousing this conclusion in modern times goes to H. Lisco, of Berlin. In 1900 in his book Vincula Sanctorum, he developed the thesis that Colossians, Philemon, Ephesians and Philippians were produced in an imprisonment of Paul at Ephesus. His arguments were often fanciful, exaggerated and insufficient to establish his case; but he opened an avenue of thought worth investigating further. Professor Adolf Deissmann of Berlin needs also to be mentioned in this connection. Before Lisco published his conclusion, Deissmann had been interested in such an hypothesis. He assigned all four epistles to Ephesus, giving his views in Light from the Ancient East, Paul, and Anatolian
Studies. Since then various men have offered their contributions, as M. Albertz (1910), P. Feine (1916), W. Michaelis (1925), H. Appel, and M. Goguel. No systematic work on this subject has been attempted by American scholars, and none by English scholars, with the exception of George S. Duncan in his book *St. Paul's Ephesian Ministry*, published in 1930. Since 1910, however, several Americans have ventured articles on this subject in various journals, as the *Journal of Biblical Literature, Expositor, Bibliotheca Sacra*, and *American Journal of Theology*. All those who advocate an Ephesian imprisonment of Paul are not agreed that all four epistles originated at Ephesus. Some assign one to this city, some a few, and others all.

I acknowledge my deep indebtedness to George S. Duncan in my preparation for this thesis. It was his book *St. Paul's Ephesian Ministry* that furnished me much material used in this study, and suggested my method of approach and of handling the subject.

Much that has been written from this viewpoint cannot be obtained in our libraries for study.
INTRODUCTION

Of the Pauline letters, Philippians, Colossians, Ephesians and Philemon are commonly known as the imprisonment epistles, since on their own testimony they were written from prison. With these four letters we are particularly concerned in this study.

According to the usually accepted traditional view, these epistles of Paul were written from Rome when the apostle was a prisoner in that city. This position the majority of New Testament scholars have held. Those who have dissented from this view have usually settled upon one of two other cities. One group has maintained that these letters were written from Caesarea, where Paul lay imprisoned for two years (Acts 24:27). Quite recently a small number of scholars, as H. Lisco, Adolf Deissmann, W. Michaelis and George S. Duncan, have concluded that they were written at Ephesus. Thus there seems to be no unanimity of opinion among New Testament scholars regarding this problem.

However, the question as to the place of composition of these imprisonment epistles is, for the church historian or Bible student, important enough to
command considerable attention. Any solution cannot help but effect one's whole conception of the missionary activity of Paul. If they were not written in Rome, then much of our New Testament history as usually conceived is faulty, Paul's literary activity will require rearrangement, and theories concerning the pastoral epistles will demand readjustment.

In view of the importance of our problem, and lack of agreement among scholars as to its correct solution, this study is undertaken to weigh the evidence for and against the cities heretofore mentioned as being probable places of authorship. A plausible answer to this question is our primary concern.

Our method of approach is primarily a historical one. In forming our conclusions we appeal to the facts as we know them, the historical situations involved, and probable inferences drawn from them. The basic sources for our data are the four epistles under consideration, namely, Philippians, Colossians, Ephesians and Philemon; although we have occasion to refer to the Corinthian Epistles, Romans, Acts of the Apostles and Paul's letters to Timothy. From these we hope to secure sufficient information for our study. External evidence, however, is introduced as addition-
al support for conclusions already reached.

For the sake of clearness, it might be well to state that the Pauline authorship and the genuineness of the imprisonment epistles are accepted for our present study. To discuss evidence both internal and external for the Pauline authorship of these letters would require a whole volume in itself.

We might state also, that arguments from style are discarded as being insufficient and misleading as bases for deductions. The same individual's style may change, depending upon the purpose he pursues, his mood at the time of writing, or the subject with which he deals. In case of an epistle, the people addressed necessarily effect the content of the letter. This, Deissmann emphasized repeatedly, asserting that the style and language of any particular letter depends entirely upon the epistolary situation, and that these factors are in most cases governed by the local situation of the person or persons addressed. Bacon was likewise equally emphatic upon the precariousness of basing the relative date of an epistle upon mere resemblances of style. Present day scholar-

ship has a tendency to discount arguments based upon similarity of style. Therefore, in the succeeding discussion, such reasoning will be passed over.

Arguments derived from theories of doctrinal development are also dismissed as being inadequate. Perhaps this may seem unfair and unscholarly to some, but a new Christology in an epistle does not necessarily prove that it is of late authorship. Neither does a developed or intricate theology portray a church long established. There is no single path of thought over which every progressive thinker must pass, nor cut and dried mould of doctrine through which all churches must be squeezed from infancy to maturity. All churches do not face the same local problems. Even though churches are established at the same time and face similar questions, it is not imperative that they face the same issue at the same time. Whether or not the church is located on a highway or is secluded in a byway, the type of leadership, the background of the people, social conditions—all bear upon the thought-life of a church. A new emphasis upon some phase of Christian teaching in a Pauline epistle does not, therefore, indicate that Paul wrote this late in life. Though his messages differ in thought and complexity, they are easily explained by
the historical circumstances of the people addressed.

"When will criticism learn to appreciate the elementary fact that Paul wrote his letters, not primarily to systematize his latest views on theology, but rather to deal in a living way with certain practical issues in his various churches? And while these issues naturally differed in each case and demanded from him a different method of treatment, his own theology was far deeper and fuller than at any one time he cared to express."

The city of Caesarea, as mentioned above, has been held by some students to be the place where Paul wrote his imprisonment epistles. In our study we pass over the arguments favoring this place as not being important and serious enough for lengthy consideration. It might be well, however, to set forth briefly some reasons why Caesarea has thus so early and quickly been discarded.

Several arguments have been proposed in support of Caesarea, chiefly centering around the fact Paul was in prison there (Acts 23-26), the location of this city, and difficulties presented in assigning the letters to so late an authorship as that of the apostle's Roman imprisonment. Among those who accept this view in regard to Colossians, Philemon and Ephesians (if genuine) are the following: Schultz, Schott, Wiggers, Laurent, Reuss, Meyer, Weiss, Schenkel, Hilgenfeld, Hausrath, Kernkel, Pfleiderer, Lipsius,

Haupt, Feine, Clemen, Sabatier and Rackham. Thiersch, Bottger, Paulus, Spitta, Holtzmann and Macpherson assigned only Philippians to Caesarea. In spite of the weight given this theory by these scholars, those who oppose seem to have the larger following. In recent times this position has largely been abandoned.

"As between Caesarea and Rome, the balance of probability is very strongly in favor of Rome, as was demonstrated long ago by H.J. Holtzmann, after carefully weighing all the data. And for Rome the majority of students decide."¹

Among the many arguments against the Caesarean supposition, the following are a few. First, the conditions of Paul's Caesarean imprisonment were quite different from the one depicted in the epistles. While being conducted hither from Jerusalem, a military guard protected his life from those who sought secretly to murder him. At Caesarea the apostle was treated with kindness and consideration (Acts 24:22); to him his friends had free access. There was no fear of a death sentence being pronounced upon him (Acts 26:31,32). Largely because of anxiety from enforced idleness did he finally appeal his case to Caesar (Acts 25:10,11). But when Paul wrote the epistles, he was experiencing great tribulation and was held

in bonds; friends were imprisoned with him; and he despised of life itself, feeling that his end was near.

Second, omitting his defense speeches, Paul did no preaching at Caesarea so far as we know. Nor did he send out others from this city to proclaim the gospel. He was an apostle to the Gentiles, and there were too many Jews in Caesarea for this to be evangelistic territory for him. If Paul ever engaged in evangelism here, there is no single hint anywhere concerning it. But wherever the four epistles were composed, the apostle was engaged in an active evangelistic campaign; young evangelists were being sent to churches in Asia, some carrying messages from Paul.

Third, when the apostle wrote Philemon, Ephesians, Colossians and Philippians several companions and helpers were with him, such as Timothy, Epaphras,

2. Eph. 6:22; Phil. 4:21; Col. 4:3,10,11; Philemon 23.
5. Eph. 6:22; Phil. 1:12,13; 2:25; Col. 1:7,28; 4:3,10,11; Philemon 10.
6. Eph. 6:21; Phil. 2:19,20,23; Col. 4:8-10, 16; Philemon 12.
7. Phil. 1:1; 2:25; Philemon 1,23,24,10; Col. 1:1; 4:10, 12,14,7,9,11; Eph. 6:21.
Mark, Aristarchus, Demas, Luke, Onesimus, Justus, Epaphroditus and Tychicus. Excepting Luke and Aristarchus (Acts 27:1,2), we have no evidence that these men were ever in Caesarea on any occasion.

Fourth, a runaway Colossian slave would not have been likely to go to the small town of Caesarea in order to escape detection, as Onesimus must have done if this hypothesis were correct (Philemon). If he were wanting to lose himself from his master, would he not have gone to a large city, as Ephesus, Antioch or Rome?

Fifth, at Caesarea Paul's face was turned toward Rome; this capital city of the empire he hoped to make his next field of evangelistic endeavor. He had completed his work in Asia (Acts 20:25-32); for years he had desired to visit Rome (Romans 15:22-24). In Jerusalem he received assurance from God that his desire would now be fulfilled (Acts 23:11). "Be of good cheer, Paul: for as thou hast testified of me in Jerusalem, so must thou bear witness also at Rome." According to Philemon (22) the apostle intended to visit Phrygia upon being released. This he would not have done after his imprisonment at Caesarea.

Sixth, in all probability if Paul had written letters from Caesarea, he would have enjoined
greetings from Philip the evangelist, in whose home he had dwelt on his last journey to Jerusalem (Acts 21:9). Nowhere in his letters is Philip ever mentioned.

Though these reasons are not intended to be complete and exhaustive, they furnish sufficient ground to show why Caesarea is rejected. They point, therefore, to another prison experience of Paul as being the time when he wrote the letters we are considering. Two other likely places, mentioned above, remain—Ephesus and Rome. To these cities we devote our entire attention in the succeeding study. Which of these two cities is the most probable place of composition of Philippians, Colossians, Philemon and Ephesians? This is the question we seek to answer. In securing our answer, we study first the four epistles individually and from this analysis form the background out of which they came; second, we examine arguments for and against a Roman authorship, observing how these fit into our picture first formulated; third, we consider in like manner reasons for and against an Ephesian authorship.
PART I

BACKGROUND OUT OF WHICH THE FOUR IMPRISONMENT EPISTLES Came AS RECONSTRUCTED FROM AN INDIVIDUAL ANALYSIS OF THE EPISTLES
Before we can intelligently discuss arguments for or against Rome and Ephesus as being the place of composition of the imprisonment epistles, it is imperative that we understand the historical setting out of which these letters were produced. This is doubly necessary since our study is essentially a historical one. Consequently, we turn our attention to an individual analysis of these epistles. From what we learn we hope to reconstruct the background of Philippians, Colossians, Ephesians, and Philemon. Though we cannot expect this setting to be complete in detail, we feel it will be sufficiently correct and reliable as a foundation upon which to base conclusions.

Chapter I
Historical Analysis of the Epistle to the Philippians

We consider now the epistle to the Philippians, and note some interesting facts concerning it. First, it was written to the church at Philippi (Phil. 1:1), the first church which Paul established in
Europe. Though it was not in Asia, it was in a neighboring province, and according to Acts was in the midst of his activities in the East.

Second, Timothy was present with Paul (1:1). He is referred to as "a son with the father, he hath served with me in the gospel" (2:22).

Third, Paul was in prison and in bonds. Repeatedly he alluded to this fact: εν τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου (1:7); τοὺς δεσμοὺς μου φανερῶς γένεθαι (1:13); πεποίηται τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου (1:14); τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου (1:17). So frequently he mentioned his chains, one would suppose the whole situation was becoming unbearable to the apostle.

 Fourth, not only was Paul a prisoner, but his condition was becoming quite serious and grave. He desired to send Timothy to Philippi (2:19), yet he hesitated. The outcome of his pending trial was dubious; it might not be favorable. So he wrote: "Him therefore I hope to send presently, as soon as I shall see how it will go with me" (2:23). He thanked the Philippians for their courtesy during his affliction (διὰ ψυχῆς 4:14), using the same term already employed in his letter to the Ephesians (Eph. 3:13). The situation was so tense, the apostle suggested that he might be put to death: "Yea, and if
I be offered upon the sacrifice and service of your faith, I joy, and rejoice with you all" (2:17). He even reached the stage that he wished to die, to "depart, and to be with Christ" (1:23). These are strange words from such a devoted apostle as Paul! Surely his condition was not normal; but he was troubled, in misery, faced with death. The picture of death was before him continuously. He determined that "Christ shall be magnified in my body, whether it be by life, or by death" (1:20). Nevertheless, as he was needed by the churches, he felt confident that he would "abide and continue" with them for their "Furtherance and joy of faith" (1:24,25).

Fifth, recently the church at Philippi had sent aid of some sort to the apostle, presumably financial help and also an assistant, Epaphroditus. Paul praised this deed, declaring "both in my bonds, and in the defense and confirmation of the gospel, ye all are partakers of my grace" (1:7). This church had sent him gifts previously. Epaphroditus, a Macedonian, brought this offering and it proved sufficient for Paul's present needs. "But I have all, and abound: I am full, having received of Epaphroditus the things which were sent from you, an odor of a sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable, well pleasing to God" (4:16-18).
There is another reference to this offering in "he that administered to my wants" (2:25).

Sixth, Paul’s imprisonment had reacted favorably to the propagation of the gospel of Christ. The apostle declared: "But I would ye should understand, brethren, that the things which happened unto me have fallen out rather unto the furtherance of the gospel; so that my bonds in Christ are manifested in all the palace, and in all other places" (1:12, 13). Although he was incarcerated, yet his evangelistic zeal had not been abated.

Seventh, there did not seem to be the best of harmony existing among all the Christians in the city where Paul lay bound. Apparently two factions had developed. "Some indeed preach Christ even of envy and strife; and some also of good will: the one preach Christ of contention, not sincerely, supposing to add affliction to my bonds; but the other of love, knowing that I am set for the defense of the gospel" (1:15-17). Even he possessed some enemies among the brethren, some of whom were rather unchristian in conduct, attempting to increase his suffering, to tantalize him. The church was having its troubles. Nevertheless, Christ was preached, and in that Paul rejoiced (1:18,19).
Eighth, Paul intended to revisit the church at Philippi and very soon if possible (1:26; 2:24).

Nineth, the church at Philippi was suffering either from internal dissension or from the presence of destructive enemies, perhaps the Jews. Paul exhorted them to "stand fast in one spirit, with one mind striving together for the faith of the gospel; and in nothing terrified by your adversaries" (1:27, 28). Later verses help clarify the situation; the apostle referred to those of the circumcision, justifying our suspicion that the trouble-makers were Hebrews. "Beware of dogs, beware of evil workers, beware of the concision. For we are the circumcision, which worship God in the spirit, and rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh" (3:2,3). We conclude that Judaizers were attempting to introduce their ideas, thereby working havoc and creating division in the Philippian church. But this was not all. "Be likeminded, having the same love, being of one accord of one mind" (2:2). "Let nothing be done through strife or vainglory" (2:3). "Do all things without murmurings and disputings" (2:14) "All seek their own, not the things which are Jesus Christ's" (2:21). "I beseech Euodias, and beseech Syntyche, that they be of the same mind in the Lord" (4:2).
Such was the trouble at Philippi.

Tenth, as the condition of the Philippian church was not the best, so Paul, being anxious concerning its welfare, proposed to send Timothy to Philippi shortly. Among other things, Timothy would inquire concerning its state and report this to Paul, and "naturally care for your state" (2:19,20). Reference has been made to this event before. "Him therefore I hope to send presently, as soon as I shall see how it will go with me" (2:23).

Eleventh, the messenger from Philippi, Epaphroditus, had just departed for his native city (2:25, 28). Paul mentioned him as "my brother, and companion in labour, and fellowsoldier, but your messenger, and he that ministered to my wants." Because of illness, "For indeed he was sick nigh unto death" (2:27, 20), the apostle thought it best that Epaphroditus return home. By this time he had recovered.

Twelfth, words spoken in the second chapter in regard to Epaphroditus lead us to conclude that Paul's prison was not far from Philippi. News that this messenger had become dangerously ill had some way traveled to his friends back home, causing them much grief (2:26,27). Their knowledge of his ill health and their reaction regarding it was carried back to
Epaphroditus. All this occurred in presumably a short time, for the context leads us to believe such concerning this whole procedure. The distance therefore between Philippi and Paul's prison would necessarily be short.

Thirteenth, several friends were with Paul during this imprisonment. Timothy and Epaphroditus we have already mentioned. Whether or not some of his companions were prisoners with him, we do not definitely know. All of which we are positive is: "The brethren which are with me greet you" (4:21). Surely he alluded to those in his own evangelistic group. Their number is uncertain.

Fourteenth, "they that are of Caesar's household" sent special salutations (4:22). Just who were included in this household and where it probably was might prove important in locating Paul's prison.

Fifteenth, Paul also spoke of "the palace" or praetorium. "My bonds in Christ are manifest in all the palace" (1:13). Where he was in prison we do not know, but it was either in or connected with a palace.

Last of all, during this period of Paul's life he was engaged in much preaching and evangelization. Timothy undoubtedly was preaching, as he usually did, if he were not in prison with Paul. The statement "as a son with the father, he hath served with me
in the gospel" is proof enough of this. Paul intend- ed to send him on a preaching and inspection journey to Philippi (2:19-23). Epaphroditus, his "companion in labour" (2:25), had evidently planned to remain with the apostle for some time, but his serious illness changed his plans. Paul would have had no need for this "fellowsoldier" if he were not actively engaged in a missionary program. Others were with him also (4:21), surely for similar reasons. Paul's un- abating zeal was demonstrated by this epistle to the Philippians. Though now in prison, he continued his work, preaching to those in the praetorium (1:13), securing converts even among "they that are of Caesar's household" (4:21). His bonds had given additional impetus toward spreading the gospel (1:12). We can- not doubt but that Paul was in the midst of a cam- paign for Christ.

