

# 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 Expositor* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_expositor-series-1.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php)

## *SAINT PAUL AT EPHESUS.*

It is impossible for any one to invent a tale whose scene lies in a foreign land without betraying in slight details his ignorance of the scenery and circumstances amid which the event is described as taking place. Unless the writer studiously avoids details, and confines himself to names and generalities, he is certain to commit numerous errors. Even the most laborious and minute study of the circumstances of the country in which he is to lay his scene will not preserve him from such errors. He must live long and observe carefully in the country, if he wishes to invent a tale which will not betray his ignorance in numberless details. Allusions of French or German authors to English life supply the readiest illustration of this principle. Even after all the study that has been expended on classical writers, I will engage to prove it in detail from almost any commentary on a Greek or Roman author, where the commentator ventures beyond mere linguistic exposition of his text.

Even to relate an incident that has actually occurred in a foreign land is no easy task for one who has not actually witnessed it. The one chance of safety for a writer in such a case lies in faithfully reproducing the narrative of an eyewitness. As soon as he ventures to write from an independent point, and to modify the account of his authority, he is certain to import into his version some of those slight inaccuracies that betray the foreigner.

I propose to examine from this point of view some details in the account given by Luke of the riot fomented

in Ephesus against Paul by Demetrius the silversmith. Luke does not profess to be an eyewitness of the scene, but he had abundant opportunity of learning from those who must have been eyewitnesses all the incidents which he relates in Acts xix. with a multitude of minute details and local touches. If the story was invented, only a person intimately familiar with Ephesus could avoid many errors, which would provoke a smile from any native of the city, or any one that was well acquainted with it. The most careful and accurate modern students of the antiquities of that country, even after close observation of the ruins, would be the first to profess their inability to attain local verisimilitude, if they had to invent such a tale. The nearest approach they could make to verisimilitude would be to collect in their narrative the details that they could actually trace from ancient remains and records, and studiously to avoid or slur over all others. But, while it would be impossible for any of us to attain verisimilitude in relating such a story, it is much easier for us to criticise such a story when told by another, and by comparison with other sources of information to detect discrepancies between the details that occur in it and facts that can be otherwise ascertained. Such criticism finds plenty of scope in the tale of Paul and Demetrius. While, on the one hand, it must be confessed that our information has hitherto been too scanty to justify us in asserting the absolute and perfect verisimilitude of the story, yet it is equally certain that no error has yet been proved to exist.

The most serious difficulty hitherto started has been the reference to the Asiarchs; but this touches an exceedingly obscure and difficult subject, and no recent writer has ventured to maintain that the reference betrays ignorance. It certainly is difficult to harmonize the reference with other known facts; but it is equally difficult to harmonize these facts with each other. For my own part, I accept

the reference as entirely accurate and as a valuable piece of evidence, on which I found a theory of the Asiarchate, which I hope, ere very long, to state in detail, and at which I have already hinted<sup>1</sup> so briefly, as to fail to make myself clear.

We look forward to Canon Hicks's forthcoming edition of the Ephesian inscriptions to add greatly to our power of criticising the nineteenth chapter of Acts; and I shall, in the course of these remarks, refer to some other recently discovered evidence bearing on the point. I hope also at some future time to discuss the verisimilitude of all the Asia Minor episodes in that book, and to show at least one remarkable case, in which a detail that for a time seemed to me to betray inaccuracy has quite recently justified itself completely: I refer to the account given of Derbe and Lystra.

It is however remarkable that the firstfruits of Canon Hicks's work should be his own attempt to prove that there occurs in Acts xix. precisely such an error in detail as a writer ignorant of the country is sure to commit in inventing a tale about it. If the proof is conclusive, I should feel constrained to follow; but the proof, at least, demands rigorous examination, and I trust to show that it is not correct. Canon Hicks, indeed, infers only that the writer, Luke, misunderstood the words of an eyewitness; but this inference will satisfy few. If the error exist, it can be far more naturally explained in another way, *viz.* as a piece of bad invention, and those who reason dispassionately about historical documents must allow a presumption in favour of the simplest and most natural explanation. Moreover I shall try to prove that the error, if error it be, is involved in the essence of the story, and must be got by the writer of Acts xix. from the account of the supposed eyewitness that he used as his authority. Finally, I shall

<sup>1</sup> In the *Classical Review*, 1889.

show that it is no error, but a true and accurate detail, that adds to the general verisimilitude of the narrative.

