

# 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 *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_bib-sacra\\_01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php)

Litány. From Ba'albek to the sea its direct course is nearest 55 geographical miles. It flows at first along the alluvial valley; then breaks through the southern spurs of Lebanon by a deep chasm for about 20 miles, much of the way over a rocky bed and with a rushing and foaming stream; and at last flows to the sea with many windings through a broad low tract of meadow land. If now for this 20 miles of chasm, we assume an average fall in the mile of 100 feet, or 2000 feet in all, (which is a very large allowance, greater indeed than the rate of descent at the Little Falls of the Mohawk,) there yet remains of the elevation at Ba'albek (3729 English feet) no less than 1729 feet to be distributed along the rest of the course, or 35 geographical miles. This gives an average fall of very nearly 50 feet in a mile, in a course mostly along alluvial vallies. This result, therefore, goes strongly to confirm that found above in the case of the Orontes; and both together would seem to afford decisive proof, that the reported elevation of the Búk'a must be greatly exaggerated.

Let us hope that public attention may be called to the various points referred to in this paper; and that those who have it in their power, will speedily cause these questions to be put at rest forever.

## ARTICLE II.

### ALLEGED ANACHRONISM IN ACTS 5: 36 IN RELATION TO THE SEDITION OF THEUDAS.

Translated from the German by H. B. Hackett, Professor in Newton Theol. Institution.

[INTRODUCTORY NOTE. The original Article is contained in the "Theologische Studien und Kritiken," edited by Ullmann and Umbreit; Jahrgang, 1837, drittes Heft, p. 622 sq. The title there is—THEUDAS, DER AUFRUEHRER, Apstlg. 5: 36. Von DR. FRIEDRICH SONNTAG, Grossherzoglich Badischem Kirchen- und Ministerialrath. In the translation the object has been to convey faithfully the sense of the original, but without being bound by the form of the German sentences.—TR.]

#### § 1.

THE anachronism charged on Luke, which forms the subject of the present investigation, occurs in the speech of Gamaliel delivered before the Jewish Sanhedrim, as recorded in Acts 5: 35—39. The apostles, among whom Peter appears as specially prominent, stood

arraigned before this body on account of the courageous testimony which they had borne to the resurrection of Christ, and their death was now demanded by many of the members as the penalty of their offence. Under these circumstances Gamaliel, so revered for his personal character and learning, arose and admonished his associates not to proceed with such rigor, but to release the accused without punishment. Belonging to the party of the Pharisees, and entertaining fully their belief of a divine fatality, everywhere and always active in the concerns of men, he remarked to the assembly that if the undertaking of the apostles was a human affair, it would not stand; but, on the other hand, if founded in the purposes of God, that it could not be overthrown. To enforce this advice, he reminded them of two insurrectionists who had formerly risen up among the people before the apostles appeared, as promulgators of the gospel, but who had perished and their schemes with them. "*Before these days,*" says the speaker, "*arose Theudas, saying that himself was some one of importance, to whom a number of men, about four hundred, joined themselves; who was slain, and all those who obeyed him were dispersed, and came to nothing. After this one arose Judas the Galilean, in the days of the taxing, and drew away many people after him; and he also, and all who obeyed him, were scattered.*"

From these words of Gamaliel we perceive, in the first place, that the Theudas named by him, who appeared at the head of about four hundred men, was an insurrectionist. Since men only are expressly mentioned who attached themselves to him, we have reason to infer that Theudas was not a person who merely sought to lead the people astray by false doctrine, but that he endeavored, at the head of his party, to accomplish his designs by violence.

So too, we must conclude from the language of Gamaliel, that this Theudas belonged to the number of insurgents at that time, who were specially noted. With this agrees also the circumstance that Gamaliel classes him with Judas the Galilean, in respect to whom, we learn from Josephus,<sup>1</sup> that soon after Archelaus<sup>2</sup> was deposed, in the year 759 from the foundation of Rome, or the year 6 of the Christian era, he instigated a powerful rebellion against the Romans, at the time of the assessment then taken by command of the emperor Augustus. Besides, it is not to be supposed that when the speaker wished to call attention to the certainty of the failure of enterprises undertaken rashly and in opposition to the divine plan, and in this connection to adduce

<sup>1</sup> Arch. L. 18, c. 8, § 1. De Bel. Jud. L. 2, c. 8, § 1.

<sup>2</sup> According to Dio Cassius, L. 55, c. 27. p. 801, ed. Reimar.

examples of revolutionists who had failed in their attempts, he would select these examples from the number of the less noted instances of such defeat. On the contrary, it lies in the nature of the case, that with this object in view, he would remind his hearers of individuals who had once rendered themselves notorious, and excited great expectation or great apprehension. We ought not to overlook also the fact, that Gamaliel attaches to the Theudas mentioned by him, the epithet *ὁ Γαλιλαῖος*, and distinguishes the time in which he appeared, still more particularly by the words *ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῆς ἀπογραφῆς*, but mentions the Theudas likewise adduced by him without any nearer designation. Manifestly, Gamaliel supposed the entire assembly addressed by him to be familiar with the case of Theudas; and at the time when he spoke, no second Theudas had come before the public as a revolutionist, with whom the first could have been confounded. The Judas mentioned by him must also have been known to the council; but the reason, without doubt, why Gamaliel took pains to describe him more closely, was that he might distinguish him from a demagogue of the same name, who had appeared some ten years before, namely, from the Judas, the son of Ezekias, of whom Josephus has given us information, Arch. L. 17, c. 10, § 5, and de Bel. Jud. L. 2, c. 4, § 1.

It results, further, from the words of Gamaliel, that the Theudas adduced by him, entertained probably a high conceit of himself, and in accordance with this, sought to play a distinguished part in the eyes of the nation. This may be inferred from the words—*λέγων ἐκείναι εἶνα ἑαυτὸν*, in which words, as was shown long ago by Kypke, Kuinoel and others, with an appeal to the Greek usage, is contained the idea that he gave himself out as something great and important. While in Gamaliel's speech no intimation whatever occurs, that Judas the Galilean exhibited a spirit which would mark him as an arrogant, ambitious man, and while in Josephus, also, this Judas appears as a person who in his efforts to stir up the Jews to revolt, aimed to restore the ancient constitution and independence of the country, rather than to secure any personal end of his own; on the other hand, Theudas appears more as a self-seeking aspirant, who at the head of the men devoted to him, sought to secure to himself great authority among the people.

