

# 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)

form successfully his duties in Asia overpowers every other thought. Timothy must work right on to the end. In the second letter the same thought is not lacking ; it appears constantly throughout the first four chapters ; but the expression of it is coloured in a totally different way, and the explanation of this colouring does not become apparent until we come to iv. 6-9. Then we see that the idea of iv. 6 ff. has been latent in Paul's mind throughout the first few chapters. This idea constitutes the unity of the Second Epistle ; it lies hid for a time, traceable only through the tone in which other ideas are expressed ; then it forces itself to the surface, and Paul thereafter gives free course to the consequences which it brings with it. He would fain see Timothy before he dies.

W. M. RAMSAY.

## THE CAREFULNESS OF LUKE.

### III.

#### PHILIP AND THE EUNUCH.

THE form in which the narrative of the Eunuch's conversion is introduced, "An angel of the Lord spake unto Philip, saying," is one that admits of two interpretations, either that the angel was a man sent by God,<sup>1</sup> as in Acts v. 19, xii. 7 ; in which case we compare Hosea xii. 4 and Genesis xxxii. 24, where the angel is a man : or that the angel had appeared to Philip as to a prophet in a vision. The latter is the more probable for this reason. When St. Luke has described Peter's vision at Joppa he proceeds to describe Peter's subsequent action as prompted by *the Spirit*. "The

<sup>1</sup> Compare what is said by Justin M., *Dial.* 75. "It has been shown in Isaiah (vi. 8) that those who are sent to announce His messages are called both *angels* and *apostles* of God."

Spirit said" (Acts x. 19, xi. 12). Now in Philip's case he represents *the Spirit* as guiding the action (viii. 29, 39) in just such a way as to presuppose the vision. Nor is Luke the only writer who follows the same use of terms. The great vision of Revelation i. is followed by seven admonitions, each one containing a characteristic feature of the vision and delivered by the Spirit: "Hear what *the Spirit saith* unto the Churches" is the practical sequel of the vision. So again at the close of the Revelation (xxii. 16, 17) the practical summary of the whole as the message of God's angel is: "The *Spirit* and the Bride say, Come."

But probably there will be less unwillingness to admit that Philip was a prophet, subject to the conditions of prophecy as a divinely appointed order, and living in a prophetic atmosphere, when it is remembered that his four daughters were prophetesses (Acts xxi. 9).

The chief difficulty in the narrative lies in the expression, "this is desert," as the conclusion of the angel's speech. Most commentators follow Robinson, who says (*Biblical Researches*, ii. 514): "*αἴρη* ('this') may refer to the way or to Gaza. The facts . . . render it improbable that the city is here meant; although there is a possibility that Luke might have written just after the destruction of Gaza about A.D. 65; and thus have been led from the novelty of the event to mention it. On this hypothesis, the words must belong, not to the angel, but to Luke, as a mere parenthetical remark." (But if so, it would be also a frigid and irrelevant archaeological remark, such as Luke has introduced nowhere else. "Gaza has since been destroyed, and is now deserted"! He ought to have said "now." But the "now" would have held good for a very few years, for Gaza quickly recovered its position. All that Josephus says is that the Jews, enraged at the infamous misgovernment of Gessius Florus, were ravaging

cities, overthrowing some and burning others, and "besides burning Sebaste and Ascalon they *were by way of destroying* (κατέσκαπτον) Anthedon (close to Gaza) and Gaza." (*B. J.*, II. xviii. 1.) Also "there exist coins of Gaza struck in honour of Titus, which show at least that the city was still a place of importance very soon after 70 A.D." (But in any case Gaza, the key of Palestine and the key of Egypt, the great calling-place of caravans, could never have been described as desert, and St. Luke knew this.) "More probable, therefore, is it that the term 'desert' is to be referred to the road on which Philip should find the Eunuch, and was indeed meant as a description, to point out to him the particular road, where he should fall in with the latter."