With this we close our examination of this epistle and turn our attention to that of the Colossians.
Chapter II
Historical Analysis of the Epistle
to the Colossians

Upon searching through the epistle to the Colossians, we notice several items of special concern. First, this epistle was written to the church at Colossae (1:2), a city in southeastern Asia, over a hundred miles east of Ephesus, near Laodicea.

Second, Timothy was with Paul on this occasion, just as he had been when the latter composed the epistle to the Philippians (1:1).

Third, some one other than Paul had evangelized Colossae (1:8,9), as the apostle had "heard of your faith in Christ Jesus, and of the love which ye have to all the saints" (1:4). It is probable that Epaphras was the missionary who had founded the church there. Referring to the fact that they had received the gospel, Paul stated: "As ye also learned of Epaphras our dear fellowservant, who is for you a faithful minister of Christ" (1:7). Epaphras was no doubt one of Paul's evangelists. His field was eastern Asia, which he worked under the apostle's supervision. Now he had returned to his master to report his success; it was this report which moved Paul to
write this letter. Not only did Epaphras minister at Colossae, but also at Laodicea and Hierapolis (4:12, 13), and most likely founded the churches there also.

Fourth, a few passages indicate that the church at Colossae had been organized recently (1:4-6, 9-12); this church was young and needed shepherding. For its instruction and development Paul sent this message.

Fifth, as was the case when Paul wrote Philippians and Ephesians, so now he was likewise in prison. He mentioned his condition alluding to the "mystery of Christ, for which I am also in bonds" (6εσχατέρευς 4:3). Before closing his letter he again reminded them of his bonds, saying: "Remember my bonds" (μνεύ τῶν δοσιμάτων 4:18). His language leads us to judge that his incarceration had been and still was quite severe. We would not expect the apostle to pour out his troubled soul to strangers as he would to his friends unless he was suffering intensely. Rather would his words to strangers be more for their own spiritual upbuilding. Though in Philippians he rejoiced in preaching to those in the palace, now he rejoiced "in my sufferings for you" (1:24), and prayed "that God would open unto us a door of utterance, to speak the mystery of Christ" (4:3). Again, he de-
sired that they "knew what great conflict (δυσμός) I have for you" (2:1).

Sixth, wherever Paul was when he wrote this epistle, he had several companions in his party sharing his evangelistic labors. Whom did he include in "we" when he said: "Whom we preach" (1:28)? No doubt he included several. The door of utterance he wanted to be opened to "us" (4:3). We know that at least one of his fellow-workers was in prison with him, Aristarchus (4:10), and perhaps also Mark and Justus (4:10,11), who were present and were called "my fellow-workers". Timothy was with the apostle (1:1); Tychicus (4:7) and Onesimus (4:9) had been or will were. Perhaps the last two named were the messengers who carried this letter to the Colossians, as Onesimus, the slave, was being returned to his master (Philemon) who lived at Colossae. Demas and Luke were also with this group (4:14).

Seventh, Paul had never visited nor consequently seen the churches at Colossae and Laodicea. This he frankly confessed. "For I would that ye knew what great conflict I have for you, and for them at Laodicea, and for as many as have not seen my face in the flesh" (2:1). This adds another reason to our supposition that the Colossian church had been founded
recently. Judging from the keen interest he showed for them in the second chapter, Paul would have visited that church by this time if such were not the case.

Eighth, though in all probability Epaphras was the founder of the church at Colossae, yet Paul exercised the general oversight of this church. If the apostle needed its minister elsewhere and recalled him, another was sent to care for the church in his stead. Thus Tychicus was dispatched to "know your estate, and comfort your hearts" (4:8), along with Onesimus, whose home was in Colossae. These two men were instructed "to make known unto you all things which are done here" (4:9). Paul also planned to send Mark to Colossae shortly (4:10).

Ninth, judging from the frequent communication passing between Paul and these churches in eastern Asia, we conclude that his prison was not far from Colossae. Evangelists in person reported their successes to their leader. This surely was a frequent occurrence. He in turn assigned them to new fields of service. He sent letters for Christian instruction and development to churches just organized, and issued new plans at will (4:10). Such close communication must presuppose that the apostle was located at some place near by, where access to him was easily obtainable.
Tenth, Paul had recently written a letter to the church at Laodicea (4:16), probably after he had been thrown into prison. He requested that the Colossians exchange epistles with the Laodicean brethren, each receiving double benefit thereby. If certain of our suppositions be correct in the discussion of the epistle to Ephesians, probably Paul alluded to the letter known to us as "Ephesians".

Eleventh, we must not close this section of our study without noting the active evangelistic atmosphere of this epistle. Missionaries were sent out; reports were received; workers were assigned to new tasks; supervision of churches was exercised; messengers were traveling to and from Paul; letters were written to churches; a large group of Christian assistants were with the apostle; exhortation was sent to workers out upon the field (4:17). What does all this mean? It can mean but one thing—a great evangelistic campaign was being conducted in the province where Paul was held prisoner. And now, even though Paul has been thrown into chains, yet from his cell, whenever he could, he still directed this great, perhaps province-wide, conquest for Christ. In fact it was the success of the apostle's program that brought about his arrest and incarceration, judging from his
own utterance; he was in bonds for speaking "the mystery of Christ" (4:3).

This concludes our examination of the epistle to the Colossians.
Chapter III
Historical Analysis of the Epistle to the Ephesians

The epistle to the Ephesians offers us several items of importance. First of all, it was addressed to "the saints which are at Ephesus" (1:1). The problem of this epistle's destination, however, is worth discussing, since several scholars have doubted that ἐν Ἐφεσῳ was in the original document. In two of the best and earliest Greek manuscripts, X and B, the words "in Ephesus" are lacking in the first verse. The most scholarly investigator of the New Testament in the early church, namely Origen, did not know these words, and found it difficult to explain "the saints who are". Jerome, two centuries later, cited the reading "in Ephesus" as a conjecture of some scholars who wished to make sense of the verse. Basil confessed that the most ancient manuscripts known to him omitted these words. Marcion, who lived in the middle of the second century, gave to the epistle the title "to the Laodiceans", but why he did this we do not know. It may have been a conjecture based on Colossians 4:16, but proves that his text did not contain "in Ephesus" in the first verse. Many scholars,
therefore, reject Ephesus as the city to which this epistle was sent, feeling that the original manuscript did not contain the phrase "in Ephesus". Among these are E.W. Bacon, G.S. Duncan, W.J. Conybeare, J. S. Howson, James Moffatt and Holtzmann. Others, as C.T. Wood and David Smith, hold that Ephesians was an encyclical sent to several or all of the churches in the province of Asia.

Likewise the internal evidence of the epistle leads us to doubt Ephesus as being the city of its destination. We read: "Wherefore I also, after I heard of your faith in the Lord Jesus, and love unto all the saints, cease not to give thanks for you, making mention of you in my prayers" (1:15,16). Other verses strike a similar note: "If ye have heard of the dispensation of the grace of God which is given me to youward: how that by revelation he made known unto me the mystery" (3:2,3). These statements inform us that Paul was addressing people whose conversion he knew only by report, and they were acquainted with him and his apostleship only by hearsay. If this be true, the letter could not have been written to Ephesus. Paul knew about the faith of the church there, not by report, but because he had established it. When Paul first entered Ephesus (Acts 19:19), there was no church
in the city, nor were there any Christian converts, so far as we know. Because of the absence of a church, the apostle preached first in the Jewish synagogue; and the Ephesians first heard the gospel from Paul. It is true that he left Aquila and Priscila behind in charge of the work while he proceeded to Jerusalem (Acts 18:18-21); but Paul first planted the church in Ephesus. It was not his habit to "build upon another man's foundation" (Rom. 15:20).

Again the people concerned are described exclusively as Gentiles\(^1\) and from all indication recently converted.\(^2\) Such could not truthfully apply to the Ephesian people.

The absence of a single message of personal greeting strongly confirms our doubts concerning the destination of Ephesians. Paul spent a long time in Ephesus (Acts 19:10), and acquired many intimate friends, yet nothing personal appears in this letter. This composition is also very general in content, not dealing with topical allusions. It is more of a treatise, adapted for strangers. We conclude, the phrase \(\epsilon\nu \ Ε\phi\epsilon\sigma\nu\) is an interpolation and this epistle was addressed to a church elsewhere than at Ephesus.

---

Since it is certain that Paul wrote a letter to the church of the Laodiceans (Col. 4:16), it might be convenient and clarifying to identify Ephesians with that letter. Any decision we make concerning this question, however, will not alter the general conclusions of this study.

Our second observation has already been suggested, namely, that this epistle was written to a church with which the apostle was not yet personally acquainted (1:15,16; 3:1-4).

Third, Paul was a prisoner somewhere at this time (3:1; 4:1). He was not only in prison, but also in chains (ἐν Ἀγριάριοι 6:20).

Fourth, in 3:13 we are informed that something accompanied the prison experience—ταῦτα ὑπέρ σοι. "I desire that ye faint not at my tribulations for you." This is the plural of ὕπερ, meaning pressure, affliction, tribulation. That all they included we are left uninformed, but if they were impressive enough to mention, his tribulations must have been quite severe.

Fifth, Tychicus was the messenger who carried this letter to its destination (6:21), and made known unto those concerned Paul's "affairs" and "all things". Tychicus was characterized as "a beloved brother and faithful minister in the Lord".
Sixth, without supposing too much, it seems that Paul was not confined alone, but had several comrades as company. Regarding Tychicus he wrote: "Whom I have sent unto you for the same purpose, that ye might know our affairs" (6:22). Whom did he include in "our"?

Seventh, the above information leads us to another conclusion. If others were with Paul, either in or out of jail, there must be some reason for their presence. Might it not be that Paul was engaged in quite an extensive campaign of evangelism? Whenever an opportunity appeared, Paul preached. From what we know about the apostle's personal characteristics, none in his company ever remained idle. This epistle is proof of the missionary atmosphere surrounding Paul. At the same time he dispatched Tychicus, who was referred to as "a beloved brother, and a faithful minister and fellow servant in the Lord" (Col. 4:7), as a messenger on a preaching mission (6:22). This assistant also carried the letter to the Colossians (Col. 4:7,8), perhaps on the same trip.

Eighth, there is a noticeable absence of personal greetings, such as we find in the other three epistles of our study. With this we conclude our examination of the epistle to the Ephesians.
Chapter IV
Historical Analysis of the Epistle
to Philemon

Thus far we have examined three of Paul's imprisonment epistles. We turn our attention, therefore, to the fourth, namely, Philemon. An analysis of this writing shows a setting very similar to those already observed.

First, Paul was a prisoner (v.1). This condition he mentioned several times (v.9,23), emphasizing it by references to his chains (v.10,13).

Second, Timothy was present (v.1). This fact we have noted already in the epistles to Colossians and Philippians (Col. 1:1; Phil. 1:1). Timothy might have been a prisoner along with the apostle, though the words in Philemon do not necessarily support such a conclusion.

Third, Paul was in prison as a result of his preaching, for he declared he was "a prisoner of Jesus Christ" (v.1).

Fourth, this epistle, unlike the other three, is a personal letter to one Philemon (v.1). Philemon was the owner of a slave, Onesimus, who had run away from his master to the city where Paul was
The apostle now returned the slave with this message to his master (v.12). We have learned that Onesimus was one of the Colossians (Col. 4:9). From this we conclude that Philemon, the master, was a citizen of that city. He and Paul were acquainted personally, for Philemon was a convert of Paul (v.19). Since the apostle had never visited Colossae (Col. 2:1), Philemon's conversion probably occurred while he on some occasion was visiting Ephesus, a city in which Paul preached for several years (Acts 19:10). Owning slaves, he must have possessed considerable wealth, and such men, especially business men, commonly traveled widely. This is the more reasonable in view of the fact that Ephesus at that time was the capital of the province of Asia. Since his conversion, Philemon had become an active Christian, for Paul addressed him as "our dearly beloved, and fellow-labourer" (v.1). In addition Paul complemented him highly, saying: "For we have great joy and consolation in thy love, because the bowels of the saints are refreshed by thee, brother" (v.7). So zealous was this man that he had formed a church in his own house (v.2). If there were only one church in Colossae, it met in Philemon's house.

Fifth, this letter was written on behalf of

Onesimus, the slave, for Paul pleaded: "I beseech thee for my son Onesimus, whom I have begotten in my bonds" (v.10). Though we are ignorant of the details involved, Onesimus had fled from Colossae and taken refuge in the same city where Paul was imprisoned. Here in prison the apostle converted this slave to Christianity. Just how these two met is not known. Perhaps some of Paul's helpers had found him and brought him to the apostle. Nevertheless after his conversion Onesimus was willing to return home. Paul interceded on his behalf, and sent him back to Philemon, not as a slave but as a beloved brother. For any wrong that he had executed against his master Paul promised to rectify (v.16).

Sixth, Paul was acquainted with other Christians at Colossae besides Philemon. For instance he sent greetings to "Apphia and Archippus our fellow-soldier" (v.2). We know nothing about Apphia, but undoubtedly the Archippus addressed here was the same Archippus to whom Paul sent the following exhortation in Col. 4:17: "Take heed to the ministry which thou hast received in the Lord, that thou fulfill it". This furnishes additional proof that the epistles of Philemon and Colossians were sent to the same city, and also that the church to which Colossians was written was the
one which met in Philemon's house, since Archippus is mentioned in connection with both groups.

Seventh, the apostle referred to himself as being "Paul, the aged" (παῦλος ἀλληλον v.9). This of course raises quite a question. Just how are we to translate the Greek word παῦλος ἀλληλον? If we give it the ordinary meaning, the King James version is correct in translating it "aged". Our conclusion then is that Paul was an old man during this imprisonment. On the other hand, if Paul spoke to Philemon as an elder or presbyter, as the word can also be translated, then this word gives us no aid as to what period the letter was written.

Eighth, as it has been suggested that the epistles to Philemon and the Colossians were sent to the same city, likewise it is quite certain that they were written and sent at the same time. Onesimus returned with this letter (v.12). He was accompanying Tychicus to Colossae when the later carried the epistle of Colossians (Col. 4:7,9). Both letters were written from the same place at the same time.

Ninth, the apostle's prison was in some city not far distant from Colossae. The events concerning Onesimus, namely his flight, his accidental meeting with Paul, his conversion and return, all
occurred in a remarkably short time. Paul used the term \( \text{ùpav} \) (v.15) to describe the time this servant had been absent from his master. \( \text{ùpav} \) does not indicate a very long period, but rather an "hour" or "season". Consequently, the city to which Onesimus fled was comparatively close to Colossae. Otherwise the events would not have proceeded so rapidly.

Tenth, though Paul was in prison, yet he requested that a lodging be prepared for him at Colossae. "For I trust that through your prayers I shall be given to you", he said (v.22). New hopes had been kindled in the apostle. The outcome of his pending trial seemed favorable; his climax of worry had passed. So confident was he of acquittal that he expected and even planned to visit Colossae shortly. He had never been to this city as yet, but now he asked that lodging be made ready for him immediately. We have no reason to doubt the fulfillment of this hope and completion of this visit to the brethren there.

Eleventh, several assistants were with Paul, some also as prisoners, Epaphras being one (v.23). We learned when studying Colossians that this evangelist was a minister at Colossae, Hieropolis, and Laodicea, and that he had brought Paul news concerning these churches. For some reason he had been cast into pris-
on, in the same one with Paul. From this cruel abode he sent greetings to Philemon along with Paul. Others present, perhaps not as prisoners, likewise sent greetings, as Mark, Aristarchus, Demas, Luke (v.24). These men were classed as "fellow-labourers". They were all with Paul when he wrote the Colossian epistle.

Twelfth, we must not overlook the evangelistic tone and fervor of this letter. Several "fellow-labourers" (v.24) were present. Paul's evangelism was prosecuted even while in prison; he had converted Onesimus to Christianity (v.10). From his jail he issued letters. As soon as he regained his freedom, he intended to complete some evangelistic missions, particularly one to Colossae (v.22). Everything concerning organized evangelism drawn from the epistle to the Colossians holds equally true for this one to Philemon, and vice versa.

With this we close our investigation of the four epistles which Paul wrote while in prison.
Chapter V

Some Elements Common to all the Imprisonment Epistles

We have studied the four imprisonment epistles of Paul individually, in order to secure a picture of the historic background out of which these letters grew. To complete this setting, we now point out from the facts observed several elements which they hold in common. Little need be said regarding most of these common factors, as they have been discussed in the four preceding chapters. However, some may require additional elaboration in order to see the combined weight of the evidence presented.

First, these four letters were all written to churches either in or near the province of Asia. Two were sent to Colossae, one to Philippi, and one to Ephesus or, according to our conclusion, to Laodicea.

Second, the next common element is the imprisonment of Paul. He was in jail facing a charge that might prove fatal. As is the case with anyone under similar conditions, his hopes rose and sank from time to time depending upon the outlook of his
pending trial.

At times the apostle's hope of regaining freedom almost disappeared. The situation was tense and serious. Sometimes he found comfort in knowing that "Christ shall be magnified in my body, whether it be by life, or by death" (Phil. 1:20). Circumstances were evidently not so favorable. He even reached the point where he desired to die; "For me to live is Christ, and to die is gain....For I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart, and to be with Christ" (Phil. 1:21,23). His imprisonment reached a critical stage. There was a possibility of his being "offered upon the sacrifice and service of your faith" (Phil. 2:17). He requested, however, that "ye faint not at my tribulations for you" (Lph. 3:13). To the Colossians he could not refrain from mentioning his "sufferings" (Col. 1:24). He would have them know "what great conflict I have for you, and for them at Laodicea, and for as many as have not seen my face in the flesh" (Col. 2:1).

At other periods the outcome of Paul's trial looked more favorable to him, and he hoped for a speedy release. Though the picture was dark enough when he penned Philippians, yet somehow he was confident that "I shall continue with you all for your furtherance
and joy of faith; that your rejoicing may be more abundant in Jesus Christ for me by my coming to you again" (Phil. 1:25,26). Later he added: "I trust in the Lord that I also myself shall come shortly" (Phil. 2:24). In spite of all handicaps, Paul felt he would be able to visit Colossae too, for he requested Philemon (v.22): "Prepare me also a lodging: for I trust that through your prayers I shall be given unto you". The apostle had his moments of optimism along with his more pessimistic moods.

