

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *The Expository Times* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_expository-times\\_01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php)

pdfs are named: [Volume]\_[Issue]\_[1<sup>st</sup> page of article].pdf

## The Pastorals and a Second Trial of Paul.

BY THE REVEREND F. R. MONTGOMERY HITCHCOCK, D.D., MALDON.

IT was Paul's plan to visit Spain after Rome. Of his intention to visit Rome we hear frequently (Ro 1<sup>11</sup>, 13 15<sup>23</sup>, Ac 19<sup>21</sup>; cf. 2 Co 10<sup>16</sup>). But he did not intend to stay. He would not build upon another's foundation (Ro 15<sup>20</sup>), a sentiment that would be appreciated by Romans whose Romulus legend was connected with another's *foundation*. In 2 Co 10<sup>16</sup>, referring to the same purpose to preach the gospel in 'the parts beyond,' which would include Rome and Spain, he used a different term—'line' (καρών). His resolution is fixed, but the time is not yet. 'Whosoever (ὡς ἄν) I proceed to Spain' (Ro 15<sup>24</sup>). 'For I hope on my passage through to see you and to have a send-off from you on my journey there.' Here he used a word (διαπορευόμενος) which Polybius had used (iii. 68) of the legions that passed through Rome on their march to meet Hannibal. He also alludes to the Roman custom of escorting distinguished persons to their offices (προπεμφθῆναι). This term also conveys the temporary nature of his visit, and that his sphere of action lies beyond Rome. He is now proceeding with his collection (εὐλογία, 2 Co 9<sup>5</sup>) to Jerusalem; and lest they should be jealous, he adds, 'I shall make my way back through you to Spain, and am sure I shall come to you with a full blessing (εὐλογία) of Christ.' In Ac 19<sup>21</sup>, 'After I have been there (J) I must also see Rome,' he said nothing about this projected visit to Spain, not wishing to make the Ephesians jealous. They would have been more jealous of the visit to Spain than the Romans, the eastern markets being in keen competition with the western, which the Romans naturally favoured as Romanized. This may be the reason why nothing is recorded of Paul's visit to the West. We have to take into account not merely the jealousy of Gentile and Jew, but also the jealousy of Roman and Greek. The feeling against Greeks was intense in the Roman world in those days and later, and in Romanized districts like Spain and Gaul, and was heartily reciprocated by the Greeks, who refused to be Romanized.

When Paul wrote Ro 15 his idea was to return and visit Spain, taking Rome on the way. So far, he says, he has in preaching 'proceeded from Jerusalem round about, even to Illyricum' (v. 19), meaning that he has done his duty to the eastern portion of the Empire, and would now turn to the western. The question is, would Paul, whose

purpose had been delayed by two long periods of imprisonment, have carried out his plan when released? This assumes that he was released, an assumption based upon the following considerations:

(1) The Acts ends on a ringing note of optimism: 'proclaiming the kingdom of God and teaching the things concerning the Lord Jesus Christ with complete liberty and without hindrance' (μετὰ πάσης παρρησίας ἀκωλύτως). How easy to add a short sentence regarding His death, if it happened. There were no reasons practical or political for silence. But, if release followed, it would be a well-known fact unnecessary to mention, for the writer intended to write a third volume, Ac 1<sup>1</sup>, meaning 'the first' (πρῶτον) not 'the former' treatise. So at the end of Acts we stand on the verge of something new for Paul and the Church. Luke stops, like writers of serials, at a situation pregnant with life and interest. His clear-cut period of two completed years stands out in his memory against some background so important as to need a book for itself. He knew what happened.

(2) The precise way in which he mentions this period, 'he abode two whole years (διετία ὅλη) in his own hired house' (Ac 28<sup>30</sup>), implies that after those two years he did not abide in his own hired house but had moved out of it. Where? This exact period corresponds with other fixed periods in Acts, e.g. 'a year and six months' (18<sup>11</sup>), 'two years' (19<sup>10</sup>), 'two full years' (24<sup>27</sup>). In all these places the aorist denotes that the period mentioned came to an end, and another began. The precise measurement of the period in question implies that something happened at the end. What? What would a Roman understand? Surely release. In the *Hecyra* of Terence (i. ii. 12) a woman says, 'I endured him for two complete years' (*biennium perpetuum*). She says nothing about release, but it is understood. As nothing is said to the contrary, we are entitled to infer a release here.

(3) What a splendid ending to Paul's story and conclusion to the Acts if Luke could have closed his records with an account of Paul's martyrdom, which would have suitably followed that of Stephen and James! Such a climax would have appealed to Luke's artistic sense, but instead he presents us

with the apostle's uncontrolled liberty of speech as his climax.