Robinson then proceeds to decide in favour of the road through Eleutheropolis, as leading "through a country without villages inhabited only by nomadic Arabs. The chief difficulty has ever been to show how this region, *in itself so fertile*, could be called *desert*. That the district was at that time in like manner deserted is not improbable. In the days of the Maccabees, the Idumeans had taken possession of Judea as far north as Hebron . . . where they were subdued and compelled to embrace Judaism." Here we must observe that Josephus says, "They submitted to circumcision and the Jewish laws, and from that time forward they were Jews." So much so that in 70 A.D. their leader Simon said, "We Idumeans will stand by the house of God and draw our swords on behalf of our common country" (*B. J.*, IV. iv. 4). Now it is not probable that the country, rich and fertile as it was, inhabited by these Idumeans, who had settled there for 170 years before Philip's journey and become partially civilized and circumcised and eager patriots, however cruel and sanguinary (*Jos. B. J.*, IV. v.) should be called "desert" just because their fore-

fathers had been a migratory horde. Robinson's conclusion—though one must hesitate to differ from any of the splendid results of that bold and original explorer—seems to be invalidated by the latter account of the Idumeans in Josephus. We desiderate evidence for the admitted misnomer of that road being called desert.

However, Robinson's interpretation had usually been followed till a few years ago Dr. G. Adam Smith revived the opinion that "desert" was applied to old Gaza, as distinguished from new Gaza, following Schürer,<sup>1</sup> but not his conclusion. The existence of "New Gaza," and inferentially its distinction from Old or Desert Gaza, rests upon the evidence of an anonymous (of what date?) geographical fragment. He also considers that the repeated mention by Josephus of Gaza as "maritime" shows that when rebuilt by Gabinius in B.C. 57 it was "rebuilt on a new site and possibly close to the harbour." Now Schürer, who holds that "desert" applies to the road, says the port was not New Gaza, nor was it Old Gaza, and while he admits that Strabo knows nothing of New Gaza he follows the anonymous fragment of unknown date in believing its existence. Colonel Conder has shown that the port of Gaza (Ghüzzeh) was Limên (El-Mineh)—a Greek name, probably therefore in use in Philip's time. (*Tent-work in Palestine*, ii. 168.) But the reader of Josephus will see that what he says thrice over (*Antt.* XIV. iv. 4, XV. vii. 3, *B. J.*, I. vii. 7) is, not that there was any distinction between a maritime Gaza and another, a "desert" Gaza, but simply that certain towns named were inland (Scythopolis, Gadara, Hippo, Pella, Samaria), and others were maritime (Gaza, Joppa, Caesarea, Dora). Naturally, then, a city having a port, as Gaza had, being itself three miles from the sea—Arrian says 2½ miles—

<sup>1</sup> *The Jewish People*, E.T. Div. II. vol. i. 71, misprinted in *The Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, p. 187, ed. 1894.

is classed as maritime. It is not legitimate to argue from the relative term to the absolute, nor from the general to the particular, in order to prove that New Gaza was maritime while Old desert Gaza was on the ancient caravan route. Meanwhile, the proof of the existence of New Gaza is of a shadowy kind.

Besides this, even if there were a place New Gaza in Philip's time, we should have to suppose the angel said: "Arise, and go toward the South, unto the way that goeth down from Jerusalem to Gaza, that is to say, Old or Desert Gaza, not the New or Maritime, which is two miles off the main thoroughfare." There seems something peculiarly pedantic in such a deliverance. The precision would be utterly needless, for the road from Samaria or from Jerusalem to either Gaza was one and the same. There is nothing in the narrative to imply that the meeting took place precisely at Old Gaza. But what is more important—there is no evidence that Old Gaza, if it existed as such, was called Desert Gaza. It was not possible that any considerable period of time should pass without there being a Gaza on the main thoroughfare for caravans to and from Egypt; and, if a new Gaza were built, it would soon be contiguous to the Old, which would probably not be called "Desert." And this is completely in accordance with Schürer's conclusion that "both Old and New Gaza lay twenty stadia (2½ miles) inland," since both must have been on the road.