Third, according to all four letters Paul was thrown into prison as a direct result of his evangelistic preaching. He characterized himself as "a prisoner of Christ Jesus in behalf of you Gentiles" (Eph. 3:1), and reminded the Philippians that now they also faced the opportunity to suffer in behalf of Christ, "having the same conflict which ye saw in me, and now hear to be in me" (Phil. 1:29,30). It was for Christ that he endured such tribulation, as those who were converts to Christ (Col. 1:24; 2:1). Such phrases as "Prisoner of Jesus Christ", "Prisoner of the Lord", "Ambassador in bonds", or "bonds in Christ" are frequent, all of which presuppose an

1. Ephesians 4:1; 6:20; Philippians 1:13; Colossians 4:3; Philemon 1,9.
energetic preaching program interrupted by this imprisonment.

Fourth, in all these letters friends were named as being present. Those mentioned were Timothy, Epaphras, Mark, Aristarchus, Demas, Luke, Onesimus, Epaphroditus, Tychicus and Justus, the same persons named in Philemon were named in Colossians. We would naturally expect this, since we are positive these two letters were written and sent at the same time. Several were present whom the apostle did not name when he composed Ephesians, for Tychicus was sent to them "that ye might know our affairs" (Eph. 6:22). Probably the "our" included most or all of the men already named. If this epistle were not dispatched to Ephesus, but to Laodicea where Paul was personally unknown (Eph. 1:5; 3:1-4), is it not likely that most of his companions would be unacquainted at Laodicea also? In this case there would be no need to insert their names. On the other hand, if Ephesians were a circular letter, sent to several churches, it would be more appropriate to omit personalities. Neither would there be any need of mentioning these men in Philippians. As we shall learn later, they spent their efforts in preaching in the province of Asia. It is quite likely, therefore, that
they were unknown to the people at Philippi. It is possible too that they were temporarily absent on missionary enterprises when Ephesians and Philippians were written.

Timothy was mentioned as being present when the epistles to Philippians, Colossians and Philemon were written, although his name was omitted in Ephesians. Tychicus was present when Colossians and Ephesians were written, making both Timothy and Tychicus there during the composition of Colossians. This fact furnishes good ground for believing that Timothy was also present when Ephesians was composed. It is very unlikely, however, that Timothy was known at Laodicea; consequently there would be no reason to insert his name in the epistle. Thus we are led to feel that most all of these men were with Paul during the writing of these four epistles, but it cannot be proved conclusively.

Fifth, the apparent close contact which Paul had with the churches addressed must not be overlooked. This he maintained by letter, messenger, visitation and by instructing evangelists. Assistants were constantly on the move. Epaphroditus had come from Philippi to Paul with an offering (Phil. 2:25; 4:18) to supply the apostle's needs. He had apparently intended to remain with him for awhile, but due to illness was forced to
return home (Phil. 2:25-28). To this church Paul planned to send Timothy "to care for your estate" (Phil. 2:20). Tychicus was sent to whomsoever Ephesians was written "that ye might know our affairs, and that he might comfort your hearts" (Eph. 6:21,23). Epaphras had evangelized Colossae, Hieropolis and Laodicea (Eph. 1:7; 4:12,13). He had returned to Paul, where for some reason he was thrown into jail with his teacher (Philemon 23). Other workers were busy in Colossae, as Philemon (Philemon 1; Col. 4:9) and Archippus to whom Paul sent instruction (Philemon 2; Col. 4:17). To Tychicus, along with Onesimus (Col. 4:9), was given another task—to carry epistles to Colossae, one for the church there and one for Philemon (Col. 4:7). Tychicus was to "know your estate, and to comfort your hearts" (Col. 4:8); and with Onesimus would "make known unto you all things which are done here" (Col. 4:9). Paul had planned to dispatch John Mark to Colossae, "touching whom ye received commandments" (Col. 4:10). Certainly this was close contact to maintain, especially with churches some of which Paul himself had never visited.1 So concerned was Paul about the welfare of these churches that

he himself intended to visit some of them shortly, as soon as conditions permitted.¹ Their work

Sixth, all these letters were written in the midst of a great evangelistic drive headed by Paul. Traces of such we have already observed. Of this campaign, the fact that he sent epistles of Christian instruction to churches is sufficient proof. How many letters Paul dictated during this period we can only surmise, although we do have evidence of two others (Col. 4:16; Eph. 3:2,4), unless one can be identified as the epistle to the Ephesians. This indicates great missionary activity. In all these epistles Paul's chief concern was the proper development of the churches in this vicinity. When necessary he reprimanded or exhorted workers in these growing brotherhoods, as in the case of Euodius and Syntyche, and Archippus (Phil. 4:2,3; Col. 4:7).

The presence of so many helpers at this time leads us to the same supposition. Their names and number we have already noticed. They were frequently alluded to as "fellow-labourers", "fellow-workers unto the kingdom of God", "servants of Christ", "a faithful minister and fellow-servant in the Lord", etc. If

¹ Phil. 2:24; 1:26; Philemon 22.
titles mean anything, these men were engaged in evangelism and Paul was overseeing their work.

Additional weight is given our conclusion when we notice Paul's references to preaching. At the time of this imprisonment preaching was his one chief concern. He told the Ephesians that "unto me... is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ" (Eph. 3:8). To the Colossians he emphasized his task as preacher of "the gospel...whereof I Paul am made a minister" (Col. 1:23). His responsibility to preach received additional stress in "Whom we preach, warning every man, and teaching every man in all wisdom; that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus: whereunto I also labour, striving according to his working which worketh in me mightily" (Col. 1:28,29). He desired to "open my mouth boldly, to make known the mystery of the gospel, for which I am an ambassador" (Eph. 6:19,20). His incarceration hindered his task of preaching, therefore he hoped "that God would open unto us a door of utterance, to speak the mystery of Christ" (Col. 4:3). Because he wanted to preach, he wanted to be free. Preaching was his primary task; in this he was constantly engaged.

That Paul was involved in a missionary drive
is evident also from references concerning the spread of the gospel. To the Philippians he declared that even his imprisonment had "fallen out rather unto the furtherance of the gospel" (Phil. 1:12). Evidently that was the one aim he sought. While in the prison he preached to those in the palace (Phil. 1:13), until he reaped fruit there. "My bonds in Christ are manifest in all the palace, and in all other places", he wrote (Phil. 1:13). At the close of this same letter, Christians in the palace sent greetings—"All the saints salute you, chiefly they that are of Caesar's household" (Phil. 4:22). Other preachers had taken heart, "waxing confident by my bonds" (Phil. 1:14), and "spoke the word without fear". There were some in this city who preached from envy and strife, but Paul rejoiced for "notwithstanding, every way, whether in pretence, or in truth, Christ is preached" (Phil. 1:18). This was all that mattered to him. His work so prospered that he could say the gospel had come to the Colossians "as it is in all the world" (Col. 1:6), meaning of course their part of the world. The conversion of Onesimus was a portion of this drive (Philemon 10), and perhaps that of Philemon, Epaphras, Apphia and Archippus. In fact it was the success of this growing campaign for Christ which brought about his arrest and imprisonment. Paul's
missionary program, according to our evidence, was organized and covered considerable territory, probably the whole province of Asia.

As a conclusion to the six foregoing assertions, and as a seventh common element to our epistles, these four letters were written from approximately the same place at approximately the same time. If the above be true, that: (1) these four letters were all written to churches either in or near the province of Asia; (2) Paul was in prison facing charges which might prove fatal to him; (3) Paul was placed in prison as a direct result of his evangelism; (4) practically the same friends were with the apostle when he issued these letters; (5) Paul was in close contact with the churches in Asia and Philippi; (6) these epistles were written in the midst of a great evangelistic drive centering in the province of Asia, then certainly our conclusion holds. We have pointed out before that Timothy was present at the writing of Philemon, Colossians, and Philippans, and that Tychicus was present when Ephesians, Colossians, and consequently Philemon were written. This is so significant that it needs re-emphasizing. Here is an overlapping in the presence of Timothy and Tychicus, both being present when Colossians and Philemon were written and one or the other being present at the com-
missionary program, according to our evidence, was organized and covered considerable territory, probably the whole province of Asia.

As a conclusion to the six foregoing assertions, and as a seventh common element to our epistles, these four letters were written from approximately the same place at approximately the same time. If the above be true, that: (1) these four letters were all written to churches either in or near the province of Asia; (2) Paul was in prison facing charges which might prove fatal to him; (3) Paul was placed in prison as a direct result of his evangelism; (4) practically the same friends were with the apostle when he issued these letters; (5) Paul was in close contact with the churches in Asia and Philippi; (6) these epistles were written in the midst of a great evangelistic drive centering in the province of Asia, then certainly our conclusion holds. We have pointed out before that Timothy was present at the writing of Philemon, Colossians and Philippians, and that Tychicus was present when Ephesians, Colossians and consequently Philemon were written. This is so significant that it needs re-emphasizing. Here is an overlapping in the presence of Timothy and Tychicus, both being present when Colossians and Philemon were written and one or the other being present at the com-
position of Philippians and Ephesians. Both in all probability were present, though both were not mentioned. Other conditions being similar, this overlapping presence considerably strengthens the above conclusion.
Chapter VI
Individual History of the Men Mentioned in the Imprisonment Epistles as Being Companions of Paul

The names of several companions of Paul have been enumerated in the foregoing chapters. It is needful to become better acquainted with these men. On which of Paul's missionary journeys did they accompany him? In what provinces did they pass most of their time in missionary endeavor? Answers to these questions will not only clarify the background we have been attempting to reproduce, but will also furnish us some idea as to where Paul was imprisoned when he composed these epistles. Therefore, we give these men special, individual attention.

First, there was Timothy, actually present when Paul wrote Philemon, Philippians and Colossians.¹ This young man was born at Lystra. His mother was a Jewess who believed on Christ, but his father was a Greek (Acts 16:1). Timothy was converted by Paul on the apostle's first missionary journey (I Tim. 1:2), and by the time he returned on his second tour, Tim-

¹ Phil. 1:1; Philemon 1:1; Col. 1:1.
othy "was well reported of by the brethren that were at Lystra and Iconium" (Acts 16:2). From this we conclude that Timothy was already gaining repute as a preacher of Christ. No doubt because of his character and capabilities, Paul decided to add Timothy to his evangelistic company, for which task he was ordained (I Tim. 4:14; II Tim. 1:6). Henceforth this young preacher was a fellow-worker with Paul.

Timothy passed through Lystra, Galatia and Mysia with the apostle's party, and came to Troas (Acts 16:6,7). He was present at Philippi when Paul and Silas were imprisoned. He journeyed through Amphipolis and Apollonia to Thessalonica, where he witnessed the disturbance, and fled from thence with Paul to Berea. Here he remained for a time with Silas, while Paul passed on to Athens (Acts 17:14). Timothy joined the apostle at Athens shortly, carrying news from Thessalonica (Thess. I. 3:6). He was sent back to Thessalonica with a message for the church there (I Thess. 3:1,2), and joined the apostle again at Corinth (Acts 18:5). At Corinth Timothy tarried for some time with Paul and Silas, preaching the gospel to the people of this city (II Cor. 2:19). Now the references to Timothy disappear for awhile, but we are safe in supposing that he remained with Paul in Corinth the following year and a half, that he sail-
ed with the apostle to Ephesus, and that he either remained in that city while Paul proceeded to Jerusalem, or accompanied Paul, or returned home to Lystra for a short visit.

Attention is next called to Timothy during Paul’s third missionary tour. He was at Ephesus where the apostle had been preaching and teaching for some two and a half years. Luke stated that "he (Paul) sent into Macedonia two of them that ministered unto him, Timothy and Erastus (Acts 19:22). It is probable that Timothy had been with Paul on this venture from the time the apostle "went over all the country of Galatia and Phrygia in order, strengthening all the disciples" (Acts 19:23) until and during his lengthy and variegated stay at Ephesus.

It seems that Paul intended for Timothy to visit the churches from Macedonia to Corinth (I Cor. 4:17; 16:10), but whether he completed this plan or not is difficult to say. A close investigation of the epistles leads us to feel that he was recalled to Ephesus before he ever reached Corinth, and II Corinthians gives no hint that the young preacher had been there. Erastus, his partner, did reach Corinth (II Tim. 4:20) and there he remained (Rom. 16:23). Upon returning to Ephesus, Timothy was placed in charge of the
church (I Tim. 1:3), while Paul visited the churches of Macedonia and Greece (Acts 20:1,2). At least that was his plan which he eventually completed, though many unexpected events apparently intervened to delay his progress.¹ By the time he reached Greece, Timothy met him there (in Corinth); for when Paul had traveled through Macedonia and "those parts" into Greece, where he stayed for three months, Timothy was among the company which returned with Paul into Asia. (Acts 20:4,5). Timothy with some others went ahead of the party at Philippi, and waited for Paul and Luke at Troas. Here our definite knowledge of this evangelist ends. Whether he returned to Ephesus or Lystra no one can say. Excluding a passage in the epistle to Hebrews, there is no evidence even implying that Timothy accompanied the apostle or was ever in his presence after the latter sailed from Troas.

Just where Timothy was when Paul wrote the two letters to him, or just where Paul was is quite difficult to say. The tone of these epistles indicates that the former was somewhere in the districts around the Aegean Sea, probably at Ephesus.² He was

². I Tim. 1:3; II Tim. 1:15; 4:10-13; 4:19-21.
along when Paul issued the epistle to Romans (Rom. 16:21). Very likely it was sent from Corinth, just before the apostle left this city for the last time, although the date and place of this document cannot be dogmatically established. Hebrews 13:23 indicates that Timothy had been imprisoned somewhere, but had since been set at liberty. Where and when this occurred can only be conjectured. Certainly Timothy visited more places and conducted many more evangelistic enterprises than we will ever know; but there is no positive evidence that he ever was at Rome.

Next, attention is directed to Epaphras, a preacher and fellow-worker of Paul, but unfortunately one of whom we know very little. There are only a few references to this man which are at all informative. Epaphras was a Colossian (Col. 4:12) who was converted to Christianity, probably by the apostle. Since Paul had not visited the city of Colossae prior to this (Col. 2:1), it is quite likely that his conversion occurred in some other city of Asia. Afterward, Epaphras attached himself to Paul’s group of evangelists and went forth to Preach. He was a credit to his calling, for Paul complemented his zeal for the "Colossians, and them that are in Laodicea, and them in Hierapolis" (Col. 4:13), and called him a faithful minister (Col. 1:7) for those at Colossae.
It was probably Epaphras who founded the churches at Colossae, Hierapolis and Laodicea. He was acquainted with Onesimus and Philemon. His ministry in eastern Asia was interrupted by a visit to Paul who was in prison; where, we do not know. For some cause Epaphras was arrested and subsequently imprisoned with his teacher (Philemon 23). Most likely he was soon set free and returned to Colossae, otherwise Luke would surely have mentioned him in Acts. We have no reason to suppose that this preacher ever traveled or evangelized outside of Asia.

We come now to the young man Mark, who probably attached himself to Paul's company after the death of Barnabas, and a few years work with Peter the apostle. John Mark was born in Jerusalem, being a mere lad at the time of Christ's crucifixion. His mother was Mary (Acts 12:12), in whose home the disciples often assembled for worship. He was a nephew of Barnabas (Col. 4:10). When Paul and Barnabas visited Jerusalem with provisions from Antioch for the needy, Mark returned to Antioch with them (Acts 12:25). He engaged in part of the first missionary journey, but for unknown reasons withdrew at Perga (Acts 13:13) and returned to Jerusalem.

Mark had removed to Antioch again by the
time Paul and Barnabas attempted a second missionary tour; but their plans never matured because of a quarrel involving John Mark. When they had decided to revisit the churches which they had established, "Barnabas determined to take with them John, whose surname was Mark" (Acts 16:37). To this Paul objected (Acts 16:28). The objections were so strong that the two missionaries parted company; and Barnabas with Mark sailed to Cyprus (Acts 16:39). Just where all Mark preached, and how long he assisted Barnabas is difficult to determine. For awhile he was in Babylon with Peter (I Peter 5:13), and very likely wrote his gospel then.

By the time Philemon and Colossians were written, Mark was with Paul (Philemon 24; Col. 4:10) and was intending to visit Colossae. The old breach between them had been repaired, and Mark now served faithfully. Later and from prison the apostle wrote to Timothy requesting his own presence and asking that he bring Mark along, "for he is profitable to me for the ministry" (II Tim. 4:11). How long he served the churches in Asia is uncertain. There is no evidence that he ever traveled west farther than this province.

There was another helper of Paul by the
name of Aristarchus, a Jew (Col. 4:11). He was held prisoner with the apostle at the time Colossians was written (Col. 4:10). Not much is known concerning him. When the great Ephesian riot occurred, Aristarchus with Gaius was seized by the mob and taken into the theater; what happened to him there is obscure. He was described as being a Macedonian (Acts 19:29) and a companion of Paul in travel. From this we can safely conclude that Aristarchus was one of the many missionaries who assisted Paul in the great evangelistic program which he launched in Asia during his two and one half years stay at Ephesus. This man was among the number who accompanied Paul from Corinth to Troas on his third enterprise (Acts 20:4), being described as a Thessalonian.

Aristarchus may have accompanied Paul to Jerusalem, witnessed his arrest, and remained with him during his two years imprisonment at Caesarea, although this is improbable. However, he was present when Paul embarked as a prisoner from Caesarea for Rome (Acts 27:2), but this does not necessarily mean that Aristarchus accompanied him to Rome. Their ship stopped at Myra, a city of Lycia, where another, sailing from Alexandria to Italy was boarded (Acts 27:5,6). In fact Aristarchus appeared to furnish the reason
why the ship stopped at Myra, for Luke stated: "And entering into a ship of Adramyttium, we launched, meaning to sail by the coasts of Asia, one Aristarchus, a Macedonian of Thessalonica, being with us" (Acts 27:2). Lightfoot believed that Aristarchus parted from the apostle at Myra, his destination being not Rome but his native city Thessalonica.¹ There is no additional information concerning this preacher, not even evidence that he at any time was in Rome.

