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

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

A LOST CHAPTER OF EARLY CHRISTIAN HISTORY.

In the quaint and interesting story or legend of St. Thekla, which has come down to us under the name of "the Acts of Paul and Thekla," a certain Queen or rich lady, named Tryphæna,[1] plays an important part. Gutschmid first pointed out that Tryphæna was an historical personage, and his remarks about her, with their mixture of acuteness and error, have been simply reproduced by Lipsius, who failed to observe how much had been learned about her in the interval since Gutschmid wrote. Lipsius quotes the paper in which Mommsen unravelled as far as was then possible the complicated history and relationship of Tryphæna; but apparently imagined that Mommsen's Tryphæna was a different person from Gutschmid's. There is indeed an extraordinary dissimilarity between the two. Gutschmid's Tryphæna was a daughter of Juba, king of Mauretania and Cleopatra (daughter of the famous Egyptian queen), and gained the title Queen by her marriage to Polemon, King of Cilicia. Mommsen's Tryphæna belonged to a noble family of Asia Minor, was Queen of Pontus in her own right by inheritance from her mother Pythodoris (granddaughter of the Triumvir Mark Antony), and reigned in Pontus conjointly with her son Polemon. Yet all that differentiates the two queens is error on the part of Gutschmid. Both he and Mommsen were speaking of the same person.[2] The difference between them gives a good measure of the progress of knowledge

[1] "Queen" in the Syriac version, "a certain lady of a royal house" in the Armenian, "a certain rich woman" in the Greek and Latin (but Lipsius inserts *βασίλισσα* in his edition of the Greek text without MS. authority).

[2] Mommsen's paper summed up and added immensely to the results of other scholars, chiefly Waddington and Von Sallet.

with regard to the history and circumstances of Asia Minor in the early Christian period.

In the *Church in the Roman Empire before A.D.* 170, the present writer attempted to treat on the basis of Mommsen's paper the part which Tryphæna played in the Thekla-legend; and the conclusion reached was that there must have been a real historical foundation for the action attributed to her in the legendary *Acta*.

In the present paper the discoveries of the last few years with regard to this queen will be described; and it will be evident that, although no such startling transformation has occurred as that which made Gutschmid's into Mommsen's Tryphæna, yet the subject has advanced considerably. It will also be observed that the progress of discovery in this case affords an instructive example of the way in which the history of the first century is gradually being restored, by a new detail here and an incident there; and it also gives a warning as to the extreme wariness and care with which new discoveries or suggestions must be scrutinized before they are accepted.

The inference to be drawn from the whole circumstances which have to be related is that it is proper, every few years, to study afresh, without prejudice in favour of former views, the history of early Christianity in the light of our growing knowledge of the period.

The difficulty in identifying the Tryphæna of the Thekla-legend with the Pontic queen was this. Tryphæna appears in the legend as a lonely widow, complaining of her powerlessness and isolation from her family, taking part in a great ceremony of the Imperial State religion at Pisidian Antioch, and therefore obviously resident in, or on the borders of, Southern Galatia. The Pontic queen reigned in a distant country; and though her presence at such an Imperial ceremony might have been easily understood, if the ceremony had been held at Ancyra, the capital of North Galatia

and of the entire Galatic Province, yet it seemed highly improbable that she should appear in Antioch, and her complaint of powerlessness and friendlessness also appeared out of keeping with her sovereign position. The following hypothesis was advanced in the *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 386, to account for her presence.