The third solution, therefore, that there was a "Desert Gazà" seems to break down as much as the other two, that the road was desert, and that the city was desert. We might be inclined to say that here St. Luke is careless; he does not care to say which he means, or what he means, or why he has said or reported, "This is desert." He does not care to avoid the charge of irrelevancy even if it be unjust. And yet I do not think the assertion would be

right. There is a simple explanation ready to those who will adopt the prophet's point of view. St. Luke did not write for the critical and uncritical of the twentieth century : he wrote for the understanding Christian of the first ; he wrote for Theophilus, and such as he was ; he wrote for those who were not far removed from the atmosphere that the prophets breathed. Such readers might be expected to be acquainted with the Argument from Prophecy, and to know that the New Testament is lying hid in the Old, and the Old, when fulfilled, lies open in the New ; that the first Christians being prophets were seeking for fulfilments of their Bible everywhere ; and were applying events to texts and texts to events, even future events, to a degree that we may sometimes think to be forced, but when we find them in the New Testament among the foundations of the faith, we often feel them to be touching and wonderful.

St. Peter, as was shown in a former paper on this subject, had certainly been pondering on Isaiah, and it is the most natural supposition that, whether in Peter's company or not, Philip did likewise. If so, he would find some very remarkable indications that the way of God's elect was outside of Jerusalem, from which he and his fellow-disciples *had been scattered abroad* (R.V. But *dispersed* is the only right translation, Acts viii. 4). His Greek bible said, "Rejoice, O thirsty *desert*, let the desert exult and blossom as the lily" (Isa. xxxv. 1). But one of the most remarkable lodes in a whole mine of prophecy is a line in Isaiah xvi. 8 : "Wander ye the *desert*"; they that have been made *apostles* are (or were) *left behind in* (? the city), for they cross (or crossed) *the sea*." Let us take this and set it beside the angel's "this is desert," and beside the statement of Acts viii. 1, "So all *were dispersed* throughout the regions of Judea and Samaria except the apostles." It needs hardly to be said that the context, though referring to Moab, and there-

fore, to speak geographically, remote, offered no impediment to the Christian prophets finding their own fulfilment and their own guidance in the words of the text. Had the context been thoroughly weighed in the case of any and every prophecy of the Old Testament, it is not too much to say that future generations would never have heard of the Argument from Prophecy ; there would have been no such Argument at all. Only the intense belief that " whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through endurance and through comfort of the Scriptures might have hope," enabled the apostles and enables ourselves to endow any prophecy of the Old Testament with its secondary meaning ; and yet this, more often than not, is actually so powerful as to obscure the primary meaning. The same mental process in the apostles which has given us the fulfilments in Christ of the texts of Isaiah and the Psalms as expounded in Acts i.-iv. and elsewhere, was beyond all possibility of doubt active in dealing with numbers of other passages of Holy Writ, some of which can be recovered by diligent study on our part. It seems certain that Isaiah xvi. 8 did not elude the diligent eye of the apostles. It is certain that it precisely describes what they did and what Philip the evangelist did. He did *wander*, or pass without an exact knowledge of his destination, *over* a tract of land said to be *desert* ; the *apostles* were *left* permanently (*ἐγκατελείφθησαν*) *in the city* ; they had *passed through the sea* in the figurative sense of being buried with Christ by baptism into His death. For it is exactly in that sense that St. Paul explains Deuteronomy xxx. 13, " Neither is it beyond the sea that thou shouldest say, Who will go over the sea for us and bring it to us, and make us to hear it, that we may do it ? " That is, he says (Rom. x. 7, using " *go down into the deep*" apparently as a middle term between " the sea " and " Hades," the grave),

“to bring Christ back again from the dead.” This is one of the most forced applications of prophecy to the modern mind; but it was in St. Paul’s way, it was in the Christian prophet’s way. And accompanied as it is by scores of similar interpretations, it forbids us to object that any use of ancient prophecy for Christian purposes is forced.