The next man we mention is Demas, one who was with Paul at the time Colossians and Philemon was issued (Col. 4:14; Philemon 24). Not being included among those of the circumcision, he was evidently a Gentile; and was known by the brethren at Colossae. There is one other notice of him, and this was not very honorable. II Timothy 4:10 reads: "For Demas hath forsaken me, having loved this present world, and is departed unto Thessalonica," which most likely was his home. This was the last we heard of Demas.

Next there is Luke, the physician, the author of the Gospel of Luke, and recorder of the Acts of the Apostles. Judging from the "we" passages in Acts, Luke was along on Paul's first trip from Troas to Philippi,

¹ Lightfoot, Commentary on Philippians, p. 35.
Luke's home (Acts 16:10). Just how frequently he was with the apostle from this time forth cannot be definitely ascertained. He was along during the later part of Paul's Ephesian ministry, for the words of the narrative (Acts 19:21-41) are of such detailed nature as to indicate that the author was an eye witness. He accompanied Paul from Philippi to Jerusalem just preceding the latter's arrest and imprisonment at Jerusalem (Acts 20:5). It is likely that Luke remained with him during his long imprisonment at Caesarea, and again set sail with him for Rome (Acts 27:1,2). Luke completed the journey to Rome (Acts 28:11-16) no doubt remaining with the old apostle until his death.

Just where Philemon and Colossians were written has not been decided, but Luke was with Paul then (Philemon 24; Col. 4:14), and was classed as a fellow-laborer and a beloved physician. He was still at hand, comforting and caring for his friend, when II Timothy was penned (II Tim. 4:11). In fact, he was the only person with the apostle at that time.

Onesimus is the next individual considered, one who was a slave, and on whose behalf the epistle to Philemon was dispatched (Philemon 10). His master was Philemon, a citizen of Colossae and convert of Paul (Philemon 19). Onesimus had fled from his master...
to the city where Paul lay in jail, when he is first introduced to us. Here he accidentally met the apostle, the occasion of which is uncertain. Perhaps the slave was arrested; or too, Epaphras, who knew him, may have found him and brought him to Paul. As a result, Onesimus was converted to Christianity and decided to return to Philemon. On his behalf Paul wrote a letter and sent it along with him to Colossae, requesting Philemon to receive Onesimus, but now as a brother (Philemon 16). Onesimus was mentioned once more, in Colossians 4:9. He was classed as "a faithful and beloved brother". Tychicus, who carried the letter to the church at Colossae, accompanied Onesimus on his return trip.

The next to attract our attention is Epaphroditus. Our only knowledge of him is furnished by two references. From one we learn that he carried an offering from the church at Philippi to Paul, who was in prison somewhere (Phil. 4:18). The other informs us that he had become ill while on this mission (Phil. 2:25-26), and was "nigh unto death". He was called "my brother and companion in labour, and fellow-soldier, but your messenger, and he that ministered to my wants". We conclude, therefore, that Epaphroditus was more than the messenger of the Philippian church; he
was an evangelist of capabilities and proven value. As soon as he recovered, Paul sent him back to Philippi, that his friends at home might not worry about his condition unnecessarily. His stay with Paul was short.

Another friend and assistant who was present at the composition of Colossians and Ephesians was Tychicus of Asia. He was an evangelist of some note, and one who won the confidence of Paul. There is only one reference which definitely placed him in the chronology of Paul's ministry. Acts 20:5 speaks of Tychicus "of Asia" as being among the party which left Greece with the apostle for Macedonia and Troas. Other statements give us additional information about this man, but nothing dependable as to his whereabouts. Being from Asia, Tychicus must have been acquainted with the churches of that province. Paul sent him to Colossae along with Onesimus, carrying a verbal message as well as the Colossian epistle (Col. 4:7). He was pronounced as one of the circumcision. From Acts 18:7 we learn of a Justus at Corinth, "one that worshiped God, whose house joined hard to the synagogue". Likewise was Tychicus present when the epistle to Ephesians was composed (Eph. 6:21). It is quite certain that he carried this message to its destination. If Paul indeed sent it to the church at Laodicea, Tychicus could have delivered it on his same trip to Colossae.
At the time Paul requested Timothy to come from Ephesus to him, he sent Tychicus to relieve Timothy at Ephesus (II Tim. 4:12). On another occasion the apostle wrote for Titus to meet him at Nicopolis as soon as he sent Tychicus or Artemus to take his post during his absence. Titus may have been at Corinth; if so, Tychicus probably relieved him there for a season. At least Tychicus was at Corinth in Acts 20:5, referred to above. The correct chronological order of these various movements is difficult to establish. There is no ground to believe that Tychicus ever left the provinces of Achaia, Asia, or Macedonia.

One other helper is mentioned—Jesus, who was called Justus. This man sent greetings to the people at Colossae, and was consequently with Paul at that time (Col. 4:11). But who was he? He was definitely classified as one "of the circumcision". From Acts 18:7 we learn of a Justus at Corinth, "one that worshipped God, whose house joined hard to the synagogue". After Paul broke with the synagogue on his first visit to Corinth, he entered this man's house, where he continued "a year and six months teaching the word of God among them" (Acts 18:11). This Justus could have been that same character. If so, he followed the apostle
during his evangelism, and assisted in the work, eventually becoming acquainted with the brethren at Colossae.

This concludes the list of Paul's known companions at the time these imprisonment epistles were written.
A Roman Authorship of the Inscriptions
Discussion of the Arguments for and Against

PART II
In Part One we reconstructed some main features of the historical background out of which the imprisonment epistles of Paul were produced. In Part Two we consider arguments for and against the city of Rome as being the place where Paul wrote these letters. To what extent these arguments fit into the situation as depicted in Part One is a matter of major concern. Unless they do, Rome must be rejected. To do this adequately necessitates a knowledge of the apostle's condition as a prisoner in the capital city. How was he treated? What were his future plans? Did he expect to receive his liberty? Such questions need to be answered. The first chapter of this section, therefore, is a narrative of Paul's arrest at Jerusalem, his confinement at Caesarea, and his arrival and stay in Rome.

Chapter VII

History of Paul From His Arrest at Jerusalem Through His Two Year Stay in Rome

Paul did not tarry at Ephesus on his last journey to Jerusalem, but sailed past and stopped at
Miletus (Acts 21:16). Luke attributed this move to the apostle's haste; he desired to be at Jerusalem on Pentecost. "From Miletus he sent to Ephesus, and called the elders of the church." To these he delivered his farewell speech, reviewing his work while with them, and closing with the exhortation that they be faithful overseers of their flock (Acts 20:28-35). During his address Paul sadly declared: "And now, behold, I know that ye all, among whom I have gone preaching the kingdom of God, shall see my face no more" (Acts 20:25). Surely this augury fell like a sledge upon his friends who loved him so much. This stern reality applied not only to those elders, but also to all in Asia and thereabout to whom Paul had preached. Somehow he was positive that this was his final meeting with any friends in the East. "And they all wept sore, and fell on Paul's neck and kissed him, sorrowing most of all for the words which he spake, that they should see his face no more. And they accompanied him unto the ship" (Acts 20:38).

At Jerusalem Paul was mobbed by a group of his Jewish countrymen, bigoted because of their religion, and angered because the apostle had deserted the self-appointed fold of the Jews. They detested him because of his successful Christian evangelism. Paul would have been lynched, but for the "chief captain of the
band", who with soldiers and centurions rescued him from a mob of Jews (Acts 21:27-33). Thus he became a Roman captive, not because he had disobeyed Roman law, but because of a disturbance started by others. He was innocent of any charge; and as soon as the centurion in command learned Paul's identity, he treated him with consideration and respect. "Take heed what thou doest: for this man is a Roman", were his orders to the chief captain (Acts 22:26), who entertained similar feelings (Acts 22:29).

Naturally enough the Jewish court was prejudiced against the apostle, but by skillful manipulation he was able to keep the court divided; it reached no decision. "The night following the Lord stood by him, and said, Be of good cheer, Paul: for as thou hast testified of me in Jerusalem, so must thou bear witness also at Rome" (Acts 23:11). Indeed this was consolation; it removed all fear as to his future course. Nothing could have suited the apostle better, for several months previous "Paul purposed in the spirit, when he had passed through Macedonia and Achaia, to go to Jerusalem, saying, After I have been there, I must also see Rome" (Acts 19:21). Now God was sanctioning his plan; his visit to Rome would be completed. The apostle had nothing to fear.
Due to a Zelot plot to murder Paul (Acts 23:12), since hope of securing his condemnation was slight, the chief captain transferred him to a prison in Caesarea. Special precautions were taken to secure his safety. His guard was composed of two-hundred soldiers, seventy horsemen, and two-hundred spearmen (Acts 23:23); the company departed "at the third hour of the night". Paul was provided a beast upon which to ride. Scant courtesy few prisoners received from the Roman government! This was not the way Rome treated men whom it intended to execute. What did all this mean? The chief captain commanded: "Bring him safe unto Felix the governor" (Acts 23:24). His letter to Felix showed no charge of which Paul was accused, but recounted his rescue and stated: "Whom I perceived to be accused of questions of their law, but to have nothing laid to his charge worthy of death or of bonds" (Acts 23:29). Lysias had no reason for even holding Paul prisoner. Felix kept him in "Herod's judgment hall".

Five days later, Ananias, the high priest, came to Caesarea for Paul's trial. The only accusations of any weight whatsoever, which the Jews presented, were that the apostle was "a pestilent fellow, and a mover of sedition among all the Jews throughout the world, and a
ring-leader of the sect of the Nazarenes" (Acts 24:5).

Petty Jewish prejudices, however, under Roman law would condemn no man. Being puzzled as to what action to pursue, Felix laid over the trial until Lysias, the chief captain, could come to Caesarea. In the meantime, his orders were "to keep Paul, and to let him have liberty, and to forbid none of his acquaintance to minister or to come unto him" (Acts 24:23).

So far as we know Lysias never came to Caesarea on behalf of Paul. Though Felix interviewed the apostle often, he held him prisoner; and being a ruthless politician, he hoped "also that money should have been given him of Paul, that he might loose him" (Acts 24:26). But the money he desired never came. When he was succeeded by Festus, Felix "willing to shew the Jews a pleasure, left Paul bound" (Acts 24:27). The apostle accordingly remained a prisoner, not because he deserved confinement, but because he refused to bribe his freedom and on account of political policy.

Shortly after taking his post, Festus brought forth Paul for trial. Jews from Jerusalem "laid many and grievous complaints against Paul, which they could not prove" (Acts 25:7). The apostle answered all charges successfully. But Festus, like the procurator before him, was a politician; and "willing to do the Jews a
pleasure, answered Paul, and said, Wilt thou go up to Jerusalem, and there be judged of these things before me" (Acts 25:9)? Hear Paul's noble reply: "I stand at Caesar's judgment seat, where I ought to be judged: to the Jews have I done no wrong, as thou very well knowest. For if I be an offender, or have committed anything worthy of death, I refuse not to die: but if there be none of these things whereof these accuse me, no man may deliver me unto them. I appeal unto Caesar" (Acts 25:10,11). This was straight talk to a Roman governor, especially when coming from a prisoner. At the most Paul knew he had nothing to fear from the Romans. Regarding him, Festus later confessed to King Agrippa: "Against whom when the accusers stood up, they brought none accusation of such things as I supposed: But had certain questions against him of their own superstitions, and of one Jesus, which was dead, whom Paul affirmed to be alive" (Acts 25:18,19).

Out of political courtesy, after certain days King Agrippa came to Caesarea to salute the new governor. To him Festus related Paul's case. Agrippa desired to hear him; so accordingly, the next day the apostle made his defense before this king. Preceding the address, Festus declared: "When I found that he had committed nothing worthy of death, and that he himself hath ap-
pealed to Augustus, I have determined to send him. Of whom I have no certain thing to write unto my lord. Therefore I have brought him forth before you, and specially before thee, O king Agrippa, that, after examination had, I might have something to write. For it seemeth to me unreasonable to send a prisoner, and not withal to signify the crimes laid against him" (Acts 25:25-27). Quite a predicament for a Roman governor is it not, especially when sending a prisoner to Caesar to be judged? King Agrippa heard Paul's defense. His verdict was: "This man doeth nothing worthy of death or of bonds" (Acts 26:31); and "This man might have been set at liberty, if he had not appealed unto Caesar" (Acts 26:32). Three Romans had thus far judged Paul, and all were agreed as to his innocency. Due to his appeal, however, arrangements were made to send Paul to Rome.

Along with other prisoners Paul was delivered to "Julius, a centurion of Augustus' band" (Acts 27:1). Luke the apostle's doctor, was along and sailed with Paul (Acts 27:1, 2). In the narrative, Luke wrote "Entering into a ship of Adramyttium, we launched, meaning to sail by the coast of Asia, one Aristarchus, a Macedonian of Thessalonica, being with us" (Acts 27:2). These two, Luke and Aristarchus, were the only friends,
so far as we know, who were in company with Paul; and Luke was probably the only one who ever reached Italy with the imprisoned apostle. No doubt Aristarchus left the ship at Myra in Lycia (Acts 27:5), and proceeded to his home at Thessalonica. Paul, in the meantime, was treated cordially and with respect. When the ship stopped at Sidon, "Julius courteously entreated Paul, and gave him liberty to go unto his friends to refresh himself" (Acts 27:3). The centurion changed ships at Lycia. There he "found a ship of Alexandria sailing into Italy; and he put us therein" (Acts 27:6). Luke continued the voyage with Paul. Aside from him, we have no assurance that any other of the apostle's friends or fellow-workers were at any time with him in Rome.

Throughout the voyage Paul was treated with consideration, even though he was a prisoner. The voyage was not without its perils. For many days the ship weathered a severe storm, and was at last grounded on a beach off the Island of Melita. Due to the wise counsel of Paul not a life was lost, though the ship was totally destroyed (Acts 27:41,44). The soldiers' advice was "to kill the prisoners, lest any of them should swim out, and escape" (Acts 27:42). "But the centurion, willing to save Paul, kept them from their
Julius allowed Paul a large degree of liberty, while delayed on Melita. The chief man of the island was named Publius. He received Paul and Luke, lodging them courteously for three days (Acts 28:72). His father, who lay sick of "a fever and a bloody flux", the apostle healed, as well as others who came to him for this purpose (Acts 28:8).

After three months the company sailed in another ship for Rome. At Puteoli the apostle "found brethren, and were desired to tarry with them seven days: and so we went toward Rome" (Acts 28:14). Extraordinary liberty for a prisoner! The "brethren" Luke referred to were Christians; thus Christianity had already preceded Paul to Italy. Not only were there Christians at Puteoli, but also in Rome, for Luke wrote (Acts 28:15): "And from thence (Rome), when the brethren heard of us, they came to meet us as far as Appii forum and The three taverns: whom when Paul saw, he thanked God, and took courage." In this manner the apostle came to Rome. The journey had taken from August in A.D. 59 to March in A.D. 60 to complete the journey, about eight months in all.1

The same attention shown Paul thus far was continued at Rome. Although the other prisoners were delivered to the captain of the guard, "Paul was suffered to dwell by himself with a soldier that kept him" (Acts 28:16). This continued for a space of two years. Luke's account is: "Paul dwelt two whole years in his own hired house, and received all that came in unto him" (Acts 28:20). There is nothing to lead us to believe that Paul was ever placed in the common prison during this imprisonment at Rome. He had his special guard; he lived in his own rented house. All who desired had free access to the apostle.

As to the Jews in Rome, Paul straightway called the chief of them together for an interview. Here he displayed his former conviction, saying, "There was no cause of death in me" (Acts 28:18), and they "would have let me go". To his situation the Jews replied: "We neither received letters out of Judea concerning thee, neither any of the brethren that came shewed or spake any harm of thee" (Acts 28:21). Paul had been eight whole months in route to Rome, yet no accusations of accusers had arrived from Jerusalem. Evidently the Jews were less enthusiastic about the affair—seemingly their experiences at Caesarea had taught them much. No charge they might make against Paul could be sustained.
by Roman law, so no one had appeared against him.

Nevertheless, the Jews at Rome wanted to hear about Christianity, for said they: "Concerning this sect, we know that everywhere it is spoken against" (Acts 28:23). This did not mean that they were entirely ignorant about the doctrine of the new religion. To them Christianity was just a Jewish sect, condemned by all orthodox Jews, and they were inquisitive to know Paul's view of the matter. No opportunity could have pleased the apostle better, so he preached Christ to those Jewish elders. "Some believed the things which were spoken, and some believed not" (Acts 28:24). Perceiving their hardened hearts, in accordance with his old custom, he denounced their lack of faith, and turned to the Gentiles (Acts 28:25-28). Thus Paul began his preaching and his ministry in Rome.

The last verse of Acts left the apostle in Rome "preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching those things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ, with all confidence, no man forbidding him". His old dream was then realized. His field lay open before him; none attempted to interfere. Jews could not seriously molest or hinder his work; they were forced to remain quiet for their own protection, since they were disliked and oppressed at the capital city. The fact that a few years
earlier "Claudius had commanded all Jews to depart from Rome" (Acts 18:2) is sufficient to illustrate the esteem with which Jews were regarded there. Whether accusations against Paul ever came from Jerusalem, Acts did not reveal. The probability is that none came. Palestine at this time was a seething caldron of rebellion, ready to explode any moment. The crisis came A.D. 66, when all Palestine arose in revolt against Rome. With war clouds gathering, and with Roman hatred for the Jews increasing, it is unlikely that representatives from Jerusalem appeared against Paul at Rome.

As the scene closed upon Paul, his future looked very bright and full of promise. There was no hint of a coming catastrophe. Perhaps Luke intended to write a third narrative and record those unknown experiences of the apostle subsequent to his trial, as some have suggested; perhaps he did and it has since been lost to us. Be this as it may, our sources of information close with Paul fervently preaching in the imperial city.
Chapter VIII

Arguments Favoring Rome as the Place of Composition of the Imprisonment Epistles of Paul

Rome has been almost unanimously chosen as the place where Paul composed his imprisonment letters. This contention we proceed to examine. With the facts ascertained in Chapter VII before us, we shall endeavor to discover just how far those produced in Part One fit into this situation. In this chapter we suggest arguments favoring a Roman authorship of these epistles.