The known facts were these: (1) Tryphæna reigned in Pontus for some years after A.D. 38, conjointly with her son Polemon: some coins bear the portraits and names of both her and her son: (2) her father had at one time been king of Iconium and a considerable territory round and south of it, and her son was granted part of that territory by Claudius and sent to live on it by Nero. The hypothesis as stated was built on those facts, to the effect that Polemon, who came of age and entered on the sovereignty after his mother had become accustomed for many years to regard herself as Queen in her own right, found some difficulty in getting on amicably with her. He had been educated from infancy in Rome, while she lived and played the great lady in Asia. She had succeeded her mother Pythodoris, who reigned for many years alone in Pontus, treating her own son as a subject and not as a sovereign; and Tryphæna too was likely to be exacting in her demand on her son's obedience. Now, though historians allude to Polemon occasionally, they never mention Tryphæna. This proves that she was not so successful as she probably wished in imposing her influence on her son and on the realm. It is therefore natural and probable that she quarrelled with her son, and retired to a life of seclusion in her own family estates in one of her father's former kingdoms; and hence we find her in the *Acta* a solitary, disappointed and mournful old woman, resident somewhere in or on the south frontier of Southern Galatia, and appearing at its capital, Antioch, to show her loyalty and do honour to the Emperor by greeting his representative and

by taking some part in a great festival of the Imperial worship.

The coins bearing the name of Queen Tryphæna have been much increased in number during recent years. They can now be divided into classes, and the chronological succession of the classes fixed with probability or even certainty. Coins are known, which bear her name and portrait, and the portrait without name of her son Polemon with the date 17 and 18, (IZ and IH). M. Imhoof Blumer interpreted these dates as reckoned from A.D. 38, when Polemon was permitted by the Emperor Caligula to take up his inheritance, as King of Pontus, jointly with his mother. Hence he concluded that she was still reigning there until A.D. 55. In an article on Pontus in Dr. Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. iv. p. 16, I have accepted this reckoning.

But if Tryphæna had been living and striking coins as Queen in Pontus in A.D. 55 and 56, the hypothesis just stated could hardly be sustained. It would require to be complicated with some such addition as that she had been reconciled again to her son and returned to Pontus. Now the sole justification of the hypothesis lay in its being so natural and probable; but in proportion as the disagreement of the joint rulers is probable, so their subsequent reconciliation would be improbable. Another suggestion might be that Tryphæna's acquaintance with Thekla began at a later date, but that does not suit the *Acta* well.

In short, according to M. Imhoof Blumer's view, the numismatic facts would be distinctly unfavourable to the historicity of the Tryphæna episode; and a probability would be established that the incident in which she plays a part was merely a fictitious romance about a historical personage. In the article on Pontus, just mentioned, I originally inserted a footnote saying that some correction of my published views on this subject would be necessitated

on account of M. Imhoof Blumer's discovery, but by a fortunate chance the note was struck out of the proof-sheets in order to make room for an addition required in the text.

M. Th. Reinach has published in the latest number of the *Numismatic Chronicle*, 1902, p. 4 ff., a note on the coinage of Tryphæna, in which he corrects the dating of the great Swiss numismatist; and the changes which he makes throws a flood of light on the history of the Queen. His arguments, it should be added, are drawn purely from considerations of Roman history, and probably he is not aware of my speculations about the Queen in the legend, or if he is aware of them would regard them as too vague and shadowy to be worthy of the notice of a historical inquirer. Hence the light which his views throw on the tale of Thekla is all the more welcome and valuable. It is unnecessary here to state fully his arguments, which appear to me conclusive in the present state of our knowledge; [1] those who are interested in the demonstration can study it in his own words. But he has not lingered over the subject long enough to point out in detail how much his view simplifies both the numismatic and the historical development. This simplicity is in itself a strong argument in his favour; and, though his view still remains on the plane of theory and hypothesis, like that of M. Imhoof Blumer, and must remain so until new discoveries confirm it, yet there is no reason to doubt that it will be accepted by the historians and the numismatists.

The history of the Queen, if we accept his view, now stands out clearly. She was born some time after B.C. 12 and before B.C. 8 (when her father, Polemon I., King of Pontus, died), she was great-granddaughter of Mark Antony, and second cousin of the Emperor Caligula (A.D. 37–41),

[1] Except one single point, which is rather doubtful, but does not seriously affect the conclusions here stated: see below p. 289.

while her mother was cousin of the Emperor Claudius (A.D. 41–54). She was married to Kotys, King of Thrace, and left a widow by his early death before A.D. 19 with three sons, who were taken to Rome and brought up there in company with the future Emperor Caligula, while Tryphæna took up her residence at Cyzicus, which had naturally been in close relations with her husband and his kingdom.