Should it be objected that the fruitful and palmy and populous Gaza could never be called desert, and that the road to it through cornfields and olive-yards and pastures was equally the reverse of a desert, the answer is sufficient, that any temporary solitude or quiet place can become the desert of prophecy when the conditions of prophecy are fulfilled or to be fulfilled. We rather ask: Had it room for an evangelist to wander? Was it to become a scene of joy to him? Was it *bereft* (ἐρήμῳ) of that which he had to bestow? And on the other hand we ask, Have we not a very familiar parallel to this very use? Was it possible for John Baptist’s voice to reach the crowds so long as it was the voice of one crying *in the desert*? Was Jordan bank anything like a desert—that jungle of luxuriant vegetation? Yet that was where he preached, and where they came to him.

And then Philip read, moreover, in the same passage of Isaiah which John Baptist quoted: “I am the Lord thy God, the Holy One of Israel, who saveth thee: I make *Egypt* and *Ethiopia* an exchange for thee, and Syene on behalf of thee” (xliii. 3). “I will say to the north-wind, Come; and to the *south*-wind, Forbid not: bring my sons from far, and my daughters from the ends of the earth, all men who have called upon my name” (xliii. 6). “And I will make a way in the *desert*” (xliii. 19, 20); “for I make in the *desert* a water, and streams in the waterless place, to give drink to my race whom I have chosen.”

Was it possible for Philip to come to any other conclusion

than this, that the desert was intended in the purpose of God to occupy a place that it had never held before? For some reason or other in the divine Counsel the persecution that arose about Stephen had resulted in the removal of himself and others from the busy haunts of men, and it seemed that they were now more than ever commanded to journey to the desert, and there fulfil His purpose. The desert was on the south and also on the east of Judea. But there was a passage in Isaiah (li. 3) which also spoke of the west: "And now I will encourage thee, O Sion, and I encourage all her desert places, and I will make her desert places as a paradise, and those toward the *west* as a paradise of the Lord." This would seem to Philip to illustrate an earlier verse: "There shall be a clean way there, and it shall be called an holy way, and an unclean man shall not pass by there, nor shall an unclean way be there: but they that *have been dispersed abroad* (οἱ διεσπαρμένοι) shall journey upon it, they shall not go astray" (xxxv. 8). This is another very remarkable fact, that St. Luke thrice in this connexion (Acts xi. 19, viii. 1, 4) applies the term "dispersed" to those exiled members of the Church in Jerusalem; he implies that they formed a fresh Dispersion (διασπορά) of the people of God, who were "sown abroad" as seeds of a future harvest of faith. Had the only idea that St. Luke cared to convey been that they were "scattered," as the Revised Version says, he would have said ἐσκοπίσθησαν, διεσκοπίσθησαν.

It may be worth while to observe in passing that the Jews "of the Dispersion" are those who are commonly, though not quite exactly, included in the term Hellenists, simply because their natural language was the *lingua franca* Greek, which Alexander's conquests had made universal. Every one of the writers of the New Testament was a Hellenist, but not every one was a Jew of the Disper-

sion. St. Peter was not,<sup>1</sup> while his readers were. St. James was not, while his readers were. But the particular reason why St. Luke used the word *διασπαρέντες*, "dispersed," was probably this: he found it in Isaiah applied to a condition of men of which he saw the "fulfilment" in the very condition of Philip and the disciples of Jerusalem; they were "the dispersed." The question arises whether they then, as well as the author of Acts writing years later, were conscious of themselves as "the dispersed." The tendency of criticism in the present day is to inquire concerning every paragraph and every verse, not merely who wrote it, but who provided the material for writing it. And here the choice will be merely whether the term which is thrice applied to the fugitive evangelists is St. Luke's own or his informant's, i.e., St. Philip's. If we consider it to be the latter's term, we should then hold that he was all the more convinced that he and the rest were to be led by the guidance of Isaiah xxxv., and that his mind was prepared for the angel's command, that he, as one of the dispersed, was to journey along a road of the desert. He would take the angel's meaning to be, "This land (sc. ἡ γῆ) is the 'desert' of prophecy, of which you have read in Isaiah."