(4) What we think happened was this. When Paul was released after his trial, conditionally upon leaving Rome, Luke would have accompanied him to a port east or west of Rome, and then withdrawn to Philippi, and Paul was on his way to rejoin him in Macedonia when he begged Timothy to remain in Ephesus (1 Ti 1<sup>3</sup>). This would leave time for a visit to Spain or Gaul. For it would be unlike Paul to have ceased to feel the urge to preach in those parts after his release. If he failed to carry out his purpose—and he was nothing if not tenacious of purpose, e.g. in the collection—how can we explain the exultant note in 2 Ti 4<sup>17</sup>, 'So that through me the message might be completely given, and *all the nations* might hear,' if he failed to let the nations who collected in Rome hear? This phrase πάντα τὰ ἔθνη has here the same force that the 'race of mortals' or 'the human race' has in Tacitus, who used both expressions of the people of the empire; e.g. *Ann.* xv. 44, where speaking of the fire and the massacre he says the Christians were 'condemned owing to the hatred of the *human race* for them' (*odio humani generis*). Tacitus, a strict Roman, would certainly include the western half of the Empire, the Romanized portion, as well as the eastern. On what principle are we to exclude them from Paul's summary?

(5) Paul's optimism received no check during his imprisonment. In Ph 2<sup>17</sup> he referred to his death as a remote possibility.<sup>1</sup> 'Even supposing that I am offered up'—which he rejects a few lines down—'but I am confident in the Lord that I myself shall also shortly come' (v. 24). See also Ph 1<sup>26</sup>, Col 4<sup>7</sup>. And he requests Philemon to prepare him a lodging. At the end of the two years, we hear of nothing to damp his hopes. The Acts and Epistles sound the same note.

(6) In Ac 23<sup>11</sup> we have our Lord's encouragement, 'Cheer up, for, as thou didst testify concerning me in Jerusalem, thou must, *in like manner*, testify in (unto) Rome.' The ὡς . . . οὕτως implies similarity of witness. This message meant Paul's deliverance from Jews, why not similar deliverance from Romans. His first testimony was made before a tribunal, why should not the second be also before a tribunal? This appearance of Jesus made it impossible for the narrator to ignore the gloom of the apostle on his way to the city. Such anticipations as we find in Ac 20<sup>22</sup> are no indication of his future, for they were dissipated by that

<sup>1</sup> Jebb οὐκ ἔτι καὶ, *Ædipus Tyrannus*, p. 296.

appearance. That message discounts the argument based upon Ac 20<sup>25</sup> against the second imprisonment.

Encircled by weeping friends and weeping himself, Paul used words he probably would not have uttered an hour before. He is going to Jerusalem, not knowing what bonds and troubles await him there, and adds, 'I know that you shall no longer see my face, I mean all of you' (οὐκ ἔτι . . . ὑμεῖς πάντες). It is argued that this means that the Ephesians will never see him again. Supposing that the words can be so understood, why might not Paul have been mistaken? He was not infallible. Writing afterwards to Philemon and the Philippians he expressed a confident hope of release. Which of these was frustrated? One ambiguously reported by another person once, the other plainly expressed three times by himself, at a date much nearer the event. The expectation of release is surely the weightier. And the gloomy forebodings of Ac 20<sup>25</sup> and 21<sup>23</sup> are set aside by the cheering message of the Lord in 23<sup>14</sup> and supply no basis for argument.

Moreover, the Greek words cannot bear the weight placed upon them. 'Not again you all, shall see my face' means 'Some of you shall not see my face again': cf. 2 Th 3<sup>2</sup>, 'faith is not the gift of all' (ὃ πάντων), means 'it is the gift of some, not of none'; 1 Co 15<sup>51</sup>, 'We shall not all sleep' does not mean 'none of us shall sleep'; cf. Ac 10<sup>40</sup>, etc. The next time some would be missing. Against this one doubtful saying we have many optimistic ones, e.g. Ph 1<sup>19</sup>, 'I know that this will turn out to my salvation,' the very words used in Job 13<sup>16</sup> (LXX) to express Job's certainty of the vindication of his character. So far, we have seen nothing to make the apostle give up his project. That he changed his plans is clear from his request to Philemon to secure him a lodging. But this does not imply that his plan of visiting the West was completely dropped. Neither is there anything to suggest a fatal termination to his first imprisonment.