The mother of Tryphæna was Pythodoris, who reigned as Queen of Pontus after her husband's death until A.D. 22–23,[1] when she died. By the custom of Asia Minor Tryphæna ought now to have succeeded to the sovereignty of Pontus, but the jealousy and distrust of Tiberius would not permit her to take up the succession to her mother, and she continued until that Emperor's death to reside, either occasionally or permanently, in Cyzicus, the great city on the Propontis. Here she was a person of great consequence on account of her high birth and wealth. Several long inscriptions show her as taking an active and interested part in municipal affairs. It was a habit with the women of Anatolia to take an active interest in public life, and both Queen Pythodoris and Tryphæna were true to the custom of the country. The former governed Pontus and Bosporus for more than thirty years as reigning sovereign, and Tryphæna played an intelligent part in the State of Cyzicus.[2]

As early as A.D. 15, during her husband's lifetime, the merchants and resident strangers of the Province Asia made a dedication in her honour at Cyzicus. Later the State and the Roman merchants of Cyzicus, "her second fatherland," recognized her services by several dedications. She became priestess of the Empress Livia. She restored or

[1] The date is inferred by M. Th. Reinach from the coins mentioned: see p. 286

[2] See Mr. Hasluck's account of her public works in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 1902, p. 132.

rebuilt various parts of the city which had suffered much during the Mithridatic and the Civil Wars. She re-opened to commerce the harbour which had been injured by the blocking of the entrance-channels.

It was perhaps through recollection of the Queen that the name Tryphæna lasted in Cyzicus, where a martyr, St. Tryphæna, is mentioned under Diocletian. There may be a vestige of truth about this later Tryphæna, and, if so, her case might merely prove that the name became popular in Cyzicus. But it seems more probable that the martyr is fictitious. Her story is too like that of Stratonica;[1] and the resemblance suggests that a legend gradually gathered in Christian memory round the name of the Queen, not as a real personage of real history, but as a figure in the tale of Thekla. But the localization of St. Tryphæna in Cyzicus implies that the Church in Cyzicus was old enough to have some vague recollection that the Tryphæna of the Thekla legend had had some connexion with their city. If our interpretation is correct it would furnish a good example of the way in which martyr-legends grew round a really historical name, though not a vestige of truth can be found in the story, as it gradually took form by gathering detail from other *Acta* of martyrs which might or might not possess some claim to be historical.

Meanwhile the kingdom of Pontus seems to have been administered directly by a representative probably a procurator of the Emperor Tiberius; it was not incorporated in a province, but treated like a dependent kingdom (as hitherto it had been), only its sovereign was not for the moment allowed to hold the reins of power.

The death of Tiberius changed the position of Tryphæna.

[1] Stratonica in *Acta Sanctorum*, 31st October. Tryphæna, *ibid.*, January, vol. ii. p. 1081.

Her mother's cousin, Caligula, now became emperor. He carried his affection for his relative to an extreme, gave his deceased grandmother Antonia the title of Empress with divine honours, and favoured the names Antonia and Antonius. His three companions in childhood, the sons of Tryphæna, were all raised to be kings: the eldest in his father's land of Thrace; the second, Polemon II., in his grandparents' and mother's sovereignty over Pontus and Bosporus; the third, Kotys, in Armenia Minor. These changes needed time, and it was not till October or November A.D. 38 that the new administration of Pontus began, for the dated coins of Polemon II. show that his first year was the one which ended in September A.D. 39.[1]

Antonia Tryphæna now returned to Pontus, and the Pontic coinage shows that she reigned there as Queen Tryphæna. Now, during the period of her retirement in Cyzicus, Tryphæna could hardly have ventured to take the title of Queen. It was not safe to do anything that might give umbrage to the jealousy of Tiberius, or be capable of being represented to him as disrespectful or disobedient. But, on the other hand, she seems not to have been given the title by Caligula, when he gave it to her son, but simply to have resumed it as being already hers by right of birth; and, if so, she must have dated it from her mother's death. To date it from A.D. 38 would be an act of treason, for it would attribute to Caligula an action, which he did not perform.