While I am unable to agree with the theory stated by Canon Hicks, I should like to acknowledge the high interest and value of his paper in the last number of *THE EXPOSITOR*. The importance of closely scrutinising the details of such a document is great, and the results, whether we actually agree with them or not, are sure to be highly suggestive. I could quote many cases where a book or paper, whose results could not be accepted, was far more valuable and suggestive than any statement of certain and indisputable facts could be. Canon Hicks's paper is one of these cases: its value in method is quite unconnected with its value in results.

I should be very ready to acknowledge that, with regard to the identification of Demetrius, Canon Hicks has made out at least the probability of his case. It would be, of course, almost as difficult to prove an identity between two persons named John Smith in our own country as between two persons named Demetrius in Greece or the west coast of Asia Minor. But he may be taken to be right in dating his inscription about 50-60 A.D., and the state of the case may then be thus stated. Two independent documents mention a Demetrius in Ephesus about 50-60 A.D. In each case the Demetrius is a man of standing in the city, influential and presumably wealthy. In the one case Demetrius is specified as "a silversmith," and as evidently a leader in the trade; in the other case the Demetrius in question is designated in the ordinary way by his father's and grandfather's name, and by his "thousand." Such was the regular legal designation of a citizen—the addition of the father's name being practically universal, while the grandfather was less commonly mentioned, chiefly in the case of the commoner names. In addition to this, the official position of the second Demetrius, as member and

chairman of a board of city magistrates, is recorded. The variety of style in the references is quite natural, and the fact that nothing in the one case agrees with anything recorded in the other is due to the different character of the documents, and affords no presumption that the two persons are different. The identity of the two is therefore quite possible; and a natural inclination leads us to hope that it may even be called probable.

While in deference to Canon Hicks's high authority and experience, I am quite ready to accept his date for the inscription, I should state that *à priori* I should have been inclined to refer to a later period both this inscription and the one afterwards inscribed on the same stone. The latter is placed by Canon Hicks in "the age of the Antonines," *i.e.* 140-190 A.D. I should certainly have been inclined to refer this text (see p. 405) to the revival of paganism which I believe to have taken place about 200 A.D., and the earlier inscription of Demetrius to about 100 A.D. The form *νεποτιός*, with *ο* for *ω*, seems rather to belong to a period later than Nero, though it was certainly the common form at least as early as 104 A.D. But Canon Hicks has no doubt taken all this into consideration before forming an opinion, and I am quite ready to follow him provisionally.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Mr. C. Smith has now shown me the Ephesian stones, and I am unwilling to put the Demetrius inscription earlier than 70-80 A.D. It has *ο* for *ω* twice, and a late form of *Xi*, and is in some respects of later character than the Salutaris inscription (104); but this is perhaps due to the fact that the *νεποιοι* (who were people of not the highest class) employed an inferior engraver. The *νεποια* was a *munus*, not a *honor*. Canon Hicks's impression seems really to agree with my view: he assigns the period as "the latter half of the first century" (p. 405), whereas in stating dates roughly by periods 57 A.D. is usually called "the middle of the century." He also seems to feel that the use of *ο* for *ω* is hardly consistent with 57 A.D.; for in his formal publication (of which Mr. Smith showed me the proof) he restores *νεωπ.*, whereas on p. 418 he uses *νεοπ.* From his article I did not gather that of this critical word only the first letter remains on the stone, and the rest is his ingenious restoration. I quite admit that his restoration is highly probable, but it is not certain; and it therefore forms only a weak support for the accusation that Luke made such a serious error.

Canon Hicks's next point is, that the inscription belongs to the very year in which occurred the famous scene in the theatre, and that "the honour therein voted to him and his colleagues was in recognition of the services rendered by him and them on behalf of the national goddess"; *i.e.*, as is shown in the sequel, in recognition of the demonstration against the Apostle which Demetrius (and his colleagues, as Canon Hicks would add) organized in the Great Theatre.

There can be no doubt that, if this be so, we must gain from the discovery, as Canon Hicks recognises, much new light on the events related in Acts xix. Does this new light confirm or controvert the record? According to his interpretation, it puts an entirely new aspect on the whole scene, and an aspect which is absolutely at variance with the character ascribed to it in Acts xix. It is represented to us in Acts as a spontaneous demonstration by a trade which was threatened against the new influence that was likely to undermine its prosperity. Canon Hicks makes it out as due to the action of the priests,<sup>1</sup> whose "jealousy only waited for an opportunity of attacking the apostle." "The plan they adopted" was to get the board of *neopoi* "to organize a demonstration against the apostle." Demetrius called together the silversmiths and "those engaged in kindred trades. He appeals first to their trade interests, and soon proceeds to work upon their fanaticism."