A few arguments favoring Rome are drawn from all four epistles. Among them are the following. First, Paul was a prisoner when all these letters were issued; and we are confident that he suffered an imprisonment while he was in Rome.

Second, the letters were written when the apostle was engaged in missionary work. Details of this have already been discussed. At Rome, he was active in evangelizing for Christ. He "received all that came in unto him, preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching those things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ, with all confidence, no man forbidding him" (Acts 28:31). This was diligent preaching. We do not know the extent of his success at Rome, but surely, as was always true
with the apostle, his efforts bore some fruit after two years of preaching in one city. Even though he was in confinement, yet he was free to receive friends and teach anyone who came to his house. Such a condition the epistles also revealed.

There are additional views favoring Rome which are drawn from the epistles individually. But if it be true, as we feel we have reasonably proved, that these were written at approximately the same time and from approximately the same place, then if it can be shown that one epistle was written at Rome, as a result the rest must have been penned there also. Accordingly, we turn to reasons taken from Philippians.

First, Paul mentioned that his bonds in Christ were manifest in all the palace (ἐν διαμέσου τοῦ πρασετωρίῳ Phil. 1:13). One would naturally expect to find the palace located at Rome, the seat of the government.

Second, the apostle wrote (Phil. 4:22): "All the saints salute you, chiefly they that are of Caesar's household" (οἱ ἐκ τοῦ καίσαρεος οἰκίας). One would suppose that Caesar's household was in the city where Caesar lived; in this case it would appear to be at Rome.

From Philippians our attention is called to Colossians. What arguments are found here which favor Rome? First, the fact that Onesimus was present (Col.
4:9) when this epistle was penned is proof enough to some that Paul was in Rome on this occasion. Rome would be the ideal and even the natural place for a run-away slave to go. Crucifixion was the punishment dealt to any slave guilty of this offence. Certainly therefore, anyone fleeing from his master would take all pains to escape detection. At Rome among the seething thousands from all over the world a fugitive could never be found, and to this city Onesimus fled. Here he met Paul; here he was converted; and from Rome Paul sent him back to his master.

Second, it was definitely declared that Luke was with Paul (Col. 4:14); and from Acts we know that Luke accompanied the apostle to Rome.

The epistle to Ephesians furnished no individual evidential reasons at all for assigning it to a Roman authorship. The best attempt to derive an argument from Ephesians has been made by Maurice Jones, but his is largely imagination with little or no proof, and not at all convincing. The following words are his contentions.

"The imperialism of the Epistle to the Ephesians also tells strongly in favor of Rome being its place of origin. The imagery in that Epistle shows clearly the influence of Imperial ideas upon the mind of the writer. In his hired dwelling in Rome he had leisure and opportunity to study on the spot the wonderful history and progress of that
mighty empire. He saw before his eyes visible traces of its growth from one small centre, his own immediate surroundings spoke of its universal dominion and of its unity, he realized in his own person something of the pride of its citizenship. More than all he learnt to understand the unique position of the emperor, supreme lord of the world and becoming more and more the object of actual worship. These and cognate ideas are plainly discernible behind the glorious vision of the Empire of Christ, the church universal, that he depicts in this Epistle, and they all point to the Imperial city itself as the source of the Apostle's inspiration in this particular direction."

Arguments derived from the epistle to Philemon are few in number. First, verse eleven referred to Paul as "Paul the aged". If this is to be understood in its ordinary sense, it indicated that the apostle was an old man when he issued this letter. As his imprisonment at Rome occurred in the later part of his life when he was growing aged, this phrase suited that period of his life.

Second, this letter was written on behalf of Onesimus, the slave. The argument advanced from Colossians that this man fled to Rome holds equally true here, because Philemon and Colossians were composed at the same time and dealt with the same individual.

Third, Luke was along when Paul dispatched this letter to its recipient (Philemon 1); and as has been noticed from Acts, Luke actually went to Rome with his teacher.

External evidence has nothing to offer in support of Rome. In fact there are very few arguments actually supporting this city as the place where these letters were composed. Most contentions defending it either attempt to show the impossibility of their being written elsewhere, or presuppose their Roman authorship. This former method offers no positive evidence, and the latter position begs the question and consequently has nothing left to prove.
Chapter IX

Arguments Opposing Rome as the Place of Authorship of the Imprisonment Epistles of Paul

To the arguments set forth in Chapter VIII, the following objections are raised. First, the fact that we have definite knowledge of Paul's confinement in Rome does not at all prove these manuscripts were written from that city. We know just as truly that the apostle experienced many other imprisonments (II Cor. 11:23), although we are not told just when or where they occurred. It is possible that Paul's letters could have been penned during any one of these imprisonments.

Second, Paul's reference to the palace (Phil. 1:13 πραϊτωρίου) did not necessarily point to the city of Rome. The "praetorium" was not only the imperial palace of the Caesar, but was also the name given to the headquarters of any praetor, the general of the army, or the military governor. It was constantly used to designate royal residences or palaces of Roman procurators. Pilate's headquarters in Jerusalem was called the praetorium; likewise was Herod's residence in Caesarea. Therefore, the passage under consider-

amination as evidence does not favor a Roman authorship of these epistles. It is rather valuable proof against it. The implication here is that Paul has been imprisoned in the praetorium, and consequently has become acquainted with and possibly converted most everyone present. But he was not confined in a praetorium at Rome. Therefore, Philippians 1:13 opposed the writing of these epistles at Rome.

Third, "Caesar's household", as mentioned (Phil. 4:22), could be located equally well in cities other than Rome. Duncan has successfully shown this to be true.

"We must not allow this phrase to suggest to the Emperor's palace at Rome, and imagine either that several members of the royal family had become adherents of the Christian Church, or, on the other hand, that the reference is exclusively to menials engaged in the royal kitchen. Caesar had members of his 'household' in every part of the Empire, a sort of civil service engaged in managing the Imperial property and attending generally to Imperial interests. These officials were naturally found in large numbers in provinces which were definitely assigned to the Emperor, but even in provinces like Asia which were classed as 'senatorial' and where the proconsul was, in theory at least, responsible directly to the senate, there was always a procurator whose duty it was to supervise all property and revenues of the province which, in contrast to what went into the aerarium or public treasury, were regarded as belonging to the Emperor's fiscus. Under the procurator, who was himself not unlikely to be a freedman, was a large staff of freedmen and slaves, and these, as we know, constituted themselves in the various centres into collegia or guilds.... J.T. Wood in his "Discoveries at Ephesus", 1877, cites an in-
Such were the members of "Caesar's household". They consisted of the entire force of slaves and attendants of every sort, attached in any capacity to the imperial menage, whether at the time resident in Rome or elsewhere. One would expect them to have quarters in the praetorium, provided one existed in the city where they happened to be. This phrase does not, therefore, speak decisively for Rome, or even fix the balance of probability in its favor. So far as we know, Paul had no contact with "Caesar's household" whatever during his imprisonment at Rome.

Fourth, Onesimus was not likely to have journeyed all the way to Rome. Does it seem reasonable that a poor slave would have undertaken such a hazardous journey of over 1,200 miles, including two sea voyages, when there were other large cities closer which would have served his purpose just as well? If the meeting of Onesimus did occur at Rome, this is proof in itself that a slave could be found in that city. Besides the Roman fugitivae lay in wait to arrest such runaways. Onesimus would not

1. Inscriptions from Tombs, Sarcophagi, etc., No. 20.
have been any safer at Rome than he would have been elsewhere.

Fifth, the fact that Paul was classed as "Paul, the aged" (v. 9) is no reason for placing this imprisonment at Rome. The apostle was near sixty years of age during his ministry at Ephesus. If he were incarcerated some time during that period of his ministry, this phrase could just as truly have applied to him then.

There is some doubt as to "Paul, the aged" being the correct interpretation of this passage. Duncan argued the contrary.

"By a simple emendation (πρεσβύτερος for πρεσβύτης) we obtain the sense of 'ambassador remarks that he is now also Christ's prisoner; and we obtain corroboratation of this interpretation when we recall how in II Corinthians (belonging to the same general period as that to which we wish to assign Philemon) Paul uses the phrase ὅτε ἐπὶ κρίσις; 'πρεσβύτεροι, 'we are ambassadors on Christ's behalf' (5:20)."  

In either case we find no support for a Roman hypothesis here.

Sixth, the fact that Luke was present when Colossians and Philemon were written and was also with Paul at Rome does not necessarily furnish ground favoring an authorship during the Roman imprisonment. Luke

accompanied Paul much of the time. As the apostle was thrown in prison often, Luke could just as easily have been present during another and an earlier imprisonment.

Having, therefore, given our objections to the arguments urged in support of Rome, we draw from the epistles themselves additional ones which declare against Rome. Visualizing again the background pictured in Part One, we point out the following, considering first those which have their bases in all four letters.

First, Paul's prison experience at Rome differed radically from the one depicted by the epistles. From them we have learned that at times the outcome of his coming trial did not look very hopeful or favorable, that his situation was frequently critical, and that his hope of securing freedom often departed from him. Such was not his state at Rome. Nothing in Acts leads us to doubt Paul's confidence in a favorable verdict at Rome; he had absolutely no reason to believe he would die there. Rome had no interest in punishing Paul; it made no charge against him; it had not arrested him on ground of a crime committed against the Roman state. Roman officers had rescued him from a Jewish mob, thereby saving his life. Roman officers had given him
particular attention, and sent him under special guard for his own protection to Caesarea. The apostle had been divinely encouraged and convinced of his safety. The Roman government was not hostile to Paul; on its own initiative he would never have been arrested. His case had been tried by two Roman governors (Felix and Festus) and one king (Agrippa), and all rendered opinions favorable to him. The reason he had been a prisoner was either to please the Jews, or to secure a bribe from him. At last, despairing of liberty so he might resume his work, Paul appealed to Caesar, expecting of course that Caesar would set him free. Festus himself confessed he had no charges against Paul to forward to Rome along with him. He requested King Agrippa to hear Paul's case for the expressed purpose of advising him what to write to Caesar as charges against him, and what he wrote was favorable to Paul. Just as Claudius Lysias had shown special kindness to Paul, so Julius, who escorted him to Rome, did likewise. The apostle was allowed to visit with friends in Sidon while the ship rested in port. At Rome Paul was given utmost consideration and was allowed to live in his own rented house for two years, having a special guard, preaching freely, and receiving all who came to him. There is no indication that the Sanhedrists ever sent delegates to
Rome; certainly they would have done so within two years if they intended to. Even if they had, Caesar would have followed Gallio's example at Corinth (Acts 21:31-40; 22:28-30). The whole atmosphere there was totally different from that of the imprisonment epistles.

Second, the epistles inform us that Paul was imprisoned as a direct result of his evangelism. This was not true of his confinement at Rome. Paul was a prisoner there before he began his preaching, for he went to Rome as such.

Third, as set forth in Chapter V, Paul maintained a very close contact with the churches of Asia when he wrote these letters. This would have been impossible from the distant city of Rome. Such a task would be trying enough today with all our modern inventions to aid. Rome was over 1,200 miles from Asia; besides the journeys on land, two sea voyages of five days were involved. Several weeks were needed to complete the journey, transportation was none too fast. Extreme danger and hardship accompanied a trip. Paul was certainly in jail closer to these churches.

Fourth, it is very unlikely that the apostle would have written letters such as these from Rome to churches in the East. For about ten years he had preached to people in this territory, "so that all they which
dwelt in Asia heard the word of the Lord Jesus" (Acts 19:10). Growing churches were established throughout that region, including Asia, Macedonia, Achaia, Galatia and others. When he left Asia, the last time, he felt that his work there was now completed. Therefore, he turned his attention to Rome. Here he wished to embark upon a new campaign of protracted preaching. When once he arrived at his new destination it would have been very unusual for him to have neglected this field and turned his attention backward to churches in Asia, especially after having definitely closed his labors there (Acts 19:21; 20:25).

The general situation simply does not fit into a Roman imprisonment. Is it likely that Paul would have spent so many years in Ephesus and the neighbouring country evangelizing, without at that time founding churches at Laodicea, Colossae, and Hierapolis, or without visiting them? In the letters these churches do not seem very old. Yet if these letters were written from Rome, we would have to suppose that Paul did nothing about them all the time he preached in Asia, but after he was many hundred miles away and years later, then he sent men back to found and shepherd churches in this locality—and all this when he was particularly interested in his new field of labor. It
does not seem reasonable, especially since we know that Paul was diligent and systematic in his evangelism.

Again we consider objections drawn from epistles individually. We start with the Epistle to the Philippians.

First, we learn from this letter that the church at Philippi sent Paul an offering, undoubtedly financial aid, which was thankfully received (Phil. 4:10,14,18). He declared: "Notwithstanding ye have well done, that ye did communicate with my affliction." Paul was therefore in need when he received this gift; it came at the proper time. Yet so far as we know, he was never in need at Rome. Felix had held Paul prisoner at Caesarea for two years hoping to extort a bribe from him for his freedom (Acts 24:26). He was treated as a gentleman of means during this period by all Roman officials. Before he arrived at Rome he was met by Christians from that city who gave him much encouragement, and who would have gladly assisted him had he been in need. Immediately the apostle rented his own private dwelling when once in Rome. This he occupied for at least two years, though he could have lived in the praetorium without expense. Apparently he needed no financial aid when at Rome. The offering from Philippi must have been sent to him on another occasion.
Second, there was a lack of harmony among the brethren in the city where Paul was imprisoned. He declared that some preached because of envy and strife (Phil. 1:15,16), and tried to increase his affliction. Factions existed; the church was divided. At Rome, however, such was not the case. There is no hint of such disputing there. Before Paul reached Rome the brethren came as far as Appi forum and the three taverns to meet him; love and tranquility seemed to hold sway. Nothing suggested a change of attitude on their part.

Third, the church at Philippi was having its own share of trouble. Besides the destructive inroads of Judaizers, internal dissension was working havoc. This situation did not fit into so late a period as that of the Roman imprisonment. By that time the church would have already emerged from its stormy period, and be growing and radiating its Christian message. Judaizers would also have been crushed. When Paul left Philippi his last time this church was thriving and operating smoothly. Such condition as pictured here points to an earlier period in his ministry.

Fourth, it has already been pointed out in connection with the illness of Epaphroditus (Phil. 2:26-28) that Paul's prison was not far from Philippi, else
news could not have traveled from the prison to Philippi and back again with such rapidity. The context implies that no messenger was dispatched with the news; aside from Roman officials and merchants little traveling was done between Rome and the East; and rumors could not have been carried that fast. In fact Epaphroditus seemed not to have wanted the people at Philippi to know of his condition until he could return and reveal it himself. Since they had already heard of his severe illness he returned home sooner than he had anticipated, in order to quiet his friend's sorrowings over him. This could not have occurred as it did if Paul were located at Rome.

Fifth, there is absolutely no testimony favoring the presence at Rome of the friends and companions of Paul who are named in this epistle. Timothy was along when Philippians was written. Him, Paul intended to send to Philippi. Likewise Epaphroditus, the messenger, was there. All textual proof that these men were at Rome has been taken from the imprisonment epistles themselves, from Titus, and from First and Second Timothy, after assuming that these letters were sent from Rome. Then too, why was there no greeting sent from Luke, who was a native of Philippi and certainly with Paul at Rome?
Sixth, in this epistle the apostle stated:

"Nevertheless to abide in the flesh is more needful for you. And having this confidence, I know that I shall abide and continue with you all for your furtherance and joy of faith" (Phil. 1:24,25). Now why would Paul send such a statement from Rome, especially when he was aged and nearing the end of his life? Had his previous efforts at Philippi been in vain? In spite of all his efforts there, the several evangelists produced by this church, and its growth in Christian love even to the extent of sending missionary offerings to Paul, would he never be able to wean this babe and teach it to walk alone? Surely he had better success at Philippi than that! When Paul was a prisoner at Rome this church was able to go on without him. These words were undoubtedly from an earlier period of the apostle's life, from another imprisonment, when his supervision was sadly needed, when this church was still in its infancy and demanded his care.

The epistle to the Colossians furnishes these additional objections to a Roman authorship. First, several companions were with Paul when he wrote Colossians, namely, Timothy, Epaphras, Aristarchus, Mark, Jesus called Justus, Tychicus, Onesimus, Demas and Luke. It has been observed from the history of these men that,
with an exception of Luke and possibly Aristarchus, there is no evidence that they were ever in Rome. Of course if we assume that these epistles were written from Rome, we beg the argument and manufacture our own evidence.

Second, we know definitely that Aristarchus was a prisoner along with Paul (Col. 4:10). Conceding that he may have gone to Rome, what reason is there to suppose that he would have been arrested there? Why would Rome seize peaceable friends of Paul when it had not arrested him on its own desire? The apostle was treated kindly at the capital city; friends were allowed to visit him; and none were endangered for doing so. But in this case, we would also have to suppose that after Aristarchus was arrested, he was courteously allowed to stay in the private home of Paul. Aristarchus witnesses against Rome.

Third, the fact that the apostle's prison seemed to be quite close and accessible to the Colossian church adds additional objections to the city of Rome being the apostle's place of imprisonment.

Fourth, the great conflict endured, as alluded to in Colossians 2:1, was not natural to the situation at Rome. The confinement there was not so close, confining or serious.
Fifth, according to this epistle Paul was exercising quite an efficient supervision over the church at Colossae. This task would have been impossible from Rome; the persons involved moved too freely and easily--Epaphras coming to Paul from Colossae, Tychicus and Onesimus going to Colossae with this letter, Mark intending to depart for that distant town, Archippus encouraged in his work. Rome was too far away for this.

It has been suggested that there are no implications or suggestions in the epistle to Ephesians which would support its composition at Rome. There are several, however, which tend to prove the opposite.

First, if this epistle were sent to Laodicea, it is unlikely that it was written from Rome. Paul's interests were then in Italy, and even farther west; he hoped he could go to Spain (Rom. 15:24,28). His face pointed westward, not eastward. At that time Laodicea would have been most remote from the apostle's mind, especially since it was a church which he had neither founded nor seen. It is far more likely that he would have visited this church or written to it while he was in Asia, provided he were interested at all.