Thus there was a Queen and a King of Pontus reigning conjointly. Formerly it was imagined that they must have been a married couple: so Gutschmid and others believed, but Waddington first pointed out that the Queen is represented on the coins as much older than the King

[1] In the Pontic calendar the year began about equinox of autumn.

and must therefore have been his mother, and the inscriptions subsequently discovered have entirely confirmed his observation.

The relation between the young King and the old Queen must have been a delicate one (as has been shown above), and the coins, as they are arranged by M. Th. Reinach, bring this out very clearly, proving beyond doubt that the want of good feeling, which our hypothesis supposed, did actually exist between the two sovereigns.

In the first two years of the joint reign, A.D. 38–40, the Pontic royal coins bear the portrait and name of Tryphæna on the obverse; on the reverse appears the portrait of Polemon but not his name, also the numbers 17 and 18 (IZ and IH). There can be no question that here the intention is to represent the Queen as the important personage and the young King as secondary. Tryphæna evidently desired to imitate, as far as respect to the imperial mandate permitted, the example of her mother, who had associated her eldest son with her in the administration without allowing him the kingly title. The dates, therefore, must be counted according to the chief personage on the coin, and not according to the nameless portrait on the reverse side; and, since there would naturally be an outburst of coinage when Queen Tryphæna began to exercise her long-delayed sovereignty, it may be assumed that the year 17 of her nominal reign was the first of her actual power A.D. 37–38, and that her mother had died in A.D. 22–23.

But this was not long permitted, and there follow a series of coins undated, bearing the portrait and name of Polemon on the obverse, and on the reverse the name and sometimes the portrait of Tryphæna. It is probable that the earliest of these coins were those bearing the portrait of the Queen, and that she afterwards lost this mark of equality.

This series evidently belongs to the period 41–48 A.D., but none of them bear dates, so that absolute certainty is unattainable. Probably the series began when Claudius came to the throne in January 41 A.D. He was not so favourable to the Pontic sovereigns as Caligula had been, for he took away the realm of Bosporus from them (giving in compensation a part of Cilicia Tracheia along with the important city of Olba). He may have objected to Tryphæna's action in making her son a secondary personage contrary to imperial order.

The probable course of events may be restored from analogous incidents in the history of such dependent kingdoms. The King was discontented with his inferior position and sent envoys to complain to the supreme authority of the Emperor. The Queen sent other envoys to state her side of the case. The Emperor then gave his decision, but the proceedings must have lasted a considerable time.

The situation was complicated by the murder of Caligula and the accession of Claudius, in January A.D. 41, and it can hardly have been earlier than the end of that year that the new Emperor's decision arrived, giving the superior position to the King, but not degrading the Queen. Equality was established as nearly as possible between the two sovereigns, and the delicate question whether the regnal year inscribed on the coins should be counted according to Tryphæna's or Polemon's reign, was solved by omitting the number. The arrangement lasted for some years, but the influence of Tryphæna grew weaker and her portrait disappeared from the coins, though her name remained.

About A.D. 48 the joint coinage ceased, and Polemon struck coins henceforth without recognizing his mother's rights. In A.D. 49, there begins a new series of coins, bearing on the obverse the name of Polemon with or without

his portrait, and on the reverse the portrait of a Roman Emperor or Empress along with dates from 12 to 23 (IB to KΓ),[1] evidently the years of Polemon's reign. The series therefore ranges from A.D. 49–50 to 60–61.

So far as numismatic evidence goes this might have suggested that Queen Tryphæna died at this time, when she must have been about 57 years of age. But here the *Acta* of *Paul and Thekla* completes the record. Tryphæna was still living, but the experiment in dual sovereignty had failed and was now abandoned. First the portrait of the Queen had disappeared from the coins, and now her name also disappeared. The exact circumstances are unknown. Perhaps another appeal was made to the Emperor and he decided against her. But it is not improbable that the mother became tired of the unpleasant situation and voluntarily retired from Pontus either into private life on one of the family estates, or into a semi-royal residence on the royal property in Cilicia Tracheia.