The narrative in Acts xix. in its opening words states the connexion between the silversmiths and Artemis: Demetrius "made silver shrines of Diana," and his trade would therefore disappear if her worship decayed. Canon Hicks however argues that this phrase is inexplicable and unintelligible, and that it is a bad inference from the words of an earlier narrator and eyewitness, who had described Demetrius as a silversmith by trade, and as holding the

<sup>1</sup> In order to represent Canon Hicks quite accurately, I shall try to preserve his own words as far as possible.

office of *Neopoi* of Artemis. The title was misunderstood by Luke, who, in recasting his authority, altered *νεοποιὸς Ἀρτέμιδος* into *ποιῶν ναοὺς ἀργυροῦς Ἀρτέμιδος*. Let us then substitute this new version for the old. The first thing that then strikes us is, that in this version the narrative gives no explanation of how the trade interests were threatened. Demetrius says to the silversmiths, "By this business we have our wealth": he then tells them that the worship of Diana is threatened, and the inference is, that their trade is in danger. This speech has no meaning unless Demetrius is addressing tradesmen who work for the temple; and no person could relate the story intelligibly without putting in the forefront an explanation of the close relation between the trade and the worship of Artemis. Silversmiths were common in all Greek cities; the silver work of Athens was famous and lucrative, yet it had no relation to the worship of Artemis. There must have been some reason why the silversmiths of Ephesus were peculiarly connected with the temple, and this reason must have been stated at the outset of the tale, for it is assumed throughout as the explanation of the whole proceedings.

We must then suppose that the original authority began his tale with a statement showing the connexion between the trade, as whose champion Demetrius comes forward, and the religion with which Demetrius assumes that the interests of that trade are identified. This connexion must either be the same as that which Luke assigns or a different one. Canon Hicks evidently considers that it was a different one, both because he states that Luke "misapprehended the document before him," and because he considers that Demetrius drove "a brisk trade in metal statuettes" of the goddess Artemis. This then was the connexion stated in Luke's authority. We have to suppose that Luke, not merely misapprehended the meaning of *Neopoi*, but also omitted the explanation given of the



connexion of the trade with Artemis-worship, and substituted a quite different explanation.

That Luke should not understand the meaning of *Neopoiος* is hardly probable; but that he should so arbitrarily and violently alter the account of the eyewitness whom he follows is in the highest degree improbable.

Another objection occurs to me, which, in view of Canon Hicks's high authority in the antiquities of Ephesus, I hardly venture to state. I have never seen the phrase *νεοποιὸς Ἀρτέμιδος*, which he assumes to have been used in Saint Luke's authority. The officials in question are, in all the inscriptions which I remember to have seen, called *νεοποιοί* simply. I may assume that Canon Hicks would not have used the other title unless he could justify it from the inscriptions of Ephesus, which will soon be fully accessible in his book; but I wish he had quoted an example. *Neopoiοι* of Aphrodite at Aphrodisias<sup>1</sup> do not, in view of the diversity of usage in different cities, seem to me a sufficient justification for a *neopoiος* of Artemis at Ephesus. But considering Canon Hicks's accuracy and the knowledge of Ephesus which he alone (till his book appears) possesses, I simply appeal to him for information on this point. I maintain however that, if he cannot justify the phrase by the authority of inscriptions, in which these officials occur very frequently, the use of a wrong title would constitute precisely one of those errors in detail, which might be used as a proof that his supposed eyewitness was no eyewitness, but an inventor.

Is the phrase, "which made silver shrines of Diana," so inexplicable as Canon Hicks supposes? He says that none of the commentators have explained it; and certainly all the references which he quotes from them justify his statement that they have failed to explain it. I confess that the explanation has always seemed to me so obvious that

<sup>1</sup> *Corpus Inscr. Græc.*, No. 2811. Cf. Dittenberger, *Sylloge*, 6.

I never thought of looking into a commentator. I have been familiar for years with terra-cotta shrines of Artemis, and had always understood that the richer classes bought silver shrines of a similar character. I claim no originality for the suggestion, which I have always understood to be accepted among archæologists. I think I have read it as stated by Professor Ernst Curtius in publishing an example of the kind; and I think he actually quoted the allusion in Acts xix. in illustration of the example which he was publishing. I speak however from distant recollection, and as I write in Scotland, where no scholars' library exists, I cannot verify the statement.<sup>1</sup>

Such small shrines in marble abound, and they were especially used as dedicatory offerings in the worship of that Asiatic goddess who was worshipped as Artemis at Ephesus, and under other names, but with essential identity of character, in many other cities of Greek or semi-Greek character. Scores of examples are enumerated in the *Archäologische Zeitung* for 1880, and the number might easily be raised to hundreds. Terra-cotta shrines are not so numerous, partly on account of their more perishable character, and partly from the fact that in many cases part of the shrine was suppressed and left to the imagination, as was sometimes the case even in marble; so that the shrines thus become little more than statuettes of Artemis.