Besides this, it is not to be doubted, according to the words of Gamaliel, that Theudas with his company met with a disastrous end. He was slain—*ἀνῆρέθη*, and his followers were dispersed and came to nothing—*διελύθησαν καὶ ἐγένοντο εἰς οὐδέν*. Those who escaped alive after the death of their leader, broke up their connection with

one another, and disappeared without further influence or observation. Judas the Galilean also perished—*ἀπόλωτο*, and his followers too were entirely scattered—*διασκορπίσθησαν*. But it is remarkable that Gamaliel does not add the words with reference to the adherents of Judas—*καὶ ἐγένοντο αὐτῷ οὐδέν*. The ground of this lies in the fact, that the scattered remnant of the party of Judas continued after his destruction, as we learn from Josephus, to work on still in secret, and labored to maintain his free spirit and reckless principles among the people. Hence the speaker could not say of this party, that they came to nothing. The faction of Theudas only could be considered as annihilated, because every trace of this faction after the death of their leader, entirely vanished.

Finally, in respect to the time in which Theudas presented himself, Gamaliel says—*πρὸ τούτων τῶν ἡμερῶν ἀνέστη Θεοδᾶς*, i. e. *before these days in which we now live, before the time in which the apostles came forward, arose Theudas*. How long it was before this time, the speaker does not say; and it was not necessary that he should say, since he addressed those whom he could suppose to possess already a knowledge of the affair. But since Gamaliel subjoins that Judas arose after Theudas—*μετὰ τούτου*, and since he designates the Judas intended by him, as was remarked above, as the Galilean who rose up in the days of the taxing, in order to distinguish him from another adventurer of the same name, it is evident that Theudas appeared some years earlier than Judas the Galilean, and ran his dangerous career before the taxing alluded to in the Acts of the Apostles. If now we go back from the days in which Judas the Galilean arose to the period which preceded, we come at the distance of ten years to the time of Herod's death, when the country was infested by outlaws, so as to be full of the most terrible commotion. As in addition to Judas the Galilean, Gamaliel wished to present still another remarkable example of unsuccessful agitation, and one, too, drawn from earlier days, he would hardly be expected to pass over the time which immediately followed the death of the first Herod, since this time offered to him so many distinguished examples of this kind, and since during the long period next preceding, in which Herod governed the country as king, no year presents itself in which we could with equal reason place the outbreak of Theudas. Hence our view is, as has been maintained before now by several learned men, that Theudas is one of those insurgents who appeared under the emperor Augustus, in the year of the death of Herod, i. e. in the year of Rome 750, and consequently ten years before the time of Judas the Galilean. At all events, the statement of Gamaliel requires that we should not place

the Theudas who came before Judas later than in the days of the emperor Augustus.

Perhaps it may seem, however, to justify some surprise, that Gamaliel should present to the attention of the Sanhedrim these examples of disappointed political machination, inasmuch as the aims and labors of the apostles were not directed at all to the accomplishment of political changes, but solely to the advancement of the spiritual kingdom of their Lord. But it does not follow, because Gamaliel in his speech associated the two factionists with the apostles, that he himself regarded the apostles as men of a similar character. What we may, however, infer from this with truth is, that their opponents in the assembly who desired the death of the apostles, wished to represent them as actual traitors, or, at least, as persons politically dangerous, whose conduct would bring on confusion and ruin; and under this pretence they demanded their death. This was, indeed, but the old malicious falsehood which the rulers of the Jews had already alleged against Christ (Luke 23: 5), and which they themselves at a later period employed against the apostle Paul (Acts 24: 5). In this way it can be easily explained, how Gamaliel found himself led to refer to the examples which have been cited. He wished by this course to admonish the council that they, who, besides this, at the time of the Roman dominion, possessed no power over life and death, had no occasion to proceed in so unauthorized and violent a manner against the apostles; because if they really entertained treasonable intentions, or should they occasion any disturbance, it was certain they could not escape the destruction which then awaited them. Gamaliel first warns the members of the Sanhedrim, that they should take heed to themselves as to what they would do to these men. He then reminds them of the unhappy fate which befel the factious Theudas and Judas, without any interposition on their part, and thus at the same time reminds them of the destruction which the apostles also must expect, if they were similar people. He then exhorts them, once more, to refrain from the apostles, and remarks in general, that their work if it was an affair of men, would certainly perish. He adds then, the emphatic and significant words: *But if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it.* It scarcely needs to be observed here, that Luke has not communicated to us the entire speech of Gamaliel, but only its most important contents.

## § 2.

But it has appeared to some learned men a circumstance of serious import, that Josephus in his historical works has taken no notice of

a Theudas, who made his appearance under Augustus; either there where he speaks of the fearful commotions<sup>1</sup> excited in the year of Herod's death or in any other passage, and that the first mention of an impostor named Theudas, which occurs in the Jewish historian, makes him appear in the reign of the emperor Claudius.

The case stands thus: The emperor Augustus had long since departed from the theatre of life; Tiberius, also, in some of the last years of whose reign Gamaliel delivered his speech, was dead; even Caligula had already been put to death, and Claudius had ascended the throne, before we read of any Theudas in the pages of Josephus. Almost fifty years had passed since the death of the first Herod, and almost forty since the outbreak of the notorious Judas the Galilean, and from ten to twelve or even more since the speech uttered by Gamaliel, when in the time of the Roman procurator Cuspius Fadus who, as is well known, governed Judea after the death of king Agrippa the First, the Theudas spoken of by Josephus appeared on the stage, and consequently between the years 44 and 47 A. D. performed the part related of him.

The account which Josephus has given of this man in his *Archæology* L. 20, c. 5, § 1, amounts to this. In the time of Fadus mentioned above, an impostor—*γῶης* as he is termed, named Theudas, rose up, who gave himself out to be a prophet. He persuaded many people (*τὸν πλείστον ὄχλον*) to follow him with their movable effects to the Jordan, and promised them that at his command the stream should divide itself and afford them an easy passage. But Fadus despatched a company of troops after him; these fell upon him and his adherents unexpectedly, slew many of the people, and took many of them together with Theudas himself prisoners, and so put an end to the disorder. Theudas was afterwards executed, and his head carried to Jerusalem.

In consequence of this statement in Josephus, and his silence with reference to any earlier Theudas, several scholars have been led to conjecture that no insurgent bearing this name ever lived in the days of the emperor Augustus, and that the one mentioned in the Acts is the same person who is mentioned by Josephus, and who belonged to the time of the emperor Claudius. We find this view entertained among others by Calvin, Valesius and de Wette, but in the case of each of these critics with a particular modification.