Second, on the other hand if this letter were written to the church at Ephesus, the evidence against
Rome is still stronger. We are led to believe that the apostle was personally unacquainted with the people of this church (Eph. 1:15; 2:1-4). In that case Ephesians was issued prior to Paul's coming to Ephesus, before he knew anyone there. But such a conclusion conflicts with what we know about the whole situation, for Paul begun the church in that city. By the time he was taken to Rome, he was well acquainted with the brethren there, having spent some three years in Christian service in and around Ephesus.

One can be quite certain that Paul would have never written a letter to Ephesus from any place without sending at least a few personal greetings, as he did in his other letters. Nevertheless, Ephesians contained no personal greetings at all, though he possessed many intimate friends in that city. If this were sent to another church, such as at Laodicea, this objection disappears, although in such a case it would not have been penned at Rome.

Third, Tychicus was the messenger who carried this document (Eph. 6:21), as he did those to Colossians and Philemon, but this man never was at Rome.

The epistle to Philemon is next. What objections does it have to offer which have not been touched upon already?
First, there is additional proof that Paul's prison was not far distant from Colossae—the short time (season, hour, short time—ὑπαρχοντα v.15) elapsing between the flight of Onesimus and his return to Philemon. Rome could not fit into this picture as being the city to which Onesimus fled.

Second, Paul's request that Philemon prepare him a place to lodge, because he intended to visit Colossae soon, certainly points to a period earlier in the apostle's life (v.22). One is pretty sure of himself when he places a reservation for lodging. If Paul issued this request from Rome, with his trial unsettled and held as a prisoner, it would have sounded ridiculous. In fact, because he could not conceive of such an expression sent from Rome being taken seriously, Zahn held that this request was a humorous thrust at Philemon's liberality. But the tone of this letter is too serious for puns; Paul was in earnest. He intended to visit Philemon, for he was interested in the future of Onesimus.

Third, there is no conceivable reason for suspecting that Epaphras, even though he had visited Rome, would have been arrested in that city (Philemon 23).

Fourth, the presence on this occasion of Epaphras, Mark, Luke, Demas, Timothy and Aristarchus witness against Rome. With the exception of Luke and possibly Aristarchus, these men, so far as we are able to learn, were never at Rome; and, therefore, this letter could not have originated there. This same contention has been urged with reference to Philippians and Colossians.

Judging from the circumstantial background as reconstructed from these epistles themselves, the arguments which definitely point toward Rome as being the place where they were composed are very few in number and frail in strength. Objections to this city, on the other hand, are many and serious; the findings are against Rome. We are forced to conclude, therefore, that Paul did not write the imprisonment epistles at Rome, and are required to look elsewhere for a possible place of authorship.
PART III

DISCUSSION OF THE ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST AN EPHESIAN AUTHORSHIP OF THE IMPRISONMENT EPISTLES OF PAUL
What was done in Part II with reference to Rome, we shall endeavor to do in this section with the city of Ephesus. Is it probable that Paul wrote his imprisonment epistles from that city? Such an hypothesis raises many problems which demand solving, and necessitates a search into the events leading up to and including Paul's Ephesian ministry, the probability of an imprisonment there, and a study of the arguments for and against the authorship of these letters at Ephesus. To this task we now devote our attention.

Chapter X
Historical Account of Paul's Ephesian Ministry

Although Paul had constantly longed and planned to prosecute an extended missionary program in Asia radiating from Ephesus as the center and headquarters of his activity, the Holy Spirit, for some unknown reason, did not permit him to do so until his third missionary journey. The record reads: "Now when they had gone throughout Phrygia and the region of Galatia (both being regions of the Roman province of Galatia), and were forbidden of the Holy Ghost to preach the word
in Asia" (Acts 16:6). Accordingly Paul left the evan­gelization of Asia until later.

Paul's procedure in missionary activity indicates that he had adopted a systematic method of steadily developing his work. For convenience sake it is probable that he centered each missionary drive in a province at a time using the capital of the province for his headquarters. Accordingly on his first journey, he covered the province of Galatia; on his second tour, the province of Macedonia; and being driven hence, he proceeded to that of Achaia, using its capital as his base, and remaining there for a year and a half. On his third trip he evangelized the province of Asia and utilized Ephesus for his headquarters in a province-wide missionary program. No doubt he had long before perceived the central importance of Ephesus for this work. Just why his plans had to be altered on his second tour, we cannot but surmise.

At Corinth Paul lived with a Jew and his wife, Aquilla and Priscilla, who had recently come from Rome (Acts 18:2). They left Corinth with Paul, and sailed with him for Syria (Acts 18:18). While on his way to Jerusalem he stopped at Ephesus for a short time, and "he himself entered into the synagogue,
and reasoned with the Jews. When they desired him to tarry longer time with them, he consented not; but bade them farewell, saying, "but I will return again unto you, if God will. And he sailed from Ephesus" (Acts 18:19-21). At least the apostle had begun his work at Ephesus and most likely had gained a few converts.

To cultivate this seed during the absence, he left Aquilla and Priscilla behind (Acts 18:19). Perhaps this was why he brought them from Corinth. Already he had been forming his plans for evangelizing Asia, and saw the assistance these two would lend him in its accomplishment.

Aquilla and Priscilla were not idle during the apostle's absence. At least one conversion to their credit is recorded—"And a certain Jew named Apollos, born at Alexandria, an eloquent man, and mighty in the scriptures, came to Ephesus. This man was instructed in the way of the Lord; and being fervent in the spirit, he spake and taught diligently the things of the Lord, knowing only the baptism of John. And he began to speak boldly in the synagogue: whom when Aquilla and Priscilla had heard, they took him unto them, and expounded unto him the way of the Lord more perfectly. And when he was disposed to pass into Achaia, the brethren wrote, exhorting the disciples to receive him: who, when he
was come, helped them much which had believed through grace: for he mightily convinced the Jews, and that publickly, shewing by the scriptures that Jesus was Christ" (Acts 18:24-28). Being Jews, Aquila and Priscilla could work through the Synagogue, although a small church was already formed; the "brethren" at Ephesus wrote to Corinth on behalf of Apollos.

When Paul began his third journey, his destination was Ephesus. That he was anxious to launch his missionary activity in Asia we gather from Acts, for the writer hurriedly passed over all his experiences on this trip, and quickly took Paul to Ephesus. In his eagerness and haste he seldom paused with the churches on his way, churches which he had already established. The record reads: "And it came to pass, that, while Apollos was at Corinth, Paul having passed through the upper coasts came to Ephesus" (Acts 19:1).

The apostle's first task in Ephesus was to correct a few disciples who had been converted by Apollos before he had received instruction from Aquila and Priscilla. These men, about twelve in number, had not been baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, nor heard anything about the Holy Spirit. These he instructed more fully, either baptized them himself or had them baptized, and granted them, through the Holy
Spirit, the power to speak in tongues and prophesy (Acts 19:1-7).

Next Paul entered the Jewish Synagogue at Ephesus and preached Christ. The Jews apparently were not so suddenly excited here as they had been elsewhere, since Paul remained in the Synagogue teaching "for the space of three months, disputing and persuading the things concerning the kingdom of God" (Acts 19:8). As would inevitably happen sooner or later, when the Jews began to glimpse the outcome and implications of Paul's message, they started to draw away from him, and to arouse opposition to him and his work. Luke wrote: "divers were hardened, and believed not, but spake evil of that way before the multitude" (Acts 19:9).

Animosity toward the apostle finally became so strong that he was forced to separate the disciples from the Synagogue (Acts 19:9). He secured the school of one Tyrannus to use as a meeting place. Here he preached, taught and disputed daily. This continued for a period of two years (Acts 19:10). This school he used as his headquarters, but did not necessarily remain there all the time. No doubt at times he made short excursions out over various parts of the province, preaching the gospel wherever he went. Within two years his accomplish-
ments were surprising. Luke declared: "All they which dwelt in Asia heard the word of the Lord Jesus, both Jews and Greeks" (Acts 19:10). A great evangelistic meeting, province wide was in full sway. If Luke's statement be true, Paul certainly was not alone in this work. Necessarily helpers, evangelists and teachers were required, whom Paul no doubt supervised and directed from his basic center at Ephesus. Enthusiasm grew to such an extent that miracles were wrought "by the hands of Paul" (Acts 19:11,12). Though he never encouraged such procedures needlessly, it was natural at Ephesus, with its pagan and superstitious background, for religious fervor to take such a trend.

With the working of miracles, religious interest increased; the heat of it all became intensive. Certain exorcists attempted to imitate the apostle, believing him to be a magician as themselves. They soon learned the difference between Christianity and magic. Results were so disastrous to themselves that many were converted to Christ. The news circulated throughout the great city. "And fear fell on them all, and the name of the Lord Jesus was magnified. And many that believed came, and confessed, and showed their deeds. Many of them also which used curious arts brought their books together, and burned them before all men: and

Apparently the churches established throughout Asia at this period soon sufficiently developed to be able to care for themselves, since the apostle began to look about for new territory to evangelize. "After these things were ended, Paul proposed in the spirit, when he had passed through Macedonia and Achaia, to go to Jerusalem," saying, After I have been there, I must also see Rome" (Acts 19:21). So far as he was concerned his work in Asia was completed; churches filled the province. He desired to visit them all once more, those in Macedonia and Achaia too, then after a trip to Jerusalem to proceed to new territory—Rome.

The probability of Paul having several assistants while in Asia has already been noted. Luke revealed definitely the names of some. Timothy and Erastus were present at Ephesus as "two of them that ministered unto him" (Acts 19:22). These two, he sent into Macedonia on a special mission while he remained in Asia. Since they were spoken of as "two of them that ministered unto him", we are convinced that there were others. Gaius and Aristarchus were named
also, and classed as "Paul's companions in travel" (Acts 19:29). It would be only natural for the apostle to send these men on various preaching enterprises, to frequently communicate with them by letter or messenger, to instruct new churches founded by them personally or by epistle. Instruction would be most expected at such a time.

Due to the success of his Asian ministry, there eventually arose a terrific opposition to Paul among the pagan craftsmen of the city. It was natural for a reaction of some sort to follow the religious fervor that prevailed a short time ago. This time it was not from Jewish sources, though very likely such outbreaks did occur prior to this. Earlier the apostle had discontinued his teaching in the synagogue because of opposition from the Jews. What particulars evolved at such times we know not, but judging from the Jewish temperament they were severe enough. Jews may have encouraged the trouble which arose on this occasion, although the cause was commercial. Ephesus was the center of religious pagan worship. Annually, large feasts were held, and many sacrifices were made in the temple. Souvenirs were collected and taken home by the worshippers, and of course the best ones were imitations of the temple or statues of the goddess. Rich
people purchased the more expensive ones, many of which were made of silver and this traffic brought no little trade to Ephesus. To supply the demand a large guild of silversmiths were located there.

But Christianity was not conclusive to the promotion of such business. Due to Paul's labors, as men were converted to Christ, the shrine business proportionately decreased. The depression in business grew to be tremendous. If Paul were allowed to continue his mission, this trade would eventually have been ruined. Though it was a late time for action, Demetrius, a silversmith of Ephesus and one wise enough to see the natural outcome of Christian progress, aroused his guild friends to action for the sake of their trade (Acts 19:23-27). "Sirs," he addressed them in meeting, "Ye know that by this craft we have our wealth. Moreover ye see and hear, that not alone at Ephesus, but also throughout all Asia, this Paul hath persuaded and turned away much people, saying that they be no gods, which are made with hands: so that not only this our craft is in danger to be set at nought; but also the temple of the great goddess of Diana should be despised, and her magnificence should be destroyed, whom all Asia and the world worshipeth" (Acts 19:25-27). Thus he cleverly combined with commercial argument, his true one, a religious and pa-
triotic atmosphere—always a good combination in any age.

The speech of Demetrius had the effect he desired. "When they heard these things they were filled with wrath, and cried out, saying, Great is Diana of the Ephesians" (Acts 19:28). The cry for religious patriotism caught the popular ear. "The whole city was filled with confusion" (Acts 19:29), naturally so. What all happened, we are not told. A mob rapidly gathered, and two of Paul's fellow-labourers were caught, Gaius and Aristarchus, men of Macedonia who had become known and popular for their devoted evangelism in assisting Paul in Asia. They were in danger of being beaten. With one accord those in the mob rushed into the theatre, the community gathering place. They had no particular reason for going there, but acted more from instinct and emotion than from common sense. Nor knew they what to do after they were there. For two hours they noisely and foolishly cried out the greatness of their local goddess.

Fearless as ever, Paul would have entered into this frenzied mass of religious enthusiasts, both to learn their purpose of uproar and to protect his two friends. But "the disciples suffered him not" (Acts 19:30), the danger was too great. Neither did certain high officials of Asia who were friends of Paul think
such action wise, for they "sent unto him, desiring him that he would not adventure himself into the theatre" (Acts 19:30).

The mob continued in a confused manner. None seemed to know why they were present. "Some therefore cried one thing, and some another: for the assembly was confused; and the more part knew not wherefore they were come together" (Acts 19:32). Demetrius knew how to start a mob, but either he did not know how to accomplish his purpose, or else he did not care to reveal it to the populace. However, trouble was brewing.

The Jews of Ephesus were not on the best of terms with the Gentiles, and they feared this uproar might be directed against them. Something apparently had gained disfavor for them prior to this. At least they put forth a speaker on their behalf, one Alexander, but he was discourteously treated. "Alexander beckoned with the hand, and would have made his defense unto the people. But when they knew that he was a Jew, all with one voice about the space of two hours cried out, Great is Diana of the Ephesians" (Acts 29:33-34).

Finally the town clerk quieted the people and secured their attention. He reminded them that everyone in Ephesus knew that the city worshipped Diana. Her reputation was already established. Therefore, all their
outcries were useless ravings, and "seeing that these things cannot be spoken against, ye ought to be quiet, and do nothing rashly" (Acts 29:36). It was illegal to blaspheme the goddess or to rob temples, but the two men held were guilty of neither. "Wherefore if Demetrius, and the craftsmen which are with him have a matter against any man, the law is open, and there are deputies: let them implead one another. But if ye enquire anything concerning other matters, it shall be determined in a lawful assembly" (Acts 19:38,39). The clerk, therefore, declared that all things must be done legally. If no one has disobeyed the law, such action as that was out of order. He announced that there was absolutely no reason for the uproar, and warned that even they might be called in question for their action. Then he dismissed the assembly.

What happened in Ephesus after the dispersion of the mob is not known; what the outcome of the mob situation was we are left uninformed. Trouble probably followed, for such movements do not vanish without leaving traces behind. Paul's name was not mentioned at all in connection with the uproar, other than Demetrius being spurred to action because of the widespread acceptance of Paul's preaching. Whether the mob tried to catch him and failed, or why it picked the two it did is uncertain.
The situation, however, surely was tense and uncertainly dangerous for Paul and all his followers, as the warning given Paul sufficiently showed.

As soon as this uproar had ceased (Acts 20:1), Paul immediately departed from Ephesus to revisit the churches in Macedonia and Achaia, in accordance with an already old desire. From all indications, he was in a hurry to leave the city. Visiting and exhorting the churches as he passed, he proceeded to Greece where he tarried for three months. He returned to Syria by land, because the Jews laid wait for him as he was about to set sail. Several friends accompanied him, perhaps for protection—Sopater, Aristarchus, Secundus, Gaius, Timothy, Tychicus and Trophimus.

Luke joined Paul at Philippi. Together they continued the journey, remaining at Troas for seven days. Because of some unrevealed reason Paul did not stop at Ephesus, but sailed past and landed at Troas (Acts 20:16). The only explanation Luke gave for this was "because he would not spend the time in Asia: for he hastened, if it were possible for him, to be at Jerusalem the day of Pentecost" (Acts 20:16).

"And from Miletus he sent to Ephesus and called the elders of the church" (Acts 20:21). When they came to Miletus, Paul reviewed his work and struggles
among them. He reminded them that his own "hands have ministered unto my necessities, and to them that were with me" (Acts 20:34). He had preached and served faithfully, now he warned them of future pending troubles. In leaving he declared: "I know that ye all, among whom I have gone preaching the kingdom of God, shall see my face no more" (Acts 20:25). The apostle was taking his final adieu; he felt convinced that he would never again enter Asia. Under this conviction he left the province for Jerusalem.

Aside from the book of Acts, there are passages in certain of the Pauline epistles which refer to Paul while he was at Ephesus, and consequently are informative enough to require mentioning. The epistle of First Corinthians is almost universally conceded by scholars to have been written from Ephesus by Paul during his ministry there. To the Corinthians he wrote (I Cor. 16:7-10): "For I will not see you now by the way; but I trust to tarry a while with you, if the Lord permit. But I will tarry at Ephesus until Pentecost. For a door and effectual is opened unto me, and there are many adversaries. Now if Timotheus come, see that he may be among you without fear: for he worketh the work of the Lord, as I also do." This account coincides with the Acts record. Timothy was sent to visit the churches in Macedonia and Achaia (Acts 19:22). Paul was in trouble
at Ephesus with adversaries, and many of them, but the outcome was favorable to the gospel. In First Corinthians 15:32 interesting light is thrown upon his trouble with adversaries while at Ephesus—"after the manner of men I have fought with beasts at Ephesus". Could his situation at Ephesus have been as horrible and dangerous as this?

The epistles to Timothy serve to confirm what we already know. In First Timothy 1:3, Paul besought the young preacher to abide at Ephesus while he went into Macedonia, this parallels First Corinthians 16:8. Second Timothy 1:18 mentioned one Onesiphorus of Asia who ministered unto Paul at Ephesus. As Paul declared in his parting speech to the elders of Ephesus that he had labored with his hands to supply his necessities while in their city, a gift from Onesiphorus would at that time surely have been appreciated. According to Second Timothy 4:12 Paul sent Tychicus to Ephesus to care for the church during the absence of Timothy, whom he requested to come to him immediately, but where the apostle was at that time, we know not. Such was his ministry in Asia.
Chapter XI

The Hypothesis of an Ephesian Imprisonment

A careful examination of the known details of Paul's Ephesian ministry reveals no direct declaration that the apostle was ever imprisoned in that city. There was, however, severe opposition to his evangelism, and enough excitement to have produced his arrest. But until it is reasonably established that sometime during this period Paul was a prisoner in Ephesus, all arguments favoring the writing of the epistles under discussion here would be useless. Therefore, our next task is to investigate the grounds for such an hypothesis. Considerable New Testament evidence points toward such a conclusion.