But the proper dedicatory offering to this goddess was not a simple statuette, but a shrine. I have elsewhere traced the history of this style of representation from the remotest period to the latest age of the worship of Artemis. The innumerable worshippers of the goddess required innumerable dedicatory offerings of the style which was most likely to please her. A great city erected a great shrine

<sup>1</sup> Mr. C. Smith, when I mentioned the point to him, soon found the reference; viz. *Athenische Mittheilungen*, ii., p. 49. The illustration there will convince every one: it shows exactly the kind of *naos* which Demetrius made, except that the material is terra-cotta.

with a colossal statue of the goddess; private individuals propitiated her with miniature shrines, containing embodiments of her living presence. The vast temple near Ephesus and the tiny terra-cotta shrine were equally acceptable to Artemis: she accepted from her votaries offerings according to their means. She dwelt neither in the vast temple nor in the tiny terra-cotta: she was implicit in the life of nature; she was the reproductive power that kept the great world ever the same amid the constant flux of things. Mother of all and nurse of all, she was most really present wherever the unrestrained life of nature was most freely manifested, in the woods, on the mountains, among the wild beasts. Her worshippers expressed their devotion and their belief in her omnipresence by offering shrines to her, and doubtless by keeping shrines of the same kind in their own homes, certainly also by placing such shrines in graves beside the corpse, as a sign that the dead had once more gone back to the mother who bore them.

The phrase in Acts xix. informs us that the term *naoi*, literally "dwellings,"<sup>1</sup> was appropriated to the tiny shrines equally with the great temple; the phrase is almost unique, for we are reduced to gather all our information about this religion from scattered hints and passing allusions. Ancient literature as a rule says least about those phases of ancient life which were so fundamental and so familiar to all as to be naturally assumed as present in the minds of all readers. Precisely in regard to these phases archæology comes to our aid, and interprets the wealth of meaning that underlies the terms in which literature names them.<sup>2</sup> But I hope to have shown how entirely consistent the phrase in the

<sup>1</sup> Strictly *naós* denotes that part of the temple in which the image of the god was placed, and the whole temple as the dwelling of the god.

<sup>2</sup> According to Professor Mommsen's interpretation of a passage of Horace, it contains the only allusion to, and the only occurrence of the name for, the stepping-stones across streets, which are one of the first details that strike the modern visitor to Pompeii: the name is *pondera*.

Acts is with all that we know about the worship and nature of Artemis: it is one of those vivid touches which reveal the eyewitness, one of the incidental expressions which only a person who speaks with familiar knowledge can use, and which are full of instruction about popular ideas and popular language.

When we consider the immense and widespread influence of the Ephesian Artemis, we must acknowledge that vast numbers of pilgrims coming even from considerable distances continually visited her shrine, and that vast numbers of "*naoi*" (I accept the word on the authority of Acts xix. as the technical term used in the trade and by the pilgrims) were needed to supply the unceasing demand. Workers in marble and workers in terra-cotta drove a thriving trade through their connexion with the temple, and this connexion was directed and organized by Demetrius, evidently as guild-master<sup>1</sup> (*παρείχετο τοῖς τεχνίταις ἐργασίαν οὐκ ὀλίγην*). Luke sums up these tradesmen under the phrase, "the workmen of like occupation" (*τοὺς περὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα ἐργάτας*). We can however well imagine that rich pilgrims dedicated shrines of precious metals; and, even without any other evidence, the mere statement in Acts xix. is so natural and so consistent with the facts just stated, as to constitute sufficient proof that this was so. The silversmiths were of course a craft of higher standing, greater skill in delicate work, larger profits, and therefore greater wealth and influence, than the potters and marble-workers. How natural then it is that it should be a silversmith who gathered together a meeting of the associated trades and organized a disturbance! The less educated workmen follow the lead of the great artisan.