Calvin in his *Commentary on Acts 5: 36*, thinks that the examination of the Apostles mentioned in that chapter did not occur, and consequently that the speech of Gamaliel was not delivered before the time of the government of the emperor Claudius, and of the procura-

<sup>1</sup> Arch. L. 17, c. 10; de Bel. Jud. L. 2, c. 3. 4 and 5.

tor Fadus, and after the Theudas mentioned in Josephus had already appeared; and hence he supposes that what Gamaliel said in Acts 5: 36, refers to this Theudas who had appeared under Claudius. But it is said in Gamaliel's speech that Judas the Galilean appeared later than Theudas; a difficulty from which Calvin seeks to free himself by ascribing to the words—*μετὰ τούτων*, a different sense from the one which they ordinarily express. He affirms that by these words Gamaliel did not intend to say that Judas the Galilean appeared after Theudas, but merely that besides Theudas, Judas also arose; so that according to this interpretation the sedition of Judas might have occurred in fact before the other. Particula post, says Calvin, tantundem valet atque *insuper vel praeterea*. But manifestly Calvin's view respecting this passage is entirely untenable. His opinion stands in direct contradiction with the chronological order of the Acts; for according to this order the examination of the apostles related in the fifth chapter took place undeniably several years earlier than the death of king Agrippa the First, mentioned in the twelfth chapter; and it was not until after the death of this king in the year 44, as we learn from Josephus, that Fadus came as procurator to Judea, under whose administration the Theudas of whom Josephus speaks acquired his notoriety. Besides, the explanation of the words *μετὰ τούτων*, given by Calvin, cannot be reconciled with the usage of the Greek language.

With still greater license, Valesius in his Annotations on Eusebius<sup>1</sup> considers it possible that Luke may have expressed himself *κατὰ πρόληψιν*; and thus by a bold and conscious anachronism, represented Gamaliel who spoke in the reign of Tiberius, as referring to Theudas, though the latter did not appear before the time of Claudius, because Luke considered the reference as appropriate to Gamaliel's speech in other respects. On account of the difficulty which lies in the words *μετὰ τούτων*, Valesius assumes that in Gamaliel's discourse Theudas as the one who appeared later, stands nearer to the time in which Gamaliel spoke, and Judas the Galilean who appeared earlier, follows as the more remote. The mode of viewing their position, in other words, is the inverse one; we reckon, not in the ordinary way, from the men who are spoken of downwards to the speaker, but backwards from the speaker to the men. Thus, according to Valesius, the sense of the words *μετὰ τούτων* is not that Judas arose after Theudas, but that he appears to us as standing behind him as we look towards the past from the present, and, consequently, that he preceded him in the order of manifestation. That this explanation is in the highest degree

<sup>1</sup> Annot. ad Euseb. Hist. Eccles. L. 2, c. 11, p. 30—32.



forced and contrary to the well known usage of the phrase, hardly needs to be remarked. In addition to this, the view of Valesius conflicts with the character of Luke for candor and honesty. If Luke allowed himself in such an arbitrary and inconsiderate use of the facts of history, as to put into the mouth of Gamaliel words which Luke himself knew that Gamaliel never uttered, the credibility of his history would be entirely destroyed. One must impute also to the writer of the Acts in this case the inconceivable tomerity of trifling in the most thoughtless manner with his claims to respect and confidence among his contemporaries, since very many of them must have known perfectly well the time of so noted an event as the sedition of Theudas. The sufficient motive also to such an act of inconsideration was wanting. Had Luke been capable of inserting an argument or illustration in the speech of Gamaliel, which the latter did not employ, he could have found examples enough from an earlier period, and especially from the time of Augustus, which he could have used more easily and safely.

Agreeing with Calvin and Valesius in their opinion, that no Theudas who was an insurrectionist lived in the days of Augustus, de Wette does not hesitate to charge the author of the Acts with having violated the truth of history. This assertion is free from the difficulties which attend the other explanations that have been noticed, but gives rise to others of a different kind, so serious, that we cannot admit the idea of such a mistake on the part of Luke as possible. According to de Wette's opinion, if we correctly understand it, Luke has erred in a two-fold way. In the first place, he has committed the gross oversight of having put back the Theudas who appeared under the emperor Claudius to the days of the emperor Augustus,—fifty years too soon,—and before Judas the Galilean whom he followed; an oversight which would so be much the more surprising, since this younger Theudas appeared on the stage after Luke had already reached the period of youth, or perhaps even of manhood, and since the bloody event, and the disastrous end of the impostor in the time of Fadus, after a comparative tranquillity had prevailed in Palestine since the last years of Augustus, must as something new and extraordinary have excited great attention and have been well known. In this connection too it is not to be forgotten, that according to the statement of Josephus, the head of the executed criminal was brought to the capital Jerusalem, where besides many other Christians, the apostles also and the companions of the apostles were accustomed at that time to reside. So then, in the second place, Luke has made himself chargeable with the egregious error of representing the well known Gama-

liel, the teacher of his friend Paul, as speaking in the time of Tiberius about an event which did not take place till the days of the emperor Claudius. Such a monstrous, two-fold error in the case of a writer like Luke, under the relations in which he lived, is not to be supposed. So ignorant in the history of his age, Luke was not; on the contrary, he possessed an accurate and fundamental knowledge not only of the geography but the history of his times; as any one may see from the Acts of the Apostles, where under circumstances which put his accuracy to the severest test, we meet continually with the most decisive evidence of his exact information in such matters.<sup>1</sup> Assuredly, the author of the Acts who had so much at heart, the sacred cause of Christianity, for which he lived, labored and suffered; he whom the apostle Paul deemed worthy of his confidential and long continued intercourse, and who at the commencement of his gospel as the first part of the original history of Christianity, which he felt himself called to write, gives us the assurance that he sought to investigate everything carefully (Luke 1: 3), cannot possibly in writing the second part of his work, the Acts of the Apostles, have been so negligent, indifferent, and thoughtless in regard to things intimately connected with a cause so sacred to him, as to have committed the unheard of, double mistake with which he is charged. By such negligence he would have brought into danger, or have lost all the confidence which he possessed with his readers. In this way Luke did not treat history. His narratives contain proofs of a conscientious pains-taking and accuracy, which show themselves in the most favorable light, when we compare his statements and allusions of a geographical or historical nature with the testimonies of other writers. Even the very fact that he presents to us no great *mass* of materials in regard to the establishment and extension of the church, and the deeds and fortunes of the apostles, allows us to draw for him a favorable conclusion in this particular. Certainly there were at that time, when he wrote the Acts of the Apostles, many more narratives and

<sup>1</sup> Tholuck in his *Glaubwürdigkeit der evangelischen Geschichte* has collected some illustrations of this remark, which he has presented in a very striking light. See e. g. pp. 161—177, 375—389. Lardner also in the first part of his *Credibility of the Gospel History* has traversed the same ground still more extensively. The well-informed reader who will study carefully the book of the Acts, and compare the incidental notices to be found there on almost every page with the political and physical geography of the times, and with the national customs of the Greeks, Romans, and Jews,—for the scene changes continually from land to land, from nation to nation,—may receive as strong an impression of the truth and fidelity of the writer, and hence of the truth of the gospel history in general, as was ever produced by the best treatise ever written on the Christian Evidences.—T. B.

traditions respecting the church and the apostles in circulation; but from the circumstance that he confines himself to the communication of a comparatively small number of facts, it is evident that he did not go to work blindly in reference to what he relates, but with consideration, scrutiny and selection; and, at least, that he could not have erred in so gross a manner as is affirmed. We have in his honesty and hearty zeal for the cause of Christianity, a sufficient pledge that he would tell the truth. We cannot so much as conceive of a reason why he should not have been disposed in the case of Gamaliel's speech to relate the truth. Then, again, he lived in relations which gave him an opportunity to ascertain what Gamaliel had said at the trial of the apostles; for he was for many years the trusted friend and the companion of the apostle Paul, who, having been a pupil of Gamaliel and a persecutor of the Christians, must have been initiated into the plans of the Sanhedrim at Jerusalem. Besides this, there were many Jews of rank, some of whom were already inclined in secret to Christianity, and others of whom, after Gamaliel had spoken the well-known words, attached themselves to the Christian faith; see John 18: 42. Acts 6: 7. In this manner Luke could have obtained certain and authentic information concerning the expressions of Gamaliel. Indeed, on general grounds, it is hardly conceivable how merely among the contemporaries of a Theudas who lived under the emperor Claudius, the error could have sprung up that he lived under Augustus, and that Gamaliel had spoken of him in the time of Tiberius.