First, in his Second Epistle to the Corinthians (II Cor. 11:23), the apostle claimed that compared with his traducers he had been "in prison for more frequently". Yet prior to this statement only one such experience was recorded by Acts, namely, his arrest at Philippi. Certainly Acts did not give a complete record of Paul's imprisonments. This becomes more apparent in the face of testimony of Clement of Rome that the apostle:
was "seven times in bonds". Luke mentioned only four of such occasions altogether. Where were the others? The most likely period in which to locate them was during the Ephesian ministry.

So far as it goes the evidence of Acts favors this suggestion. During Paul's stay in Ephesus the attitude of the pagan population was very threatening. The riot engineered by the silversmiths, filling the whole city with confusion, and Paul's own language concerning "the trials which befell me by the plots of the Jews" (Acts 20:19) allude to a situation that could easily have ended in the arrest of Paul. There were few periods in his life during which hostility was more fierce and imprisonment more probable than his three years residence at Ephesus. But the narrative of his experiences in this city is fragmentary and full of gaps; apparently it came from the hand of one who was not an eye witness. It is, therefore, more than probable that among the events omitted there may have been one or more imprisonments.

Second, the First Epistle to the Corinthians, written during the Ephesian ministry, reflects the extremities to which Paul was reduced during his labors at

Ephesus. He described his condition with: "Why do we also stand in jeopardy every hour?" "I die daily," "After the manner of men I fought with beasts at Ephesus." (I Cor. 15:30-32) Such language can only mean that the apostle had passed through a period of deep distress; and that he had actually been imprisoned, tried and condemned to death in the public arena. Seeing that he was still surviving at the time of writing, it is conjectured that he was either reprieved before the sentence was enforced or that the beasts, as in the case of Daniel, refused to perform their duty. But although he had for the moment escaped death, he was still in a position of grave danger and had "many adversaries" (I Cor. 16:9).

Third, there is another passage in Second Corinthians that leads one to presuppose a confinement there. Both its tone and language reveal the seriousness of Paul's position and the imminent perils which beset him. The situation had developed unfavorably. For personal safety he was forced to fly from the city before the time he had fixed for his departure. He described the situation thus: "We despaired even of life....we have had the answer (judgment) of death within ourselves....who delivered us out of so great a death" (II Cor. 1:8,9); "Pursued yet not forsaken, smitten down yet not destroyed, always
bearing about in the body the dying of Jesus" (II Cor. 4:8-10); "As dying, and, behold, we live" (II Cor. 6:9). This can only mean that Paul and his companions experienced such a condition as already alluded to in I Cor. 15:20-32. The apostle had escaped the death penalty; and this was impossible without an imprisonment.

Whether or not his imprisonment happened after he wrote First Corinthians is not of great importance here. Paul may have endured several while at Ephesus. Our great concern is that such an event did occur to him during his stay in that city.

Fourth, evidence from the epistle to Romans is especially significant here: "Salute Andronicus and Junia, my kinsmen, and my fellow-prisoners" (Rom. 16:7); and "Greet Priscilla and Aquila my helpers in Christ Jesus; who have for my life laid down their own necks" (Rom. 16:3,4). Where could these events have occurred other than at Ephesus? No doubt the apostle was thinking of recent experiences, else why would he have mentioned them at all? Since Aquila and Priscilla were with him in Asia, and since there is no reason for believing Paul suffered incarceration either in Macedonia or in Corinth, these two allusions naturally lead us to think of Ephesus.

The only definite allusions to imprisonments
in Paul's own words, outside the prison epistles, were all written during or just after the long and extraordinarily difficult mission at Ephesus.

External evidence adds additional weight to the internal arguments already offered in support of an Ephesian imprisonment. First, there is a passage in the "Monarchian Prologues" to the Epistles of Paul which is of first rate importance. These prologues are short introductions to the Pauline epistles and are published in some versions of the Vulgate. They are generally accepted as derived (with alterations) from the Pauline canon of Marcion. They were reproduced by P. Corssen, one of the greatest modern authorities on the Vulgate, and he proved convincingly that they were based on Marcionite tradition, and are therefore of considerable value as evidence of second-century beliefs. Marcion was at Sinope in Pontus little, if any later, than A.D. 100. He was apparently reported by Irenaeus to have direct relations with Polycarp, and will at all events have had some knowledge of Asiatic tradition. He came to Rome about 135 to 140. Marcion, therefore, is a witness whose testimony should have value, especially on matters concerning Asia.

Although these prologues were written originally by Marcion, some have been slightly changed or rewritten, as in the case of the prologue to Ephesians, so as to be adapted to orthodox tradition. But the one attached to Colossians had evidently been overlooked by the reviser, for its ancient phraseology exhibits features impossible to explain on any other view than that it goes back to Marcionite tradition. What vitally concerns us here is its closing phrase: "Ergo apostolus jam ligatus scribit eis ab Ephesus". Here we have the direct assertion that Colossians was written "from Ephesus" where Paul was "already a prisoner".

Second, another bit of evidence that witnesses for the imprisonment of Paul at Ephesus, and one which cannot lightly be cast aside is a traditional story contained in the fragment of the Acts of Paul. It is quoted commonly as part of the "Acts of Paul and Thekle", a document which, according to Ramsay, goes back to the second century. This was preserved by Nicephorus Callisti, and was referred to by implication in Hippolytus. Briefly, the fragment tells how the mob of the Asian capital had Paul chained and imprisoned, previously to being given to lions. Two

1. Hippolytus, Commentary on Eun. 3:29
Ephesian ladies came at night to him to be baptized; the apostle, freed from his fetters by divine power, fulfilled their wish by the sea-shore, and then returned to prison undetected. The story continues by narrating how a gigantic lion and other beasts would not touch him, and how after a terrible hailstorm the governor of the city was converted and baptized. This episode was placed before Paul's departure for Macedonia and Achaia (Acts 19:21; 20:1). Events depicted in this story are so fantastic and fanciful that most is undoubtedly more imaginary than true. But whatever may be the legendary accretions involved, if it represents a second-century tradition, as seems probable, it must have a grain of truth at its foundation, namely, an imprisonment of the apostle at Ephesus. Though it is not proof enough in itself to establish the claim, yet it must be conceded that it does afford additional evidence for the Ephesian hypothesis.¹

Third, in his Commentary on Daniel, written in the earliest years of the third century, Hippolytus remarked:² "If we believe that when Paul was condemned to the wild beasts, the lion that was loosed upon him

lay down at his feet and licked him, why should we not also believe what happened in the case of Daniel?"
This indicates that during the days of Hippolytus, it was quite a generally accepted view that Paul suffered imprisonment at Ephesus.

Fourth, it is perhaps worth mentioning that among the ruins of Ephesus is shown a building called, apparently as far back as can be traced, "The Prison of Paul". It is an old Greek tower which formed part of the line of fortifications of the ancient city. This implies an ancient local tradition, which may add some slight weight to other indications of the same sort, but to which alone not much importance can be attached.
Chapter XII

Objections to the Hypothesis of an Ephesian Imprisonment

Several objections have been raised to the above arguments that favor an Ephesian imprisonment. Among them are the following.

First, there is the silence of Luke regarding such an event in Paul's career at Ephesus. It is true that Luke did not give us a complete account of Paul's life and experiences in the Acts, and there are many gaps in his narrative. Yet it is difficult to believe that an imprisonment of the character demanded by this theory should have entirely escaped his notice. Although he was not present himself at Ephesus, he has given us a circumstantial narrative of the chief events connected with the apostle's ministry there, and was apparently in possession of authentic and accurate information. It is strange, therefore, that an event which, if it ever took place, exercised such a powerful influence upon the apostle's life and was so fruitful in literary output, should have been passed over in complete silence.

There is also other evidence in Acts which increases the difficulty of accepting an Ephesian imprison-
The apostle's address to the elders of the church of Ephesus at Miletus (Acts 20:18-38) certainly implied a period of much distress and anxiety in Ephesus, and a persecution on the part of the Jews was definitely mentioned. But there was not the slightest allusion to anything approaching the imprisonment contemplated in the Ephesian theory.

Second, if Paul did almost suffer death in the arena at Ephesus, is it conceivable that his enemies at Jerusalem would have been ignorant or silent about it? What better support could they have had for their own accusations against him, or what was more likely to prejudice him in the eyes of Felix and Festus than the record of a trial and condemnation to the arena at Ephesus? Added to this we need to remember that Ephesus was no small isolated place, and communication with Jerusalem, Antioch, or even Tarsus no very great matter.

Third, Paul's language concerning his troubles at Ephesus by no means necessitates the supposition of an Ephesian imprisonment. They are capable of explanation on other lines. For instance the phrase "I have fought with beasts at Ephesus" presents considerable difficulties if interpreted literally. Our hindrance to doing so lies in the fact of Paul's Roman citizen-
ship. If he claimed his rights as a Roman citizen, as he seems to have done successfully in every instance recorded in Acts when he came into conflict with Roman authorities, this particular form of execution could have been unable to prove his status of citizenship, for in all cases mentioned his claim was never challenged, and all we know of the state of affairs at Ephesus point to the improbability of such difficulty occurring there. At that time only heinous crimes were punished by exposure in the arena, and it is very improbable that the apostle's enemies could have trumped up such accusation against him. Roman officials had to walk warily. It would have required a fearless, if not a reckless, man to disregard the claim to citizenship once lodged by the accused, and to condemn him to the arena without first carefully examining such a contention. Paul could not have run the risk of such arbitrary treatment anyhow, since his circle of friends included men so high placed as the Asiarchs of the district. The language of this phrase, therefore, seems in favor of regarding it metaphorically.

Similarly Paul's words which speak of himself as "delivered from the mouth of the lion" (II Tim. 4:17) cannot possibly be taken literally. That Ignatius regarded the language here as metaphorical is proved by
his use of the identical word (ἵππος), which he carefully explained as referring to his trials and experiences among the soldiers, "the leopards" who guarded him. The expression "why do we also stand in jeopardy every hour?" was true of Christians generally at that time. The phrase "I die daily" is considerably more Pauline if interpreted in the spiritual sense and not as referring to physical death.

Other claims from time to time have been urged in opposition to this hypothesis, but most are hardly worth mentioning. Reasons for any position can be discovered, whether plausible or not, if one is determined to find them and searches long enough. These stated above relating to Paul's citizenship, may prove that he was not cast into the arena, but they do not disprove his imprisonment. Accepting statements metaphorically often twists them from their true meaning. Anything can be explained in any way by this method; but one questions the correctness of results thus obtained. Arguments from silence usually prove little or nothing, though in this case the silence of Luke on this matter is important enough to deserve attention. The following chapter seeks to find a reason for Luke's failing to mention this imprisonment in his document of Acts.

Chapter XIII

The Silence of Acts Regarding an Ephesian Imprisonment

Before any conclusion concerning an imprisonment of Paul at Ephesus can be reached, one problem must reasonably be solved. If Paul were in confinement there at any time, why is it that Luke failed to record that event? In our estimation here is the strongest argument of all against the Ephesian hypothesis, for if Luke had mentioned such, certainly the imprisonment epistles would have been assigned to Ephesus long ago.

First, we must not overlook other notable omissions in the Acts record. This book was not a complete and detailed record of Paul's life work. Here we quote Duncan.

"In fairness we may claim at the outset that; surprising as the omission is, its significance ought not to be exaggerated. We have already noted how colourless and curt is the summary in Acts of that busy, anxious, almost tragic period that succeeded the apostle's departure from Ephesus. How little there is in Acts corresponding to the sufferings enumerated in II Cor. 11:23 ff. 'Five times received I from the Jews the thirty-nine stripes'--Acts gives us no instance of this; 'thrice was I beaten (by the Romans) with rods'--Acts relates only one such beating, at Philippi; 'in prisons more abundantly'--up to this period Acts tells of only one imprisonment, that at Philippi; 'three times was I shipwrecked; a night and a day I was adrift at sea'--of these experiences there is not a hint in Acts. Thus, to confine ourselves here to this
one class of omissions, we may say that, whatever Luke's motive was in writing the book of Acts, it clearly was not to give an account of Paul's sufferings. It is to be noted on the other hand that Acts, on a later occasion (viz., in the address to the Ephesian elders, Acts 20: 19) preserves Paul's own testimony to the fact that he suffered grievously at Ephesus as a result of Jewish plots. Further, we may recall that in the story of the Ephesian riot there are occasional abruptnesses and incoherences (cf. the unexpected reference to Alexander, Acts 19:23, and the omission to tell the subsequent fate of Gaius, Aristarchus, and Paul, Acts 19:29), which suggest that the narrative is not complete, while the account given of the earlier Ephesian ministry is certainly scrappy. 

Among other notable omissions of Acts, we may note that, except in Paul's address before Felix, there was no mention of the collection for the Judean Christians, though Paul devoted much time and energy for its successful accomplishment. Though he stayed three whole years in Ephesus, little is told concerning his work there, of his problems, the burning of the books of magic, etc. This is equally true of his work in Galatia and elsewhere. Many were his untold experiences (II Cor. 6:4 ff.); many were his unrecorded journeys.

Although these reflections show that this omission is not exceptional, they do not provide us with an explanation of Luke's silence in regard to an

2. Rom. 15:19; II Cor. 13:1; Acts 19:10.
Ephesian imprisonment. It may be that Luke had a good reason for excluding any such reference. If so, what could it be? Thus we come to a second argument. Again, we follow Duncan (chapter 9) in presenting this argument.

The question of this omission in Acts raises a greater, namely, what was Luke's purpose in writing Acts? We waive a thorough discussion of the case, for it is bigger than we can fully deal with here, but briefly present our position. We feel that Luke wrote this work prior to Paul's trial at Rome. His purpose was to prepare for this trial and to show the judges of Paul's innocence, namely, what was in Acts.

"a statement of the rise and development of the Christian religion, designed to supply information which it was hoped might reach those who would decide the Apostle's fate at Rome."2

Acts was a defense written for Paul. Certainly it was badly lacking in historical arrangement and completeness if it were written as a record of the expansion of the Christian faith. Luke hoped to show the judges of Paul one thing in particular, that Christianity had suffered in all its stages from the hostility of a bigoted section in Judaism, but that non-Jewish officials, e.g. Pilate, Sergius Paulus, Callic, Festus, and even the Jewish Agrippa had recognized that there was nothing in it which Rome
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need fear, and above all, that there was no case against Paul. The apostle had committed no crime. Jewish accusations concerned only Jewish laws and customs, so Gallic, Claudius Lysius, Festus and Agrippa had judged. This was important in Paul's defense before Caesar, especially so since the brother of Gallic, who as deputy of Achaia (Acts 18:12-16) had pronounced Paul innocent, was chief minister to Nero. This brother was Lucius Annaeus Seneca, the Stoic philosopher and former tutor of Nero, who was just now enjoying considerable popularity at Rome. 

Now if Paul were imprisoned and freed at Ephesus by a Roman proconsul, why was he not named as in the other cases? Apparently this would be another point to strengthen his own case. Opposition from Judaism was stronger in Ephesus against Paul than at any other place outside Jerusalem, and yet Christianity had grown, and won the sympathy and protection of responsible officials there. The proconsul of Asia resided here. But not once did Luke mention a Roman official in connection with Ephesus, or that his own case ever occupied the proconsul's attention. Why? It might be well to know just who this proconsul was.

The Annals of Tacitus furnish us with some
interesting information on this point.1 When Nero began his reign in A.D. 54, Junius Silanus, a great-great-grandson of Augustus, was proconsul of Asia. Popular rumors indicated that the people preferred "a man of ripe age, of blameless life and noble blood" as emperor, rather than the young boy Nero. This reference was undoubtedly to Silanus. To protect her son as emperor and to prevent Silanus avenging the murder of his brother, Lucius, Agrippina had Silanus secretly poisoned at a banquet. Publius Celer, a Roman knight, and a freedman called Helius administered the poison. These two men we are told "had charge of the Emperor's affairs in Asia". In each senatorial province like Asia there was not only a proconsul, who officially represented the senate, but also a procurator Caesars, appointed by the Emperor and representing his interests in every province. During the reign of Claudius the power of such representatives of Caesar was increased until they rivaled the provincial proconsuls. Celer and Helius were rewarded for their deed, and it is probable that together they exercised proconsular authority in Asia, after the murder of Silanus, until the new proconsul arrived.

1. Tacitus, *Annals*, Book XII.

* Dio Cassius*, lxi. 6; 4, 5.
Now Paul was in Ephesus from approximately A.D. 53 to A.D. 56. Silanus would, therefore, have been the proconsul who tried his case. His imprisonment and trial would have occurred prior to Silanus's murder in 54. All this happened before the Demetrius riot in Ephesus, for the town clerk quieted the mob by a strange reference to "proconsuls", in the plural, (Acts 19:38) to whom they could appeal in case of any grievance. No doubt he referred to Celer and Helius who were then the temporary proconsuls. Paul left Ephesus quickly after this riot. Perhaps he wanted to avoid trouble with these two authorities. For the same reason too he did not stop at Ephesus on his return voyage (Acts 20:16).

If the book of Acts is a document designed for Paul's defense before Nero, it is apparent why Luke would omit all allusion to the name of Silanus. This name was just not politic to use. He was still remembered as the first of the many victims of Nero's reign. His name would produce unpleasant thoughts in Nero, by recalling horrible deeds of the past, and might do the worst possible service to Paul in his trial. Such reference would have been doubly unfortunate if at the time

of the trial Helius, who supervised the affairs of Nero in Rome and Italy (A.D. 67-69) while Nero went on a tour to Greece, were now in Rome and had the ear of the Emperor.