Tryphæna had now entirely disappeared from the coinage, and the reigning Emperor or Empress was recognized. The fact was that imperial influence was now closing in on Pontus. The kings had done the work of preparing the Pontic population for absorption in the empire, which (as Strabo says) was what they were expected to do, and it was nearly time for them to pass away and let Pontus be made into a province. It is highly improbable that that influence was allowed to relax again, and that (as M. Imhoof Blumer's dating of the coins would require) any coins were afterwards struck by Polemon without an imperial effigy to convey a formal recognition of the Imperial supremacy. The Imperial policy moved steadily on to its consummation. As we know, about twelve years

[1] Claudius, his wife Agrippina, Britannicus during his brief life as heir-apparent and as joint emperor along with Nero, and Nero himself, all appear on the coins.

later, the Imperial government began to think about taking the final step, and, after some consideration, it deprived Polemon of his Pontic kingdom in A.D. 63, but allowed him to retain his sovereignty in Cilicia Tracheia with the title King, and until his death, about A.D. 73, he resided in Cilicia, perhaps at Olba. His Pontic kingdom was incorporated in the Province Galatia, as a distinct *Region* under the name Pontus Polemoniacus[1] which it retained for more than two centuries.[2]

History is, naturally, as silent about the subsequent fortunes of Tryphæna as it is about her sovereignty. But the Thekla-legend comes to our aid, showing her to us, a disappointed and solitary woman, a dethroned queen, residing in, or on the borders of, South Galatia. In her position it was natural and almost obligatory that, when the Roman governor of the Province Galatia came to Antioch to be present at a great ceremony in the provincial cultus of the emperors, and a great demonstration of the provincial loyalty, the Queen, who had been herself a priestess in that cultus, should show her respect by coming to Antioch. Thus she was present at the *Venatio* when Thekla was punished, not for Christianity (which was not yet a crime),[3]

[1] To distinguish it from Provincia Pontus, which was classed along with Bithynia, and from Pontus Galaticus, which had been part of the Province Galatia for many years.

[2] I assume that M. Reinach is right in thinking that a Pontic coin (which has hitherto been supposed to contain the portrait of Caligula and to belong to year Γ of Polemon) contains the portrait of Nero and belongs to year ΚΓ; but this is far from certain. If Waddington and others are right, we should have to understand that Caligula, when the Pontic embassies approached him, decided entirely against Tryphæna's right; and that Claudius restored her to equality. This latter supposition seems to me perhaps the probable one; but M. Reinach's authority is high, and for our purposes the point is immaterial.

[3] As is pointed out, the *Acta* is quite clear on this point. Thekla was punished solely on the charge of treason and disrespect to the emperor (*maiestas*).

but for disrespect to the Imperial dignity in having struck the high priest of the Imperial gods, and torn from his head and dashed on the ground the official crown with its portrait of the reigning emperor.[1]

In this situation how natural are the words which in the *Acta* are spoken by Queen Tryphæna, when Thekla was torn from her protection! "This second time doth affliction and sorrow come upon my house, and there is not any one to help me, . . . and no member of my noble house cometh to my assistance, and I am a widow woman." Equally natural is it that, though she laments over her loneliness and friendlessness, she is treated with extreme deference by the Roman officers, who are afraid that the emperor may be angry with them if they do anything that causes her serious annoyance. Even in her retirement she was a personage of high standing, and hedged in by the respect and awe in which even a distant relation of the emperor stood.

Further, this was true only in the period preceding A.D. 54. Nero, who came to the throne in October 54, had no relationship with the Pontic family; and he rather preferred to throw contempt on any thing or person favoured by his predecessor. The *Acta* gives a picture perfectly true to the time, and yet a picture which immediately afterwards ceased to be true and quickly faded out of memory and even out of history; one of the two brief references which Dion Cassius makes to Polemon gives the name of his father incorrectly; and no historian even mentions the name of Tryphæna, which is preserved only by coins and inscriptions.