<sup>1</sup> Canon Hicks has some excellent remarks on these guilds in the cities of Asia Minor. The institution still flourishes; and each guild is directed by a master. I have briefly described the guild of street-porters in Smyrna under the Roman empire in the *Amer. Journ. Arch.*, vol. i. A study of these ancient guilds is much needed.

On this view every detail confirms the general effect. We are taken direct into the heart of artisan life in Ephesus; and all is so characteristic, so true to common life, and so unlike what would occur to any person writing at a distance, that the conclusion is inevitable. We have here a picture drawn from nature, and copied literally by Luke from the narrative of an eyewitness.

On the other hand, look at the picture drawn by Canon Hicks. The riot is got up by the priests through the agency of a leading official and his board of colleagues. That is precisely the idea that would occur to any person inventing such an incident. Paul goes to Ephesus; he preaches at first with effect; the priests are alarmed, and raise a dangerous riot against him. Such is the picture that every inventor of the biography of a saint<sup>1</sup> is sure to draw. The priests at once occur to his mind as the natural enemies of his hero. There is nothing characteristic and individual about such an account; all is commonplace, and coloured by the religious ideas of a later time.

The first way in which Christianity excited the popular enmity outside of the Jewish community was as a disturber of the existing state of society and trade. The rise of a new god and a new worship was a matter of perfect indifference to almost everybody in the cities of the Roman provinces. In the Græco-Roman world every one was quite accustomed to the introduction of new deities from other countries. The process had been going on with extraordinary frequency, and had produced a sort of eclectic religion in all Græco-Roman cities. The priests of Artemis looked on it with indifference. They had not found it injurious to their interests; rather, the growth of each new

<sup>1</sup> While I have recently in *THE EXPOSITOR* rehabilitated some of the saints of Asia Minor, it must be remembered that the biographies of the saints of this country are destitute of all historical value, and are inventions of later centuries. Only the discovery of early evidence can enable us to learn anything definite about their real history.

superstition added to the influence of Artemis and her priests. Isis was no enemy to Artemis.

The narrative of the New Testament has led to a general misapprehension on this point. We are so accustomed to the strong religious feeling of the Jews and the intolerant fanaticism with which they persecuted all dissentient opinion, that we are apt to forget that this feeling was peculiar to them, and excited beyond any other of their characteristics the wonder of the tolerant, easy-going indifference of the ordinary pagans, who did not care two straws whether their neighbour worshipped twenty gods or twenty-one. A new deity preached in Ephesus, a new inmate of their eclectic pantheon: it was all a matter of indifference.

Gradually people began to realize that Christianity meant a social revolution, that it did not mean to take its place alongside of the other religions, but to destroy them. The discovery was made in a homely way, familiar to us all; *viz.* through the pocket. Certain trades began, with all the sensitiveness of the money-market, to find themselves affected. The gradual progress of opposition to Christianity is well marked in the Acts, and is precisely in accordance with the above exposition. When Paul began to preach in Asia Minor, he at first experienced no opposition except from the Jews. In Antioch of Pisidia, in Iconium, in Lystra, in Thessalonica, his experience was always the same. The Gentiles were indifferent or even friendly, the Jews bitterly hostile. But in Philippi occurred the incident of the "maid having a spirit of divination"; and "when her masters saw that the hope of their gain was gone," they accused Paul as a Jew before the magistrates of inciting to illegal conduct and violation of the Roman law, and turned to their account the general dislike felt by the Greeks towards the Jews.

Similarly in Ephesus the first opposition against Paul

was roused when the trades connected with Artemis-worship felt their pockets touched, and then the riot arose. It was not a religious persecution, but a social and a mercenary one. So far am I from thinking with Canon Hicks that "the hierarchy would be sensible of the apostle's influence before any others suspected it," that I should not be surprised to find priests or leading supporters of the worship of Artemis among the Asiarchs who were "the only influential friends of Paul at Ephesus." I should rather expect that the action of the priests of Artemis would be similar to that of the priests at Lystra: they would encourage the "revival," and try to turn it to their own account, as in so many cases previously such "revivals" of religious feeling had ultimately only enriched Artemis and her priesthood.

Another contradiction between the account given in Acts xix. and Canon Hicks's theory must be noticed. According to the latter, the officials who organized the riot were rewarded for this action with a special vote of distinction by the senate and the popular assembly. But, according to the account given by Luke, it was a thoroughly disorderly riot, discouraged by the Asiarchs, and rebuked by the city clerk as a groundless disturbance which involved the magistrates and the city in danger at the instance of the Roman law (see ver. 40). This contradiction alone would be fatal to the theory against which I am arguing; or rather, if the theory be true, it convicts the author of Acts xix. as guilty of a most inaccurate and prejudiced account, and as an altogether useless authority for history.