If we further ask whether there were materials in his reading of prophecy that would suggest that the desert of prophecy lay towards one point of the compass in particular, we have the west and the south indicated in Isaiah, as we have seen; and Egypt and Ethiopia and Syene have been named as an "exchange" for Israel, as though they should supply that which Israel forfeited. But the road to Gaza was the road to Egypt, and the enormous Jewish population of Egypt, which probably far exceeded that of Judea at

<sup>1</sup> On this subject see the valuable essay of Dr. T. K. Abbott, *To what extent was Greek the language of Galilee in the time of Christ?* in his "Essays chiefly on the Original Texts," etc., 1891.

this time, had made the worship of the God of Israel widely known among the heathen of the Nile Valley, so that the pilgrimages from there to the Temple at Jerusalem must have been frequent, and the pilgrims numerous, interesting, and sometimes individually remarkable. This might seem to be indicated in Isaiah xliii. 16, 19, "Thus saith the Lord, . . . who bringeth forth *chariots* and a horse and a mighty crowd. . . . Remember not the first things . . . behold I make new things . . . and I will make a way in the desert." The fact of these pilgrimages seemed to Philip to, be a fulfilment of a prophecy, which it is possible was only a description of the practice of pilgrimage in Isaiah's own earlier time: "Thus saith the Lord of Hosts, Egypt laboureth, and the merchandise of the Ethiopians, and the Sabaeans, men tall of stature, shall cross over to thee . . . and shall *worship* thee and pray in thee" (Isa. xlv. 14).

It seems inevitable that after the meeting Philip would ponder the words of Isaiah concerning "*the eunuchs* that observe my Sabbaths and choose my will and cling to my covenant. . . I will lead them into my holy mountain, and *make them glad* in my house of prayer . . . for my house shall be called an house of prayer to all nations, saith the Lord who assembleth *the dispersed* of Israel" (Isa. lvi. 4, 7, 8). They shall find rejoicing and exultation in it (li. 3). "For ye shall come forth in gladness, and be taught in joy" (lv. 12). "Behold, *proselytes* shall *come unto thee* through me, and shall dwell *beside thee* and flee to thee for refuge" (liv. 15). "O ye that thirst, *journey to the water*" (lv. 1). "Rejoice, thou barren that bearest not . . . for many are the *children of the desert* more than the [land] that has the man" (liv. 1). The baptism by the wayside (for "as they *journeyed* by the way they came to a certain *water*," Acts viii. 36) of this proselyte, the Ethiopian eunuch, by the evangelist whom he had called to his side *in the chariot* to instruct

him, would indeed seem to have been foretold in the prophet's words as they shone forth on the pages adjacent to that which told in prophecy of Jesus. Well might he hazard the statement that "the eunuch went on his way *rejoicing*." The student of St. Luke will find in proportion to the carefulness of his study that the sense of St. Luke's carefulness grows upon him, though it is not precisely of the kind that we demand of a modern historian, and involves for its fuller comprehension a slight effort of mind in order to adopt the author's point of view. No such effort was needed by Theophilus to whom St. Luke wrote, if we suppose that he was an instructed Christian somewhere about the years 70-80.

E. C. SELWYN.

LEXICAL NOTES FROM THE PAPYRI.\*

XXI.

*ποταμοφόρητος*.—Grimm's entry ("Besides only in Hesychius") would suggest that this compound was coined by John: it is just the kind of word we might easily suppose coined. But it occurs in AP 85<sup>16</sup> (78 A.D.), probably before the Apocalypse was written; also in StrP 5<sup>10</sup> (as read by Wilcken, *Archiv* v. 254), two centuries later. The list of Biblical *ἄπαξ εἰρημένα* is getting deplorably select!

*πραγματεύομαι*.—As words found only in Luke are often accused of being "choice," it is well to record that this is a common commercial word: we need not give citations now. *Πράκτωρ*, another Lucan word, is even more abundantly attested; while *πράσσω*, "exact," may also be illustrated.

*προάγω*.—For the intransitive use as in Mark vi. 45, we

\* For abbreviations see the February and March (1908) *EXPOSITON*, pp. 170, 262.