But taking up 2 Tim., we sense a different situation and a different mood. Paul no longer has personal liberty. His friends no longer have easy access to him in his private lodging. He is in Rome again, but in a different locality, where his friend Onesiphorus found him with great difficulty (1<sup>17</sup>), and in need of comforts, loaded with a chain but without his cloak, books, and tablets which he had during his first captivity, in disgrace and prison as a *criminal* (κακούργος), such as a man charged with *majestas*, high treason, would be

classed. What caused this change? A legal process called *endeixis*, instituted by one Alexander (iv. 14, 'Alexander laid *information* against me of many offences'). The LXX of Gn 50<sup>16</sup> has caused the error of translating 'did me much evil.' Luke would have put that differently, Ac 9<sup>13</sup>, ἐποίησε, but here we have ἐνεδείξατο.<sup>1</sup> The similar action taken against Apollonius, about this time, was introduced by an *endeixis*, and his trial or defence was called *apologia*, as Paul's is here. Apollonius, as guilty of *majestas*, was thrown among the *most criminal*; so Paul was treated as a *criminal* here. Although he has lost his cheerfulness, he shows the same philosophic spirit, 'I am reconciled' (σπένδομαι, Eurip. Bacch. 284).

In ch. 4 vv. 14-17 imply acquittal after the first trial, re-arrest, and a second trial. The apostle is in a reminiscent mood all through the second Epistle, and relates certain details of the first trial which must have been known to Timothy in order to dispel his fears regarding the second. It is surely natural that in his second captivity he should recall the former. In our letters we are not always giving news. We often comment upon incidents well known to both parties. It is remarkable that we can set out in corresponding columns the accounts of the two trials Paul has stood:

1. 'In my first trial no man stood with me<sup>1</sup> (as witness), but all forsook me. May it not be laid to their account. But the Lord stood beside me<sup>2</sup> (as advocate) and strengthened me, and I was delivered out of the mouth of the lion, that through me the gospel might be fully proclaimed, and all the nations might hear' (vv. 16, 17) [this implies a complete deliverance, not a preliminary *actio* which would leave Paul within the lion's reach].

2. 'Demas forsook me. Only Luke is with me. Alexander the coppersmith laid many criminal charges against me. The Lord shall reward him according to his works. (Of whom do thou beware also, for he greatly withstood our words.) But the Lord shall deliver me from every evil work, and bring me safely into his heavenly kingdom' (vv. 9, 11, 14, 15, 18).

Vv. 16, 17 are just another of Paul's many digressions. The present situation recalls the previous. Then the Lord befriended him in his isolation; now He will do the same. Alexander has re-

<sup>1</sup> Pollux, viii. 49, ὁ ἐνδεικνύμενος πρὸς τὸν ἀρχοντα τῆν ἐνδειξιν ἀποφέρει.

<sup>2</sup> παρεγένετο of witnesses, παρέστη of advocate. See Æschylus, *Eumenides*, 367 and 65; cf. *adsum* and *adsto*.

cently opposed *our* arguments (as Paul never used 'our' of himself, this implies Luke's advocacy), but ever since the first trial all the nations have listened. Then the Lord delivered him out of the mouth of the lion, Nero, in order that he might bring the gospel to the whole Roman Empire, western as well as eastern. Now He will deliver him from every evil work of Alexander and bring him into his eternal kingdom. The passage is not only a digression, it contains an hyperbaton, or verbal misplacement, which Irenæus pointed out as a peculiarity of Paul in 2 Th 2<sup>8</sup>, etc. See also 1 Ti 1<sup>3</sup>, 'As I requested you, remain (προσμεῖναι<sup>3</sup>) in Ephesus, when I was proceeding to Macedonia' (not ellipse).

The words, 'I was delivered out of the mouth of the lion' (ἐρύσθην, v. 17), have been attracted from their proper place, after the 'Lord gave me power,' to the following phrase, 'he shall deliver (ῥύσεται) me,' both terms being used together in 2 Co 1<sup>10</sup>, 'he delivered us, and shall deliver.' The verb 'give power' is not followed by 'in order that' in the N.T., but 'deliver' is. That the words 'the Lord shall deliver me from every evil work' belong to the Alexander passage which refers to the second trial is clear from the exact *parallelismus*, even clearer in the Greek: 'The Lord will reward him according to his works'; 'The Lord will deliver me from every evil work.' This study in contrasts belongs to the Alexander passage. There are many discordant notes in the last page of the Pastorals which may be resolved by the explanation of a second trial. The preliminary character of the second trial is required to explain other points (we have such preliminary trials in the *Life* of Apollonius by Philostratus, who calls them *προαγών*), for Paul has not yet received his sentence. But he knew it would not be long delayed. So he asked Timothy twice at the end of this letter, which had been written some time, but to which he added a postscript—the first place Timothy would study for instructions—adding some news and comments and urging him to 'hurry'—'hurry before the winter.' There must have been something said at the preliminary examination to convince him that the final trial, when the sentence would be given, would take place before that winter. He may also have required his books and tablets for the last stage of his second trial. There would then be a gap of four years between the acquittal in 2 Ti 4<sup>17</sup>, 'I was delivered from the mouth of the lion,' and the hour of his dictating the words, 'the Lord shall deliver me from every evil work,' an

<sup>3</sup> Infin. for imper.; cf. Ph 3<sup>16</sup>, στοιχεῖν.

hour when Paul could truly say, 'my life-work has been accomplished. The gospel has been fully and widely preached, and *all* the nations, that is the western as well as the eastern portions of the Roman Empire, have heard.'