## § 3.

Caesar Baronius also once held that the Theudas referred to in the Acts of the Apostles was the same person mentioned in Josephus, but according to his view it was not Luke who has fallen into an error but Josephus.<sup>1</sup> With him agrees L. Cappellus (who is represented, however, by Kuinoel as having expressed elsewhere another opinion), in his *Compendium Historiae Judaicae*, which he published as an appendix to his *Historia Apostolica* in the year 1634. In a Note, p. 117, Cappellus says expressly in respect to the history of Theudas related by Josephus: *In alienum tempus huc retulisse videtur Josephus historiam istam, quam necesse est prius contigisse, siquidem Gamaliel Actor. 5, 36 ejus meminit circa finem anni ultimi Tiberii.* Even Valeius himself, notwithstanding his opinion mentioned above, was not

<sup>1</sup> *Baron. Annal. Eccles. a. 1, c. 57;—a. 34, c. 272.*

disinclined to suppose an error possible on the part of Josephus, as may be seen from his remarks on Eusebius.

On this supposition, Josephus would by an oversight have placed the Theudas who appeared under Augustus in the days of the emperor Claudius, and hence about fifty years too late. Even such an oversight would have been not inconsiderable, since Josephus, although somewhat younger than Luke, lived likewise under the emperor Claudius. Josephus was born in the first year of the reign of Caligula,<sup>1</sup> and was therefore about nine years of age when the Theudas whom he mentions, performed the part ascribed to him. The mistake thus committed by Josephus would not, however, be a two-fold one, and not so flagrant as that imputed to Luke, and so far might be considered as more possible. We must also take into consideration here another circumstance which deserves attention. Josephus wrote his history of the Jewish war after the destruction of Jerusalem; and yet here he has not recorded a word of any Theudas who appeared under Claudius at the time of the procurator Fadus, although such a notice would have found its appropriate place in this work, in which he describes not only the war itself, but its gradual development, and the various tumults and disturbances which preceded it. Indeed, he even assures us in the work just named, that the procurators Cuspius Fadus and Tiberius Alexander preserved the people in peace, and that it was not until the procuratorship of Cumanus that the disturbances again commenced; for in reference to the two former he says, *de Bel. Jud. L. 2, c. 11, § 6: οἱ μηδὲν παρακινουῦντες τῶν πατριῶν ἑθῶν, ἐν εὐφροῇ τὸ ἔθνος διαφύλαξαν*; and in reference to Cumanus he says, *L. 2, c. 12, § 1: ἐφ' οὗ θόρυβοί τε ἤρξαντο καὶ φθορὰ πάλιν Ἰουδαίων ἐγένετο*. We have our first information of a Theudas known to him as having appeared under Claudius and Fadus, in the passage of his *Archæology*, already cited, *L. 20, c. 5, § 1*; a work, it is well known, which he wrote later than the history of the Jewish war, which he did not complete in fact earlier than the thirteenth year of the emperor Domitian, i. e. in the year 94 of our era.<sup>2</sup> This circumstance gives us reason to conjecture that perhaps Josephus at the time when he wrote his history of the Jewish war, knew nothing as yet of this Theudas, and possibly as long as he lived at Jerusalem had never heard of any such person, but obtained his first knowledge of him, at a later period, at Rome or somewhere else. In this case certainly, it is possible that, from want of correct information in regard to the time of this insurrection and some of its attendant circumstances, he may

<sup>1</sup> *Jos. Vita*, c. 1.

<sup>2</sup> *Jos. Arch. L. 20, c. 11, § 2.*

have placed the occurrence of it in the reign of Claudius, instead of assigning it to that of Augustus where it belonged.

But still it remains more probable that Josephus has not erred in his designation of the time; and it is but the more reasonable that we should abstain from imputing to him so great an error, if we can adopt any view which will remove the occasion for it. It is very possible that Josephus in his history of the Jewish war passed over the Theudas mentioned by him afterwards, not because he had then never heard of him but because at the moment when he wrote the account of Cuspius Fadus, he did not happen to think of Theudas. And supposing that Josephus first learned the history of the younger Theudas from Romans or Jews after the destruction of Jerusalem, it is but right to assume that in this instance also he knew how to estimate his authorities, and had an important reason why he supplied in the *Archæology* the previous omission of this event, and now placed it in the time of the proconsul Fadus, which in his earlier work he had represented as peaceful. In general, the similarity between the two Theudas, as we shall see more fully as we proceed, is not of such a kind as to afford any special occasion for banishing one of them from history.

#### § 4.

Under these circumstances since the narration of Luke bears on itself such evident and certain marks of credibility, and since probably Josephus also did not err, we think that the view that Gamaliel's Theudas is an entirely different person from the Theudas mentioned in Josephus, deserves in every respect the preference. This view we find in Beza<sup>1</sup> and Casaubon.<sup>2</sup> This view is adopted also by Grotius in his celebrated Commentary, is defended by Basnage,<sup>3</sup> and acknowledged as the correct one by Bengel,<sup>4</sup> Heumann, Rosenmüller, Kuinoel, Olshausen and others.<sup>5</sup> Even the Jewish writer, Jost, in his favorably known History of the Israelites, accedes to this opinion and admits the credibility of Luke as well as that of Josephus. All the

<sup>1</sup> Annot. maj. ad N. T., Acts 5: 36.

<sup>2</sup> Exerc. ad Baron. Annal. 2, 18.

<sup>3</sup> Histoire des Juifs, L. 7, c. 12, § 7.

<sup>4</sup> Theil. 2; Anhang, S. 76 and 77.

<sup>5</sup> Among these may be mentioned Origen, c. Celsum 1, 6; Lardner in his *Credibility*; Maurichs, *Acta Apost. ad. loc. and Excurs.*; Guericke, *Beitr. zur Einl. ins N. T.*, S. 90 sq.; and Anger *de temporum in Act. Apost. ratione*, p. 185. Winer also, himself a rationalist, admits freely that Luke may be supposed without any improbability to have referred to an earlier Theudas, and that the silence of Josephus who does not record everything, affords no valid argument against it. See his *Realwörterbuch*, art. *Theudas*.—Tr.

difficulties which embarrass the other opinions, disappear on this supposition, while it labors under no serious objection peculiar to itself.