The family of Queen Tryphæna is connected with the early history of Christianity by other legends. Various stories have gathered around the person of the Apostle

[1] Of the official crown the latest and best account is given by Mr. G. F. Hill in the Austrian *Jahreshefte*, 1899, p. 245 ff.

Bartholomew, making him an important figure in the Christianization of eastern Asia Minor and the adjoining lands. Those stories mostly agree in one point: they make Bartholomew preach in some part of the kingdom of Polemon, and even bring him into actual relations with that king or with his uncle Zenon (brother of Tryphæna),[1] who was made king of Armenia Magna in A.D. 18, and took the name Artaxias. In the legends the names are corrupted into Polemios or Polymios and Astreges or Astyages, the former being the king of the land and Astreges his brother.[2] As to the country where Bartholomew preached, the legends vary. Sometimes they speak of Bosporus, sometimes of Armenia, sometimes of Lycaonia, sometimes of Upper Phrygia and Pisidia, sometimes of India.

In this variety there is only one thread of connexion, viz. Polemon himself. He had been King of Bosporus from A.D. 38 to 41: part of Armenia was bestowed on him by Nero in A.D. 60: his grandfather had at one time ruled over part of Upper Phrygia and Lycaonia and Cilicia with Iconium as his residence, and he himself was granted the sovereignty of part of Cilicia Tracheia, adjoining Lycaonia, in A.D. 41; and he retired thither in 63. Moreover the Armenian legend says that Bartholomew suffered martyrdom at Ourbanopolis. Now Ourbanopolis was not a city of Armenia: there can be no doubt that Ourbano-polis was simply "the polis of the Ourbanoi, or men of Ourba," and Ourba or Ourwa was the native name of a city in Cilicia Tracheia, which was Hellenized as Orba or Olba, and

[1] He died in 35 A.D. Kotys, the brother of Polemon II., was made king of Armenia Minor in A.D. 38.

[2] Gutschmid and Lipsius incorrectly say that the historical Artaxias-Zenon was brother of Polemon. He was brother of Tryphæna; see the stemma constructed by Mommsen, and reproduced with an addition in the *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 427. By a slip the word 'brother' is used for 'uncle' in the article *Pontus*, *loc. cit.*, p. 16.

which is still called Oura.[1] There is every probability that Olba or Ourwa was the place where Polemon resided from 63 to 68 or later, and where he struck coins after he ceased to be King of Pontus.[2]

Even when the scene of the Bartholomew-legends is laid in India, the names Polemius and Astreges are retained, which shows that the name India is a mere vague indication of the eastern land. The whole series of tales may be taken as mere romance associated with the spread of Christianity into the districts east of the Roman bounds. But in them there seems to be some vague remembrance of some real historical relation between Bartholomew and King Polemon. It seems impossible that there should remain in those distortions some link of connexion with the king, unless some real fact existed in the background. On the other hand, so varied and ingenious are the distortions as to hide almost completely the lost fact. Possibly the steps in the growth of the legends may have been as follows.

It is practically certain that the eastern part of Lycaonia (which was subject to Antiochus, and which St. Paul had omitted as non-Roman territory, though he crossed it twice on his way from Cilicia to Derbe) must have been Christianized shortly after St. Paul's time. The best and doubtless oldest of the legends attributes this work to Bartholomew, and calls him the Apostle of the Lycaonians. From Lycaonia it is natural and probable that he should penetrate south to Olba or Oura the city of Polemon.

[1] See *Historical Geography of Asia Minor*, p. 364. Nicephorus alone among ancient authorities is right on this point. The Armenian city Areuban is quoted by some.

[2] See Mr. G. F. Hill in *Numismatic Chronicle*, 1899, p. 188, who comes independently to the same conclusion about the needed addition to Mommsen's stemma of the family, which was suggested in the *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 427 (see note above, p. 291).