I prefer then to follow the version of the incident given by Luke. Far from finding that "the action of Demetrius appears in a new and far more significant light if he really was the Demetrius of the inscription, and if the honour therein voted to him and his colleagues by the senate and people of Ephesus was in recognition of the services

rendered by him and them on behalf of the national goddess," I think that this theory both involves us in utter contradiction to Luke's account, and reduces the incident from a marvellously vivid and true picture of society in Ephesus to a commonplace and uninteresting tale.

If I were to trust my own inference from Luke, I should picture the riot as entirely that of an ignorant mob, fomented by an artisan more far-seeing than his neighbours. It was a riot disapproved of alike by priests and by magistrates: the former saw nothing in Paul to characterize him as dangerous to the goddess (see ver. 37); the latter felt that the riot was contrary to the Roman law. The distinction which Canon Hicks makes between the attitude of the Asiarchs and that of the priests of Artemis towards Paul is entirely groundless, and forms an unfortunate conclusion to a paragraph, great part of which is excellently<sup>1</sup> expressed and thoroughly true. The cultus of the emperors did indeed prepare the way for the Christian Church; but its doing so was entirely involuntary. It co-ordinated the various religions of the province into something approximating to a single hierarchy. But to maintain that the officials of the imperial cultus naturally represented a different point of view from the priests of Artemis is to go against all evidence. These officials were simply provincials, selected chiefly on account of their wealth and sometimes against their will: they did not represent even the imperial point<sup>2</sup> of view, or that of the Roman governors, but the average view of the upper classes of the province.

<sup>1</sup> In it Canon Hicks confirms all that I have said in *THE EXPOSITOR*, Dec., 1888, about the relation of the imperial worship to Christianity. It was the religion of the Cæsars, not the religion of Jupiter and Artemis, that first felt the new religion to be its enemy.

<sup>2</sup> I do not believe that Canon Hicks is right even in thinking that the Roman governors were so contemptuous of the native religion, and that "their attitude towards the local cults was much the same as that of the English Government towards the polytheism of India." Such a statement is exaggerated beyond Canon Hicks's usual sober and accurate tone.



Many of them had held provincial priesthoods before they became officials of the imperial cultus; in fact, my belief is that the former were a sort of stepping-stone to the latter. The attitude of the Asiarchs towards Paul may then be taken as a fair indication of the tone of the educated classes, among whom I include the higher priests. The attitude of Demetrius and the mob was that of tradesmen whose trade was threatened, and who got up a demonstration on its behalf.

I need not do more than refer to another example of the way in which trades connected with pagan worship were affected by the progress of Christianity. At the beginning of the second century in Bithynia the dealers in fodder for the temple victims were in danger of being ruined on account of the intermission of the regular sacrificial ritual. Owing to the sharp measures instituted by Pliny, who governed the province 111-113 A.D., the trade revived. The apparent reason for Pliny's pointed reference to this trade is, that the persons concerned in it had been prominent in urging forward the action against the Christians and active in denouncing them (*Epist. ad Traj.*, 96).

One objection made by Canon Hicks must be met. "If these silver shrines were common articles of merchandise, such as pilgrims to the famous temple purchased to take back to their homes, then we might fairly expect to find some specimens still extant among the treasures of our museums." In the first place, I imagine that the chief use made of these shrines was to dedicate in the temple. They were sold by the priests to the worshippers, and dedicated by the latter to the goddess: similar examples of trade carried on by priests are too familiar to need quotation. Why then have these silver shrines all disappeared? Simply on account of their value. They have all gone into the melting-pot; many of them being placed there by the priests themselves. Dedicatory offerings were so

numerous, that they had to be cleared out from time to time to make room for new *anathemata*. The terra-cotta shrines, being worthless, would be thrown away quietly, the silver would be melted down. Those which remained to a later period met the same fate at other hands, less pious, but equally greedy. Canon Hicks indeed speaks apparently of silver statuettes of Artemis as common. The expression however is only a careless and probably unintentional one; for they are so rare as to be almost unknown to me.<sup>1</sup>

After Demetrius's speech the excited mob began to shout "Great is Artemis!" and at a later stage they spent about two hours in clamour to the same effect. The phrase is noteworthy. In such circumstances there can be no doubt that some familiar formula would rise to their lips; it would not be mere chance words that suggested themselves to a whole crowd, but words which were well-known to all. We are therefore justified in inferring from this passage that the phrase, "Great is Artemis!" was a stock expression in the religion, just as we might argue from a single loyal demonstration that "Long live the Queen!" was a stock phrase in our own country, or *Χριστιανῶν Βασιλέων πολλὰ τὰ ἔτη* a current phrase in Constantinople under the Byzantine emperors. Conversely, if we can prove that "Great is Artemis!" was a stock phrase of Artemis-worship, we shall add one more to the list of vivid, natural, and individualized traits in this scene.