Two different persons, therefore, with the same name, according to this conclusion, exist in the history before us. The one lived in the days of the emperor Augustus, and appeared most probably, as has been remarked already, in the turbulent year of the death of the first Herod; the other arose under the emperor Claudius in the time of the procurator Fadus, about fifty years later than the former. The one appears at the head of about four hundred men; the other leads away a great multitude with him; and since they took even their movable effects with them, it would appear that entire families followed him. The one, finally, had more the appearance of an ambitious and bold adventurer, who at the head of his lawless followers attempts to execute his projects by violence; the other presents himself to us more as a common impostor who pretends to be a prophet and worker of miracles, and by lying promises seeks to entice a company of simple-minded people to the Jordan, in order there probably, with his comrades, to plunder them the more successfully in so secluded a region.

These two leaders have indeed the same name, and both were in the end put to death, as appears from the speech of Gamaliel and from the narrative of Josephus. But these circumstances afford no reason whatever for converting into one two persons between whose death there was an interval of half a century, and who differed from each other also in other respects.<sup>1</sup>

As regards the identity of the name, history presents to us elsewhere a multitude of similar examples; and especially in the Jewish history, such exist besides the one now in question. Thus among the Jews during the period from the death of the first Herod to the destruction of Jerusalem, three Judases distinguish themselves as the heads of political parties. The first is Judas, the son of Ezekias, a factious leader in the year of Herod's death; *Jos. de Bel. Jud. L. 2, c. 4, § 1*; *Arch. L. 17, c. 10, § 5*. The second is Judas the Galilean, who arose after the dethronement of Archelaus, and who is mentioned

<sup>1</sup> Meyer in his recent *Kritisch exegetisches Handbuch über die Apostelgeschichte*, adheres, on the whole, to the sceptical view maintained by de Wette, but adduces no stronger reason for it than that it does not seem to him probable, that two impostors among the Jews should have borne the same name, Theudas. It is this objection, which is merely an old one re-asserted, that our author proceeds now to consider, and which he shows clearly to be without foundation. To Meyer's assertion that Theudas was an uncommon name, we might oppose Winer's testimony that the name was *not* uncommon; but the facts which the writer has here spread before us, enable us to form our own opinion on this question.—Ta.

by Gamaliel along with Theudas. The third is Judas, the son of Jairus, the commander of an army of three thousand men at the end of the Jewish war; *Jos. de Bel. Jud.* L. 7, c. 6, § 5. During the same period five men named Simon appear among the Jews, who in like manner were instigators of sedition. These were, first, Simon, a slave of Herod in the year in which this king died; *Jos. de Bel. Jud.* L. 2, c. 4, § 2; *Arch.* L. 17, c. 10, § 6; *Tacit. Hist.* L. 5, c. 9; second, Simon, the son of Judas the Galilean, in the time of the emperor Claudius and the procurator Tiberius Alexander; *Jos. Arch.* L. 20, c. 5, § 2; third, Simon, the son of Kathla, one of the principal leaders of the Idumeans during the siege of Jerusalem; *Jos. de Bel. Jud.* L. 5, c. 6, § 1; fourth, Simon, the son of Arius, a commander of the Zealots; *Jos. de Bel. Jud.* *ibid.*; fifth, Simon, the son of Gioras, well-known as the chief commander of the Jews in the time of the fearful war waged by them with the Romans; *Jos. de Bel. Jud.* L. 2, c. 19, § 2; L. 4, c. 9, § 3—8; L. 5, c. 1, § 3, etc.; *Tacit. Hist.* L. 5, c. 12. Again, during the still shorter period between the death of king Agrippa the first and the destruction of Jerusalem, several Eleazers appear among the insubordinate Jews, of whom we will notice only four who played an important political part. First, we have Eleazer, the son of Dinaeus, who disturbed the country before the outbreak of the Jewish war, and is called ἀρχιλογστῆς; *Jos. de Bel. Jud.* L. 2, c. 12, § 4; L. 2, c. 13, § 2; *Arch.* L. 20, c. 6, § 1; L. 20, c. 8, § 5; then, Eleazer, the son of Ananias, who was active in exciting the people against the Romans; *Jos. de Bel. Jud.* L. 2, c. 17, § 2—9; L. 2, c. 20, § 4; further, Eleazer, a very noted leader of the Zealots in the time of the Jewish war; *Jos. de Bel. Jud.* L. 2, c. 20, § 3; L. 4, c. 4, § 1; L. 5, c. 1, § 2, etc.; *Tacit. Hist.* L. 5, c. 12; and, finally, Eleazer a descendant of Judas the Galilean, the courageous commander of the fortress Masada; *Jos. de Bel. Jud.* L. 7, c. 8, § 1.

With such examples, it cannot surprise us that we have also two insurrectionists named Theudas,—one under Augustus, the other under Claudius. In addition to this, the name of Theudas, as was long ago remarked by several scholars, was not uncommon. A freed-man, it is well known, is mentioned as bearing this name, in Cicero, *Ep. ad div.* L. 6, ep. 10; and a physician, also, in Galenus *de Compositione medicamentorum per genera*, L. 6, c. 14.<sup>1</sup> Theudas is a Greek form of the Syriac name ܚܘܕܐ — Thoda, as we perceive from the Syriac Translation, *Acts* 5: 36, or of the Hebrew תודא; with which name a disciple of Jesus is designated in the Talmud,<sup>2</sup> at least in those

<sup>1</sup> Tom. 13, p. 425, ed. Kühn.

<sup>2</sup> *Gen. Babyl. Sanhedria*, c. 6, fol. 43, a.

editions in which no passages are erased. The name, also, *Θευδάς*,<sup>1</sup> *Θευδάς*,<sup>2</sup> and תודוס — *Thodus*,<sup>3</sup> are evidently only different forms of the Syriac name Thoda.

But the similar fate of the two men authorizes us as little to banish one of them from history, as the identity of their name. The lot which befel them, was that which such desperate criminals usually experienced. Their plans failed; their lives fell a sacrifice to their temerity; and those of their party who escaped death, were dispersed. We find examples precisely similar to this in the history of the Judas, Simon and Eleazer who have been mentioned above. Their hopes were frustrated, and their end was disastrous. We know in regard to those of them of whose death history gives us any account, that they died in a violent manner. Judas the Galilean perished, and Judas, the son of Jairus, was slain in a battle. Simon, the slave of Herod, fell by the hand of the enemy; Simon, the son of Judas the Galilean, died on the cross; Simon, the son of Gioras, was executed at Rome. Eleazer, the descendant of Judas the Galilean, sought death at the hands of one of his companions in misfortune. Probably also Eleazer, the son of Simon, and Eleazer, the son of Ananias, lost their lives during the siege of Jerusalem. Hence we need not wonder, especially when we consider the severe course which the Romans were accustomed to pursue towards those who rebelled against them, that in a period of fifty years, two men named Theudas, who had been guilty of this political offence, died a violent death.