Now Polemon was one of that large class in Asia Minor which had been attracted by the Jewish religion. But he went further than most. He was eager to marry (as Josephus says, on account of her wealth) Berenice, daughter of Herod Agrippa I. (*Acts* xii. 1 f., 20 f.), sister of Herod Agrippa II. (*Acts* xxv. 13), and widow of another Herod, her uncle (King of Chalcis in Syria): Berenice was not merely wealthy but also possessed of such charm that Titus, the Roman Emperor, loved her and was hardly prevented from outraging Roman feeling by marrying her, though she must have been nearly fifty years old at the time. But her family was Jewish, and Polemon had to accept the conditions demanded and become a circumcised proselyte.

As Josephus calls her husband king of (a part of) Cilicia and implies that he was living in that country, Polemon's marriage must have occurred after 63 A.D. Berenice soon left him[1] and returned to her brother Herod Agrippa, and in A.D. 68 her long intrigue with Titus began. Polemon, when thus deserted, abandoned the Jewish faith, as Josephus says.

Might not this desertion of Judaism have taken the form of approximation to Christianity? There is nothing improbable about this supposition. It is well known that the new faith spread in Asia Minor most rapidly among the circle of those pagans who had been attracted towards the Jewish synagogues and had acquired in this way some knowledge of a higher religion. Though Josephus seems

[1] Josephus, *Antiq. Jud.* xx. 7. 3, says that she had been long a widow when she married Polemon, her first husband died in A.D. 41. Most writers assume that she had married and deserted him before she came with her brother to Caesareia and listened to St. Paul, Acts xxvi. 30; but there seems no reason for such an early date. This later date would effectually disprove the suggestion of some numismatists (rejected by Imhoof Blumer, Reinach, etc.) that Berenice and not Agrippina was represented by the female head on later coins of Polemon.

to attribute Polemon's proselytism entirely to greed, it looks probable that this account is due partly to prejudice, and the prejudice would be as easily explained if Polemon had abandoned Judaism for Christianity, as if he had merely relapsed into Paganism.

In the legend Polemius was converted, but Astreges was hostile, and they are both described as kings.

If the historical King Polemon adopted Christianity, or was even (like Sergius Paulus) favourably impressed by it, both the historical facts and the growth of legend would be explained and reconciled, and a new page in the history of early Christianity would be opened to us. Bartholomew, and not Paul, would rightly be called the Apostle of the Lycaonians, for the former went to the people who still bore that name politically (and among whom coins bearing their name ΛΥΚΑΟΝΕΣ were being struck at that time), while the latter addressed the Romanized cities of a Roman province.[1]

Such was, perhaps (one might even say, probably), the historical germ of the legends. There is no probability that Bartholomew went to the north-eastern lands, Bosporus, etc. Even Polemoniac Pontus was probably not Christianized until a later date. When a Christian Pontus is mentioned early, the Province Pontus is intended. In the third century, when Gregory Thaumaturgus went to Polemoniac Pontus, it is mentioned that there were only seventeen Christians in the country; and, though this is a mere fanciful detail, it preserves the real fact that Gregory went to a new country.[2] At all events it is of course impossible that Christianity spread into Bosporus when

[1] In the *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, ii. p. 709, it is suggested that the Lycaones, to whom Bartholomew went, were a tribe in the heart of Phrygia (called the Λυκάονες πρὸς ἔνδον in inscriptions). This suggestion must be abandoned, for it loses the true historical memory that Bartholomew went to the Lycaones, while Paul went to the Province Galatia.

[2] See the article *Pontus* in Dr. Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, p. 18.

Polemon II. was king there (37–41 A.D.) or into Armenia when Artaxias ruled that country (A.D. 18–35).

The northern legends would arise later through the local name Polemoniacus, which persisted for two centuries after Polemon's time. There was always a tendency to seek a legendary connexion with some apostle, and Bartholomew, as connected with Polemon, was transferred to Polemoniacus and the adjoining lands; and obscure historical memories of Artaxias perhaps remained.

W. M. RAMSAY.