A third probable reason why Luke remained mute regarding a trial before Silanus, is that this proconsul may for some reason have decided the case against Paul. If so, here would be an exception to the general attitude of Roman officials toward Paul. This would account also for Paul's extreme depressive and gloomy outlook in certain passages of the imprisonment epistles. If we can believe part of the traditional story "Acts of Paul" this is exactly what did happen. Paul was tried and condemned to the arena, from which death he was miraculously delivered.
Arguments Favoring Ephesus as the Place of Composition of the Imprisonment Epistles of Paul

Thus far we have examined the imprisonment epistles of Paul and have seen that they could not have been written from Rome. In addition, we have established the probability that Paul was in prison at Ephesus, at least for awhile, and sometime during his ministry in that city. We turn our attention to these epistles again to see how well their setting fits into the apostle's Ephesian ministry. Can these epistles have been written from Ephesus? It is our belief that they were, or at least from some town in Asia. But since Paul spent so much time at Ephesus, since it was the capital of the province, because of his serious troubles there, and as there is no definite record of an imprisonment in any other city of Asia which suits the situation so well, we decide upon Ephesus. The most likely city in Asia for such would have been Ephesus. Nevertheless, let us proceed with the arguments. This chapter contains those which favor Ephesus as the place of their composition. Those drawn from all four epistles come first.
First, all four epistles were written to cities either in or very near the province of Asia. Consequently we would expect them to be issued when the apostle was most vitally interested in the growth of Christianity of this region. This would have been during Paul's two year ministry at Ephesus.

Second, we have noticed the letters were written during a great evangelistic drive. We have learned from Acts that such occurred during Paul's stay at Ephesus. He disputed for three months in the synagogue of this city (Acts 19:8); he taught for two years in the school of Thrannus (Acts 19:10); "All they which dwelt in Asia heard the word of the Lord Jesus, both Jews and Greeks" (Acts 19:10); "so mightily grew the word of God and prevailed" (Acts 19:20) that magic books amounting to fifty thousand pieces of silver were burned; several helpers of Paul were named as being with him in Asia (Acts 19:22; 19:29); and conversions became so numerous that the silversmiths' business, which thrived on pagan religious practices, was threatened with destruction. The fervor and atmosphere of this Ephesian missionary drive agrees admirably with that of these four epistles.

Third, the epistles indicate that Paul was imprisoned as a direct result of his missionary en-
deavors. If he were imprisoned at Ephesus, as we feel sure he was, it could have been for no other reason than this. It was the success of his preaching which aroused Demetrius and his guild friends (Acts 19:23-27). To distinguish themselves from the Christians, Alexander, the Jew, attempted to address the mob started by the silversmiths' guild. The city clerk in quieting the people, defended Zeus and Aristarchus, friends and helpers of the apostle, on the ground that they had broken no religious law (Acts 19:37).

Fourth, we would expect an imprisonment of the apostle at Ephesus to be such as that set forth by these epistles. Jewish opposition to Paul was nowhere stronger outside Jerusalem than it was at Ephesus. But in this city Jews were citizens as well as Gentiles. Such being the case a trial would be more severe for Paul at Ephesus than elsewhere. The Jews were trying extremely hard to kill the apostle (Acts 20:3). What influence they possessed at Ephesus would certainly be used against him. So the outcome of his trial would remain uncertain, fluctuating between freedom and execution.

1. Ramsay, The Letters to the Seven Churches, Chapter XIII.
Fifth, the letters under consideration indicate that Paul maintained a very close contact with the churches of Asia at the time they were issued. Such would be quite easy with the apostle located at Ephesus. With this city as his headquarters he could dispatch messages or instruction to evangelists, write letters, embark on short preaching trips over the province, and reach the churches quickly.

Sixth, various reasons taken from these epistles have led us to believe that Paul was imprisoned somewhere close to Philippi and Colossae and Laodicea. Ephesus fulfills this condition. It is just a few days journey from any part of Asia.

Seventh, in the epistles many friends were named as being with Paul. Already it has been indicated that with the exception of Luke and possibly Aristarchus, the others were never in Rome, that is judging from our evidence. But we have definite testimony that they all were with him in Asia. The discussion of these men in Chapter VI has demonstrated this clearly enough.

What additional reasons do these letters furnish individually for assigning this authorship to Ephesus? The epistle to Philippians reveals the following.
First, the offering which the church at Philippi sent Paul (Phil. 4:16-18), was very likely to have been given during his Ephesian ministry. The apostle needed financial help during that period for he labored with his hands for a living (Acts 20:34). The distance from Philippi to Ephesus was short, and loyalty to Paul was still intense and fresh.

Second, the lack of harmony among the brethren in the city of this imprisonment suits Ephesus admirably. It is not at all improbable that Apollos left special friends at Ephesus, gained through his eloquence, as he possessed at Corinth (I Cor. 1:12). If so, they may have caused Paul as much trouble there as the others did at Corinth. We would expect Judaizers in the Ephesian Church, due to the thousands of Jews at Ephesus, just as there were at Jerusalem; these would oppose Paul strenuously. A certain group was awaiting an opportunity to act, for the apostle warned the elders in his departing speech: "For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them" (Acts 20:29). This warning suggests more than it reveals, but one thing is
clear—the brethren at Ephesus were not all "of one heart and of one soul".

Third, this epistle expressed the apostle's intention of visiting Philippi shortly (Phil. 1:26; 2:24). His plans here correspond exactly with his movements when he left Ephesus after his evangelism there. Luke stated Paul's purpose (Acts 19:21), during the latter part of his stay in Ephesus, of going from there to Macedonia and Achaia, that is to Philippi and Corinth. This purpose he carried out (Acts 21:1). The statement is very concise; Paul's own words corroborate it in detail (II Cor. 2:13; 7:5). In addition, his plan of visiting Macedonia after leaving Ephesus was stated in I Cor. 16:5 and II Cor. 1:16. Since Phil. 1:25-27 and 2:24 declare the same plan, and Acts 20:1f., II Cor. 2:12f., and 7:5 announce its fulfillment, there is a strong presumption that the imprisonment preceding this visit to Macedonia occurred at Ephesus.

Fourth, the internal dissension in the church at Philippi (Phil. 2:12), especially that engineered by Judaizers, point to a date paralleling Paul's stay in Asia. Opposition from this source had increased since his first missionary journey. In every town Judaizers blockaded his progress as well as attacked him after he had passed on to other cities. Attempts were made upon his
life (Acts 20:3). Such opposition led him to Jerusalem at the close of his first journey; the same problem was dealt with in letters which were written during his Eastern ministry, namely, Galatians, Romans, I and II Corinthians. It would be natural for Judaizing influence to be at its height during this period when it was also strongest in neighboring cities. Furthermore, as this church was yet in its infant stage, we would expect more trouble and difficulty during this period than we would later, after the church was well established and strong.

Fifth, if the apostle's proposal to send Timothy shortly to Philippi (Phil. 2:19, 20) was fulfilled in Acts 19:22, as was very likely the case, the imprisonment referred to in this epistle was prior to Timothy's departure, and would therefore be placed at Ephesus.

Sixth, "Caesar's household", mentioned in Philippians 4:22, favors Ephesus as much as it does any other city. This phrase did not refer to the immediate family of Caesar. Rather it meant

"the entire force of slaves and attendants of every sort, attached in any capacity to the imperial menage, whether at the time resident in Rome or elsewhere."

Any servant of Caesar, slaves and freedmen, looking after

his master's personal interests in any province, living at Rome or elsewhere, was part of his household. Such individuals in a foreign city would naturally come together in some form of association. There is inscriptionsal evidence from Ephesus showing that such "collegia libertorum et servorum domini nostri Augusti" existed there.¹ At Ephesus, Paul, as a prisoner, would have opportunity to make contacts with these persons, "Caesar's household".

Seventh, the "praetorium" (Phil. 1:13) also favors the Ephesian origin of these epistles as much as it does any origin. We have seen that this term was constantly applied to any royal residence or palace of Roman governors.² It was "the headquarters of the praetor, the general of the army or the military governor."³ ⁴

Ephesus, being the capital of the province of Asia, demanded the presence of a praetorium there. In this Paul was imprisoned; in this also "Caesar's household" lodged.

Eighth, the rapidity with which news traveled between Paul and Philippi points toward Ephesus as be-
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ing the place where the apostle was. Since this imprisonment the following had occurred: (a) news concerning it had traveled to Philippi (Phil. 1:5-7); (b) this church had sent an offering to Paul by Epaphroditus (Phil. 4:16-18); (c) Epaphroditus had become seriously ill, and news of this incident had reached Philippi (Phil. 2:26); (d) Paul had heard of the resulting grief of the people at Philippi (Phil. 2:25,26)—and all this so quickly. The journey from Ephesus to Philippi required only about one week's travel, and admirably suits these circumstances. Ephesus. From

Minth, Paul's words, "Nevertheless to abide in the flesh is more needful for you. And having this confidence, I know that I shall abide and continue with you all for your furtherance and joy of faith" (Phil. 1:24,25), are appropriate when considered in the light of an Ephesian authorship. At that time this church was young and needed the apostle's fatherly advice and supervision; it had not learned to walk alone.

The epistle to the Colossians furnishes these additional reasons favoring an Ephesian authorship.

First, just as we would expect the church there to have been organized during the Asian ministry of Paul, if it be true as some passages indicate (Col. 1:4-6,9-12) that the church was quite young when the epistle was
written, then it must have been issued from Ephesus.

Second, as Paul had not as yet visited this church at Colossae (Col. 2:1), this letter must have been issued sometime during his stay in Asia. He could not imagine Paul leaving Asia without visiting all the churches there, especially if he were interested in them enough to write.

Third, this epistle leads us to believe that the apostle exercised the general surveillance of this church at Colossae. If this be true, he certainly must have been located at Ephesus. From this city such a task could be efficiently administered, since it was the capital of Asia, and roads connected it with all parts of the province.

Fourth, Colossians 4:10 indicated that Aristarchus was a prisoner along with Paul. Luke definitely relates (Acts 19:29) one arrest of Aristarchus at Ephesus. Evidently he was well known as a Christian leader to the people of this city, and could have been arrested and imprisoned with Paul here because of the gospel. Perhaps it was subsequent to this arrest of Aristarchus when the apostle was cast into chains; perhaps Demetrius and the craftsmen did implead him, following the suggestion of the town clerk (Acts 19:28).
Fifth, the great conflict of Colossians 2:1 would have been natural to the turbulent situation at Ephesus, judging from conditions related.

Sixth, Onesimus, the fugitive slave, mentioned in Colossians 4:9, was more likely to have fled to the city of Ephesus than elsewhere. This city was easily accessible to him, being just a few hundred miles from Colossae, his home, as he himself was poor. Moreover, this city was very large, containing thousands of inhabitants. Among its residents he could easily find refuge from his master. Either he fled for freedom.

From the epistle to the Ephesians several more reasons supporting an authorship at Ephesus are obtained.

First, if this letter was written to the church at Laodicea, and is to be identified with the one referred to in Colossians 4:16, everything we know about it points toward an Ephesian authorship. His missionary campaign in Asia would furnish him an incentive for writing, even though he were unacquainted with the brethren of this church, and also give him authority to instruct them, as he was the instigator and director of the whole drive. One would suppose, however, that Paul became better acquainted with them
before he closed his evangelism in this province.

Second, his tribulation (Eph. 2:13), as pointed out in the epistle to Colossians, is better understood if Paul uttered such words while imprisoned at Ephesus.

Third, Tychicus could easily have carried this letter from Ephesus (Eph. 6:21), for he was a native of Asia (Acts 20:5).

Fourth, one other reason might be mentioned for assigning the authorship of this letter to Ephesus. If Paul sent it to Laodicea, it must have been dispatched before the great earthquake which occurred about A.D. 61. According to Tacitus, this happened in the seventh year of Nero's reign, and it destroyed Laodicea. Eusebius stated that the earthquake affected Hierapolis and Colossae as well. Such a catastrophe would surely at least have been mentioned by Paul; yet he made no reference to it. The letter was written before the tragedy, and therefore Ephesus must have been its place of composition.

Turning our attention to Philemon we observe the following additional arguments.

First, what has already been said about Onesimus applies equally well here. Paul interceded on his behalf and sent him back to his master, accom-
panied by Tychicus (verse 12; Col. 4:7).

Second, Paul's request "prepare me also a lodging" (Philemon 22) is understandable if written from Ephesus. This city was not far from Colossae; only a few days travel were necessary for a completion of a journey from city to city. It has been suggested before that one would expect such a visit from Paul while he was working in Asia and before he left the province.

Third, if "Paul, the aged" be the correct translation of verse nine, it could apply correctly to the apostle's condition while at Ephesus. He was about sixty years old then, and judging from his troubles was feeling older still.

Fourth, one could easily understand how Epaphras could be arrested at Ephesus (Philemon 23). We know that at least Aristarchus and Caius (Acts 19:29) were. If the Jewish element at Ephesus would have combined with the silversmiths, it is very probable that many Christian leaders would have been thrown into jail. Something similar may have been done. At least Epaphras was more likely to have been imprisoned here than at Rome.
Chapter XV

Arguments Opposing Ephesus as the Place of Authorship of the Imprisonment Epistles of Paul

Just as the preceding chapter set forth arguments supporting Ephesus, so the present chapter contains those which oppose such an hypothesis. What good reasons can we find in these letters that definitely point elsewhere to their place of authorship? We are forced to say that unless we presuppose and imagine too much, there are few such arguments.

The best reason for assigning them to another place is the uncertainty of an Ephesian imprisonment. It is nowhere declared that Paul was ever imprisoned at Ephesus. But as this objection has been sufficiently answered, there is no need of discussing it further here.

Another objection is an argument from silence. It is urged that since there is no reference in these letters to the "collection for the saints" at Jerusalem, they must have been written during another period of the apostle's life. There is abundant evidence that the one practical matter upon which the whole mind of the apostle was bent during his ministry of Galatia,
Asia, Macedonia and Achaia was the contribution from the Gentile churches towards the needs of the Jewish Christians of Jerusalem. The subject was referred to in letters we know to have been written at this juncture and in such a way as to reveal how near to the heart of Paul this matter lay. Is it not strange that the apostle, with his mind full of this Christian duty, should write to churches and pass it over in complete silence?

The presence of two of Paul's intimate companions during this imprisonment testify against Ephesus. These are Luke and Mark (Philemon 24; Col. 4:10,14). There is good ground to believe that Luke was not with the apostle during his ministry at Ephesus. If the use of "we" in the Acts record is a sound guide to his movements, it would seem that he was left behind at Philippi after Paul's first visit to that city and did not rejoin the apostle until he visited Philippi the last time (Acts 20:6). Again we would hardly expect to find Mark among the apostle's most valued companions during his stay at Ephesus, since it was so soon after the breach between Paul and Barnabas over the same young evangelist (Acts 15:27-41).

The epistle to Philippians offers one objection to Ephesus. It has indicated that there was division
among the brethren in the city where Paul was incarcerated, yet we have no sure foundation for believing that such was the case at Ephesus. There may have been an Apollos party at Ephesus, but the suggestion is a mere conjecture. On the other hand Acts gives us a picture of a church of Ephesus which was singularly united and actuated by the most friendly feelings towards the apostle. There is in the address at Miletus not a word hinting at any disloyalty or motives of the character implied in the epistle to the Philippians. How active the Judaizers were in this church is doubtful.

A fifth objection is found in the epistles to Colossians and Philemon, namely the presence of Onesimus with Paul. The proximity of Ephesus to Colossae tells strongly against the idea that Onesimus would naturally have fled to that city. In Ephesus he ran constant risk of recognition and detection. Evidently his master, Philemon, visited Ephesus frequently, for here he had met Paul and was converted (Philemon 19). Certainly Onesimus would have fled to some other city.

If we are to take πρεσβύτης in Philemon 9 in its natural sense as "the aged" it would seem to point to a period toward the close of Paul's life rather than to the time when he was still in full possession of his vigor and activity. This holds true even recognizing
the fact that Paul was near sixty at the time he preached in Asia. If the word is just another form of προσβεβή, however, this argument no longer holds.

Another objection taken from the language of the epistle to the Ephesians has been urged by Maurice Jones.

"If the apostle was writing from Ephesus to a church in the vicinity, how can we account for the impersonal distant tone of its language and its peculiar hesitating phraseology as applied to the readers? 'If so be ye have heard of that grace of God given to me to you-ward' (Eph. 3:2); 'I also having heard of the faith in the Lord Jesus which is among you' (Eph. 1:15); 'If so be that ye have heard him and were taught in him' (Eph. 4:21). We should expect a much more vivid, personal, and intimate relation between Paul and his readers if he was actually a prisoner in the near neighbourhood.'

Absence of personal greetings reinforces this charge. However, if he was unacquainted as yet with those to whom he wrote such language was quite natural. This objection is therefore, not a serious one.

conclusion

By way of summary, we have analyzed the imprisonment epistles of Paul to find out just what historic facts and conditions accompanied these letters. In the light of the circumstances discovered, both Rome and Ephesus were considered as possible places of authorship.

Rome, it was found, had few arguments to really support its claim. The fact that Paul positively suffered imprisonment in that city was its strongest, and no doubt this was the chief ground for uncritical tradition to settle upon Rome. It is probable also that the romantic atmosphere that has constantly shrouded the Capital of the Empire along with Roman Catholic sentiment has been instrumental in forming and perpetuating the traditional view. But if the authorship of these epistles be placed there, a host of enormous difficulties immediately arise from the writings themselves which simply cannot be reconciled to the situation, unless one has more imagination than critical faculty. Those who have favored Rome in the past surely did not adequately analyze and consider the historical and geographical factors involved.

On the other hand, almost every difficulty
presented naturally disappears if these letters were written at Ephesus. The setting back of them parallels surprisingly well what we know of Paul's Ephesian Ministry. Geographical objections are removed. The only real objection advanced against such hypothesis is our lack of a definite declaration that the apostle was arrested and imprisoned there. However, we do have considerable evidence which hints quite convincingly that such did occur. Also, there seems to have been substantial reasons why Luke remained silent about this incident.

Our conclusions, therefore, are: 1. These imprisonment epistles absolutely do not fit a Roman authorship. 2. Paul was imprisoned at Ephesus sometime during his Ephesian Ministry. 3. Since these epistles suit an Ephesian authorship better than they do any other thus far advanced, they were undoubtedly written from that city. Perhaps new light will be thrown upon this subject with the advance of New Testament scholarship.
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