#### § 5.

For these reasons, therefore, the view that the Theudas or Thoda mentioned in the Acts and the one mentioned by Josephus are two different persons, appears to us to deserve the decided preference. It rests on good ground, and is encumbered with none of the difficulties which attend the opinions of those who would banish from history one of these two offenders. Michaelis, also, in his Remarks on the New Testament, Acts 5: 36, has expressed his conviction that the insurrectionist of whom Gamaliel speaks, is an entirely different person from the one whom Josephus mentions. He considers it, however, improbable that two men should have borne the same name, and conjectures that in the case of one of them, either Luke, or, as he is inclined to believe, more probably Josephus, has given the name incorrectly. But with the examples before us which have been adduced

<sup>1</sup> Diogen. Laert. L. 9, c. 12, § 7.    <sup>2</sup> Jos. Arch. L. 17, c. 4, § 2; L. 20, c. 1, § 2.

<sup>3</sup> Gem. Babyl. Pesachim, c. 4, fol. 53, a, b; Bezah, fol. 23, a.



in reference to Judas, Simon and Eleazer, we are not authorized, at all events not required, to make this assumption. One thing only may appear to some suspicious, and that is that Josephus does not name the elder Theudas in his historical works. But in respect to this, two cases can readily be conceived of as possible, in either of which we may acquiesce, without any solicitude for the accuracy of the sacred writer. Either Gamaliel's Theudas is included among the political disturbers whom Josephus describes, in general terms, without designating their names; or this historian refers to him since he had perhaps two names, under a different appellation.

The generally received view is the former; namely, that the elder Theudas mentioned by Gamaliel is one of those factionists whom Josephus alludes to collectively without naming them. In the year of the death of Herod, the Jewish State was disturbed by frequent attempts to instigate the people to revolt; of the authors of these attempts, Josephus speaks of only three by name. But that there were many others, who appeared at the same time, he gives us to understand in the plainest terms. He says, e. g., Arch. L. 17, c. 10, § 4: *ἐν τούτῳ δὲ καὶ ἕτερα μύρια θορύβων ἐχόμενα τῆς Ἰουδαίας κατελάμβανη;* and § 8: *λησστηρίων δὲ ἡ Ἰουδαία ἔμπλεως ἦν.*

He expresses himself in a similar manner in his history of the Jewish war; e. g. L. 2, c. 4, § 1 and 3. In both of his principal works,<sup>1</sup> a seditious incendiary appears, who excited terror in the valley of the Jordan near Amatha or Betharameton, but is referred to without name. Hence this person or some other one of this class of men, who occur in Josephus without being named, may have been the Theudas whom Gamaliel had in view. Josephus has also passed over other and still more important events; as, for example, the persecution of the Christians by Agrippa the First, which is related in Acts, ch. 12, and the expulsion of the Jews from Rome under Claudius, which is mentioned not only by Luke, Acts 18: 2, but also by Suetonius, Claud. c. 25. Hence it is not very surprising if he also passed over in silence the Theudas of the Acts, or at least omitted his name. Perhaps this elder Theudas who lived so long before his time, was not as to his exploits and fortunes so fully known to him as to Gamaliel who was born many years earlier. Since even the younger Theudas was left unnoticed in his History of the Jewish War, it cannot surprise us, if he neglected to notice also the elder Theudas not only in this work but in his Archaeology, or at least if he embraced him among the other insurrectionary chiefs whose name he has not recorded.

Still, readily as we admit the possibility of this, we consider it like-

<sup>1</sup> Arch. L. 17, c. 10, § 6; de Bel. Jud. L. 2, c. 4, § 3.

wise as very possible that the Theudas addressed by Gamaliel is one of the insurrectionists mentioned by name in Josephus;<sup>1</sup> particularly since this Theudas whom Gamaliel presented as a distinguished example along with Judas the Galilean, acquired without doubt a great celebrity. There are now among the insurgents who rose up in the year of Herod's death only three whom Josephus specifies by name in the passages already cited, namely, Judas the son of Ezekias, Simon the slave of Herod, and Athronges the shepherd. One of these three insurgents, therefore, may have been the Theudas of Gamaliel, since it is possible that Josephus cited him under another name.

It is well known from the history of the East, that persons there who changed their vocation and rose to a higher grade of service, often took a second name in addition to their former one. The Persian prince Arsicas, ascended the throne under the name of Artaxerxes; Plutarch *Artax.* c. 1. The Arabian Aeneas when he attained to the regal power, called himself Aretas; *Jos. Arch.* L. 16, c. 9, § 4. Zeno, the son of Polemon, when he became king of the Armenians, required that he should be called by them Artaxias; *Tacit. Annal.* L. 2, c. 56. Such examples of the adoption of a second name we find specially frequent among the Jews. The Hasmonean Jannaeus who succeeded his brother Aristobulus the First as king, was called also Alexander; *Jos. Arch.* L. 13, c. 12, § 1. Antipater, born in Idumea, the friend of the second Hyrcanus, and under him the highest office-bearer in the land was known before as Antipas; *Jos. Arch.* L. 14, c. 1, § 3. The two brothers, Jesus and Onias, in the time of the Syrian king Antiochus Epiphanes, when they became high priests, assumed likewise new names; the one called himself Jason, and the other Menelaus; *Jos. Arch.* L. 12, c. 5, § 1. The apostles of the Lord when they left the occupations of fishermen and tax-gatherers, and devoted themselves to the mission of proclaiming the gospel, came forward also in part with new names. Simon, Bar Jona, appears as Peter; Levi as Matthew; Judas, the son of James, as Thaddaeus. The Pharisee Saul also when he entered on the new career of an apostle, went forth with the name of Paul; and his friend Silas was called at the same time Silvanus. But especially remarkable in its relation to our inquiry is the example of a Jewish insurgent, who according to the testimony both of Dio Cassius<sup>2</sup> and of Eusebius,<sup>3</sup> excited, under the emperor Trajan, a fearful tumult in Cyrene. It was the eighteenth year of the reign of this emperor, or the year 115 of our era, when this outbreak occurred. According to the concurrent account of both historians, this

<sup>1</sup> *Arch.* L. 17, c. 10; *de Bel. Jud.* L. 2, c. 4.