We have very scanty information about the ritual of the goddess, who was worshipped under various names in Ephesus and many other parts of Lydia, Phrygia, etc.; and among our scanty records this phrase did not occur till a very recent discovery. The word "great" or "greatest"

<sup>1</sup> Mr. C. Smith informs me that there is only a single silver statuette of the Greek Artemis (a doubtful attribution), and none of the Ephesian Artemis, in the British Museum.

indeed occurs as an epithet of the goddess in a number of inscriptions; but that is not a sufficient proof. We want an instance of the words being employed by themselves as a cry or formula in honour of the goddess. In trying to find such an instance the great difficulty hitherto has been that the formulas of the common people were different from those of the educated: the former were native to the country, the latter were copied from Greece. All educated people in Asia Minor gave up their national characteristics and made themselves as Greek as possible.

In 1887 Mr. Hogarth, Mr. Brown, and myself found the site of a temple dedicated to a goddess and her son, Artemis-Leto and Apollo-Lavibenos, at the Phrygian city of Dionysopolis. Beside it we found numerous inscriptions of a remarkable type. They were all erected within the sacred precinct by persons bound to the service of the two deities. They agree in representing the authors as having come before the god when polluted with some physical or moral impurity (sometimes of a very gross kind), and when therefore unfit to appear before the god. The offenders are chastised by the god (in some cases at least, perhaps in all cases, with disease); they confess and acknowledge their fault, and thereby appease the god. They are cured of their ailment, or released from their punishment, and finally they relate the facts in an inscription as a pattern and a warning to others not to treat the god lightly.

In publishing these inscriptions,<sup>1</sup> I have drawn out a number of analogies between the formulæ used in them and those hieratic formulæ which we can trace at Ephesus; and have argued that the religion of Ephesus and of Dionysopolis was fundamentally the same. Among the formulæ common to the two cults is the cry, "Great is Apollo!" "Great is Artemis!" The former occurs as a heading of an inscription at Dionysopolis, and forms a full

<sup>1</sup> *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 1889, p. 216, ff.

and sufficient proof that Luke is strictly correct in giving the latter as a cry in a popular demonstration in honour of Artemis at Ephesus.

The more closely we are able to test the story in Acts xix., the more vivid and true to nature does it prove itself, and the more justified are we in pressing closely every inference, from the little details that occur in it. I entertain the strong hope that the demonstration which has now been given of its accuracy in disputed points will do away with all future doubt as to the faithfulness of the picture that it gives of Ephesian society in A.D. 57. Even though we cannot agree with Canon Hicks's<sup>1</sup> conclusions, our best thanks are due to him for directing our close and minute attention to this most important historical scene, and to the inscription he has so ingeniously pieced together.

The finest part of Canon Hicks's paper is his proof that the revival of paganism in Ephesus was at least as early as 160 A.D., and probably as early as 104 A.D. One of the most interesting facts in the history of religion under the empire is the influence that was exerted by the new religion on the old; and the progress of discovery is gathering a store of information on this point, which will make a remarkable picture. In the first century we observe a general tone of indifference and careless ease in the higher classes, the municipal magistrates, and even the priesthood. Afterwards this security is disturbed. New zeal and earnestness are imparted to paganism; its ceremonial is more carefully studied; and even certain doctrines are adopted from Christianity, and declared to have been always present in the old worship. Canon Hicks enables us to

<sup>1</sup> One other slight point in his paper I should wish to see altered; *viz.* his rendering of *ἑσσηνεύσας ἀγνῶς* as "serving as an *essên* with integrity." *Ἄγνῶς* is a technical term in the religion of Artemis, and denotes the state of purity that results from the due observance of all the prescribed ritual with its physical and moral requirements. In my paper on the Dionysopolitan texts I have shown in some detail the ritualistic importance of this term.

carry back this revival even to 104 A.D.; and we observe that Pliny in 112 A.D. called on the Bithynian Christians to sacrifice to the emperor and the pagan gods: these different forms of religion were henceforth allied against the new faith.