Many other features in the Pastorals fall into line with this suggestion. Alexander's fierce 'hostility to *our* arguments' implies that on this occasion Paul had a companion, evidently Luke—'only Luke is with me'—to assist him. It is clear, then, that his opposition was shown to the pleadings of Paul and the evidence of Luke at the second trial. There would be no point in referring to such hostility at the first apologia, when Paul was without Luke's help and when the apostle was tried concerning specific charges entered on the *elogium* or charge sheet; and upon which no fresh charge could be entered. Alexander's appearance on the scene shows that it was a different trial. It was through his information that Paul had been arrested and brought a second time before the Emperor's court. His activities were still to be feared. He could still do Timothy harm if he was not careful. It was probably because Timothy had not exercised discretion regarding him that Paul was in his present trouble and had to say, 'of him do thou also beware' (v. 15). Something had been done that had made Alexander intensely angry. We find in the first Epistle (1 Ti 1<sup>20</sup>) mention of 'Hymenæus and Alexander, whom I am handing over to Satan,<sup>1</sup> that they may be taught not to blaspheme.' Some tactless use of that remark by Timothy, who was inclined to scold (1 Ti 5<sup>1</sup>), brought this trouble upon the apostle. That that Alexander is the man in the text is quite probable. In the former passage there was no need to mention his trade as he is coupled with Hymenæus, a well-known leader of the opposition mentioned in both Epistles (1 Ti 1<sup>20</sup>, 2 Ti 2<sup>17</sup>). But in the second passage his trade is specified to prevent

<sup>1</sup> *παρόδικα*, epistolary aorist.

confusion with another innocent Alexander. We have a parallel case in Ac 10<sup>17</sup> and 10<sup>33</sup>. In the first passage we have 'the house of Simon,' in the second 'the house of Simon the tanner.' Alexander's opportunity came, for just before the words which provoked him was a passage which could be construed as a personal attack upon the Emperor (1 Ti 1<sup>8-10</sup>), containing among many other opprobrious epithets which fitted Nero like a glove the one word that above all names he detested—*matricide*—only here in the Bible. This was Nero's 'constant epithet.' For using that word he punished people severely, and afterwards was to visit Delphi with his fury because of the oracle's reference to his crime. Now if Apollonius was impeached for high treason and impiety against Nero for saying 'pardon the gods for taking pleasure in buffoons'<sup>2</sup>—a reference to Nero—how much more likely would Paul (if he was informed against, and in those days Tacitus and Philostratus assure us there was not even liberty to converse or correspond) be charged with that offence. In days when 'no house could keep a secret,' when Apollonius dreaded to put his thoughts on paper, when a man's face was watched as well as his mouth, the apostle was courting death when he wrote that passage about the law not being made for a righteous man (like him), *but for unrighteous men* (like Nero) who had broken every law in the Roman calendar and claimed as Emperor to be above the Law (*lege solutus*), expressly mentioning the crime of *matricide*, as well as other crimes Nero regarded as accomplishments. That Alexander acted as informer is also brought out by the word 'reward,' for Nero's rewards for informers were fabulous, and included a portion of their victim's estate. Paul's estate was small, but his Lord would see to it that Alexander had his reward—a truly Pauline remark.

<sup>2</sup> Philostratus, iv. 47.

## In the Study.

### Virginitus Puerisque.

#### Greediness.

BY THE REVEREND F. J. ASHLEY, JOHANNESBURG.

'The snare is laid for him in the ground, and a trap for him in the way.'—Job 18<sup>10</sup>.

I SUPPOSE when you visit the Zoo some of the best fun you get is feeding the monkeys, and, of course,

it seems quite the right thing that what they like best is monkey-nuts. Aren't they quick to catch them? and don't they get the shells off them cleverly? and all the time keeping their eyes on you, hoping for more.

But aren't they greedy? If you throw two or three nuts one after another to a monkey quickly, he does not wait to crack and eat the first, but claps them one after the other into his mouth, till