<sup>2</sup> L. 68, c. 32, p. 1145—1146, *ed Reimar.*

<sup>3</sup> *Hist. Eccles.* L. 4, c. 2.

insurrection of the Jews who were defeated more than once by the Romans, was at last brought to an end by a great victory of the Roman commander Lucius, the same who became afterwards as they both likewise testify, the procurator of Judea. According to Dio Cassius who was born under Antoninus the Pious, and at a later period occupied the highest offices at Rome, and who certainly drew his account from authentic sources, the Jew who stood at the head of the insurgents in Cyrene, was named Andreas. But according to Eusebius, who as we see from the agreement of his narrative with that of Dio Cassius, likewise employed sure means of information, and who appeals expressly to heathen writers in whom he says that any one might find word for word everything which he relates, the same Jew appears as king Lucuas. Manifestly, the insurgent Andreas in Dio Cassius is one and the same person with king Lucuas in Eusebius. The one historian introduces him under this name and the other under that. A similar case may exist in regard to the Theudas mentioned by Gamaliel. Two of the leaders designated by name in Josephus in the passages already cited, Simon and Athronges, declared themselves as kings; and in the case of Judas, Josephus intimates that he too affected the royal dignity. Hence it is very possible that one of these three men is Gamaliel's Theudas, inasmuch as when he placed the crown on his head, he may have assumed a second name, and so occur in Josephus under a different designation from that in the Acts of the Apostles.

## § 6.

Whichever of the two cases now we may be disposed to adopt, whether we consider the Theudas mentioned by Gamaliel as one of the insurrectionists alluded to by Josephus without name, or as identical with one of the three whose career he specially describes, the result remains the same as to the credibility of Luke; we have no cause whatever to doubt the accuracy of his statements. If however we regard the second case as possible, then, finally, the question arises which of the three men whom Josephus designates by name, may with most probability be identified with the individual intended here in the Acts.

The well-known chronologist of the seventeenth century, Archbishop Usher, advances the opinion in his *Annals*, on the year 4001, that the Theudas mentioned by Gamaliel is to be considered as one and the same person with the Judas named by Josephus, who was the son of Ezekias. This view he rests on the supposition that the name Judas is the same as Thaddaeus or Theudas. But the supposition thus made

is not proved. Even the identity indeed of the names Thaddæus and Theudas is doubtful, since the Syriac translator employs for Thaddæus the word ܬܕܝܐ = *Thadai*, and for Theudas the word ܬܘܕܐ = *Thoda*, and, therefore, distinguishes the two names from each other. Still less may the name Judas, ܝܘܕܝܐ, for which the Syrian employs always ܝܘܕܐ = *Jhudo*, be considered as equivalent to Theudas or Thaddæus. The apostle Judas or Jude, the son of James, it is well known, bore indeed at the same time the name Thaddæus, but not because the two appellations were held to be identical, but in consequence of the Jewish custom already mentioned of assuming sometimes a second name. And though the two names ܝܘܕܝܐ and ܝܘܕܐ be derived from the same root ܝܘܕ (Hiph. ܝܘܕܐ), their equivalence by no means follows from this; for as two different words in general may spring from the same root, so also may two different names.

We may advance then a step further in our investigation. If the Theudas of whom Gamaliel speaks be one of the three disturbers whose names are given in Josephus, we must pronounce it most probable that the one of this number who has most claim to be considered as the individual in question is SIMON, the slave of Herod. The circumstances of his history agree with this supposition more fully than those of the other two men; and it is on this ground that we rest the opinion now expressed.

First; Among those who disturbed the public peace in the year of the death of the first Herod, this Simon appears as the one who excited the greatest attention and rendered himself most notorious. He possessed peculiar advantages for the performance of the part which he undertook. Large in person, distinguished by strength of body as well as courage, he caused himself to be proclaimed as king, and adorned his head with the diadem. From Perea where he principally kept himself, he crossed the Jordan into Judea, and plundered and burnt rich castles and country-seats of the wealthier people. Even in Jericho, only some fifteen or twenty miles from Jerusalem, he caused the royal palace to be pillaged and then set on fire. His terrible fame soon spread itself on every side to an extent beyond that of all the other insurgents of that period. His name became known among the Romans, and he is the only one among those whose seditions so signalized the last year of Herod's reign, whom Tacitus, *Hist.* 5, 9, took occasion to notice. *Post mortem Herodis, says Tacitus, nihil expectato Cesare, Simo quidam regium nomen invaserat.* Hence this Simon furnishes Gamaliel with an apposite illustration of his point, when in addition to that of the noted

Judas the Galilean, he wished to present still another striking example of an impostor who had perished together with his plans.

Second; Simon is described by Josephus as a very ambitious man, or as one who entertained a high conceit of himself. It is true, the other two insurgents also, Judas and Athronges, appear as men whose object was to gain distinction and power, and the latter was likewise accustomed among his followers to wear the insignia of royalty. But Simon, according to the representation of Josephus, was distinguished in a special manner by an extravagant sense of his own merit, inasmuch as the historian says of him expressly, that he thought no one so worthy of the supreme rule as himself. Josephus uses in reference to him the words—*εἶναι ἀξίος ἐλπίσας παρ' ὀντινοῦν*; Jos. Arch. L. 17, c. 10, § 6. These words agree in a remarkable manner with that which Gamaliel said of Theudas—*λέγων εἶναι τινα ἑαυτόν*.

Third; We read in Josephus that Simon died a violent death. Of Judas, the son of Simon, and of Athronges he does not inform us that they were put to death. Perhaps in the end when they saw that all was lost, they withdrew into concealment, so that it was not known what became of them. But Josephus informs us concerning Simon in two passages, that after his company had been entirely defeated in a battle, he was put to death in his flight by the royal commander Gratus. We read in his Archaeology, L. 17, c. 10, § 6: *καὶ αὐτοῦ Σίμωνος φυγῇ διὰ τινος φάραγγος σώζοντος αὐτόν, Γράτος ἐντυχὼν τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀποτέμνει*. This is also related in the History of the Jewish War, L. 2, c. 4, § 2. In this way the narrative of Josephus coincides with Gamaliel's expression—*ἀηροέθη*.

Fourth; The number of adherents assigned to Theudas by Gamaliel accords well with that which Josephus relates in reference to Simon. Gamaliel speaks of about four hundred men—*ἀνδρῶν ὡσεὶ τετρακοσίων*—who had attached themselves to Theudas. Even if on account of the indefinite expression *ὡσεὶ*, we go up somewhat beyond four hundred or as high as five hundred, the number then would not be very great. In the case also of Simon, we cannot infer the existence of a much greater number, according to the narrative of Josephus.<sup>1</sup> While the army of Athronges, which consisted of four divisions commanded by his brothers, is expressly spoken of by the Jewish historian as a great multitude, and while also the retinue of Judas is termed by the same writer not a small number—*πλήθος οὐκ ὀλίγον*—as the language is;<sup>2</sup> on the contrary, the company of Simon is described differently as may be seen from the words in the Archaeolo-

<sup>1</sup> Arch. L. 17, c. 10, § 17—*μεγάλη πλῆθος*.