I should like to add one more illustration of the Acts, to which I have referred at the beginning of this paper. We may infer from Acts xiv., xvi., that Lystra was west of Derbe and nearer Iconium than Derbe was. The route of Paul and Barnabas was Antioch, Iconium, Lystra, Derbe, Lystra, Iconium; and that of Paul and Silas was Cilicia, Derbe, Lystra, Phrygia, Galatia, Mysia. The parts about Lystra and Derbe are distinguished from Iconium in such a way as to imply that Lystra was not very far from Derbe; the words would have no meaning if Lystra were near Iconium and far from Derbe. Many years ago I argued that either these inferences drawn from Acts were true, or else the account in Acts xiv., xvi. could not be the work of a person that had seen the country.

At one time I was disposed to think that Lystra and Derbe were situated at the extreme south-eastern corner of Lycaonia, not far from each other, and a great distance from Iconium. This situation appeared to be in accordance with the scanty evidence and to suit the Acts. But in 1885 my friend Prof. J. R. S. Sterrett,<sup>1</sup> discovered Lystra, where Leake long ago conjectured it, about eighteen or twenty miles south of Iconium. The evidence now appeared to show that Lystra and Iconium were a pair of cities, and that Derbe was at a great distance from them. I found myself forced to the opinion (and several times stated it in conversation) that the evidence of topography was dead

<sup>1</sup> I may be allowed to mention also with pride that Prof. Sterrett was my pupil in Anatolian exploration, and though he has many years ago passed out of that stage of pupilage, and become one of the most successful of explorers, yet in 1883 I took him with me a novice in the work.

against the accuracy of the account in Acts. Prof. Sterrett, on the other hand, argued from the Acts that Derbe must be close to Lystra, and placed it accordingly a few miles to the east. This opinion seemed to me to contradict the rest of the evidence, and especially that of the geographer Strabo, about Derbe. Accordingly in my forthcoming *Historical Geography of Asia Minor*, I began to write out a detailed disproof of the situation assigned by Prof. Sterrett, arguing, on the principle which I have throughout applied, that no city should be placed on the evidence of any single reference unless it were confirmed by the other references. In the case of Derbe I showed that we must follow the majority of references, and especially that of a professed geographer, even though it disagreed with the Acts; and I then added a close examination of Strabo's words, proving that he pictured Derbe as in the east of Lycaonia. In the very act of writing out this final part of the proof, I found myself led into a minute study of the eastern Lycaonian frontier, the result of which was that I was literally forced by my own argument from Strabo to place Derbe where Prof. Sterrett had placed it on the evidence of the Acts.

If Bishop Lightfoot (whose irreparable loss all students of the state of society during the conflict between Christianity and paganism deplore) ended his paper on "the Acts illustrated by Recent Discoveries" with an illustration of the saint whom he has made peculiarly his own, Ignatius, I need not apologise for adding another at the conclusion of this paper.

The word *ἑξεμπλάριον*, used by Ignatius three times (*Eph.* 2, *Trall.* 3, *Smyrn.* 12), has been alleged as an argument against the genuineness of the *Letters* ascribed to him. Bishop Lightfoot maintains (*I.*, p. 396) that it is not an unnatural or improbable term for him to use: his reasons are general and *à priori*, no others being possible, and the

objection being of the same character. But in the Dionysopolitan inscriptions to which I have alluded the word occurs several times; and we have thus a proof that this Latin legal term had passed into the current conversational language of the almost wholly uneducated peasants who wrote the inscriptions. Some of these inscriptions belong to the second century, and may be taken as affording a presumption that the word was naturalized among the Greek-speaking orientals even as early as Ignatius. I think that this fact was communicated to the bishop in time for his second edition; it formed the subject of some of the latest letters that passed between us.

It is impossible to conclude this paper without mentioning the great importance of carrying out such a minute and careful study of the references in Acts to Asia Minor as Canon Hicks has initiated in *THE EXPOSITOR*. Such a study is only now becoming possible, owing to the progress of discovery; and every new exploration adds to the stock of material which can be applied to the criticism and elucidation of our literary material.

W. M. RAMSAY.

#### ON THE RELATION OF CHRISTIAN TO JEWISH WORSHIP.

THE recent publication of the Abbé Duchesne's valuable work entitled *Les Origines du Culte Chrétien* can hardly help directing attention afresh to the interesting question of the connexion between Jewish and Christian worship. Much has been already written on the subject, but nevertheless it can hardly be said that the exact relation between the two has been conclusively determined. Considerable light has been thrown on it by the writings of Bickell and others; but the information contained in