<sup>2</sup> De Bel. Jud. L. 2, c. 4, § 1.

gy, L. 17, c. 10, § 6: *καὶ τινος πλήθους συστάτος*, i. e. not a great but a certain multitude or a certain band. It will be noticed that Josephus does not specify numerically in either instance how many men joined these leaders in their attempts at revolt; but since he does not hesitate to designate the followers of Athronges as very numerous, and also those of Judas as not few, while he omits the use of any such epithet in relation to Simon's party, the presumption is that Josephus regarded this last as much smaller than the others. If any one should doubt whether Simon with four or five hundred men could have executed the bold feats related of him, this doubt will entirely disappear when we consider the situation in which the country of the Jews was, just at that time. Immediately after the death of the first Herod, the flames of discord burst forth at once in all parts of the land. Of the royal troops whose business it was to restore order and peace, the greatest part passed over to the side of the different insurgents and made common cause with them. Sabinus under whose command was placed the only Roman legion at that time in Palestine, had taken a strong position at Jerusalem; but he himself was in so straitened a condition that he could with difficulty hold out much longer against the rebels, and did not venture even to leave Jerusalem. Finally, Quintilius Varus who was stationed with two other legions in Syria, could not appear immediately in Palestine with these and the auxiliary troops which he had raised from the allied kings, tetrarchs and cities. Under these circumstances which existed at the commencement of this very distracted period, it was possible certainly for so daring a man as Simon with four or five hundred followers of a similar spirit to cross over the Jordan from Perea, destroy the royal citadel in Jericho and other castles, spread fear and consternation in his track, and procure for himself a fame which extended to the Romans, and of which we have still an evidence in Tacitus.

But finally; The circumstance that Simon was a slave speaks strongly for the conjecture that after he had caused himself to be proclaimed as king, he assumed another name instead of his original one. The name which he had borne as a slave, did not comport with his position after he had put on the crown. The proud spirit which he possessed, as Josephus has described him, would lead him to conceal as much as possible the low origin from which he had sprung, and hence to exchange a name which would have served only to perpetuate that remembrance, for some other in which he could appear to the world without any derogation from his new dignity as king. Hence it is in the highest degree probable, that Simon had two names, in conformity with the Jewish custom mentioned above, according to

which individuals on changing their occupation, or passing from a lower to a higher sphere of life, called themselves by a new name. Theudas, therefore, may have been the name which he had borne as a slave while he stood in that relation to Herod, and Simon the one which he adopted when he set himself up as king. The circumstance that a Simon, as is well known, was the first of the Hasmonean family, who bore the princely title, may have had something to do with his choice of this name. Should this conjecture be correct, it becomes then easy to explain why Gamaliel and Josephus have referred to him under different appellations. Gamaliel ascribed to him the name which he had borne for so long a time as a slave at Jerusalem and under which he was known to the members of the Sanhedrim; he called him Theudas because there was no reason for mentioning him under the name Simon, which he had borne a short time in his assumed capacity as king. But Josephus who wrote his historical works for Romans and Greeks, introduced him under the name, under which he once set himself up as king, burnt palaces and castles, and made himself, as we see from Tacitus, extensively renowned. As in the time of the emperor Trajan we have a remarkable example of a seditionist who occurs under two different names, since, as was remarked above, he appears in Dio Cassius as Andreas and in Eusebius as king Lucius, so we have perhaps a similar example in the time of the emperor Augustus.

It is evident from all that has now been said, that in no case can any well founded objection be urged against the accuracy of Gamaliel's speech as reported to us by Luke. If we are not disposed to admit that Josephus committed an oversight in having ascribed incorrectly the name of Theudas to an impostor who appeared under Claudius and Fadus, but consider it more probable that he too has stated the truth in this matter, we have then two Thodases or Theudasas,—the one a bold insurrectionist in the time of the emperor Augustus, the other a crafty impostor in the days of the emperor Claudius. We are at liberty, therefore, to adopt either of two conclusions;—we may consider the Theudas mentioned in the Acts as one of the political disturbers mentioned in Josephus under another name, in which case he would be most probably the same person as Simon, the slave of Herod, or as one of those factious men so numerous in that period, whom Josephus, who also passes over other important events, has not expressly mentioned in his works. At all events, we are entitled to hold fast here the consoling assurance that so far as relates to the passage on which we have been remarking, we have no ground whatever to reject the credibility of Luke; on the contrary, he who

wrote the book of the Acts, and as the confidential friend and fellow-traveller of the apostle Paul enjoyed such means for collecting the necessary facts, stands before us with claims to our confidence which still remain, and must ever remain, unimpaired.

---

### ARTICLE III.

#### REMARKS ON A PASSAGE IN PLATO'S GORGIAS, p. 497. A. ed. Steph.

By T. D. Woolsey, Yale College.

*Callicles.* Οὐκ οἶδ' αὐτα σοφίζει, ὦ Σώκρατες. *Socrates.* Ολοθα, ἀλλὰ ἀκκίζει, ὦ Καλλίκλεις. καὶ πρόϊθι γὰρ ἔτι εἰς τοῦ μισροῦσαν, ὅτι ἔχων ληρεῖς, ἵνα εἰδῆς ὡς σοφὸς ὢν με νοουθετεῖς. οὐχ ἅμα διψῶν τε ἑκαστος πεπανται καὶ ἅμα ἠδόμενος διὰ τοῦ πίνακος.

THESE words are intelligible enough in themselves, and there is no uncertainty respecting the text; so far as it depends on manuscript authority. There is however a difficulty in the clause *ὅτι ἔχων ληρεῖς*, which all the commentators seem to feel. Cornarius proposed to read *ὅτι ἔχων ληρεῖς*, probably on account of the harshness of the parenthesis with *ὅτι* in this place. Coray conjectured *ὅτι ἐκὼν ληρεῖς*. Heindorf's nice tact led him to go deeper into the difficulty, and he expresses himself as follows: "Verbis his *ὅτι ἔχων ληρεῖς* quid faciam non video. Calliclem haec sane deceret: (conf. § 100.<sup>1</sup>) Socratem, leniter ubique et argumentorum vi, non verborum asperitate adversarii nugae convincentem meo quidem iudicio parum decet. Tum prorsus pervertunt ironiam in verbis quae statim post inferuntur, *ἵνα εἰδῆς ὡς σοφὸς ὢν με νοουθετεῖς*; atque, ut sunt h. l. interposita sensu propemodum omni carent.—Nunc nulla mihi relinquatur dubitatio quin alieno loco a librario intrusa sint, in proximis fortasse Callicli sic tribuenda; *οὐκ οἶδα ὅτι ἔχων ληρεῖς*."

In the appendix to Heindorf's Select Dialogues of Plato (second ed. Berl. 1829), Buttman acknowledges in part the force of Heindorf's objections, but endeavors to weaken it by the following considerations: "ut aliquo modo vulgatam lectionem tuear, per parenthesis quandam inserta haec accipio, quae sic quoque, et magis sane pro more suo ef-

<sup>1</sup> He refers to p. 490, D. E.